November 3, 2016

TO: Members of the Board of Regents
    Designated Representatives to the Board of Regents

FROM: Joan Goldblatt, Secretary of the Board of Regents

RE: Schedule of Meetings

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2016

8:30 to 10:40 a.m.     Husky Union Building, Room 334
ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Regents Rice (Chair), Riojas, Simon, Wright-Pettibone

*10:55 a.m. to 12:20 p.m. Husky Union Building, Room 334
FINANCE AND ASSET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE: Regents Jaech (Chair), Ayer, Benoliel, Blake, Harrell

12:35 p.m.     Husky Union Building, Room 334
REGULAR MEETING OF BOARD OF REGENTS: Regents Shanahan (Chair), Ayer, Benoliel, Blake, Harrell, Jaech, Rice, Riojas, Simon, Wright-Pettibone

*3:30 p.m.     36 Gerberding Hall
REGENTS GET-TOGETHER WITH FACULTY LEADERSHIP

*or upon conclusion of the previous session.

Unless otherwise indicated, committee meetings of the Board of Regents will run consecutively; starting times following the first committee are estimates only. If a session ends earlier than expected, the next scheduled session may convene immediately. Committee meetings may be attended by all members of the Board of Regents and all members may participate.

To request disability accommodation, contact the Disability Services Office at: 206.543.6450 (voice), 206.543.6452 (TTY), 206.685.7264 (fax), or email at dso@uw.edu. The University of Washington makes every effort to honor disability accommodation requests. Requests can be responded to most effectively if received as far in advance of the event as possible.
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
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Academic and Student Affairs Committee
Regents Rice (Chair), Riojas, Simon, Wright-Pettibone

November 10, 2016
8:30 to 10:40 a.m.
Husky Union Building, Room 334

Approval of Minutes of Committee Meeting on October 13, 2016

COMMITTEE ACTION

1. Academic and Administrative Appointments
   Gerald J. Baldasty, Provost and Executive Vice President

2. Introduction of New Leadership: Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Minority Affairs
   Gerald Baldasty, Provost and Executive Vice President
   Rickey Hall, Vice President & Chief Diversity Officer, Minority Affairs & Diversity

3. Introduction of New Leadership: Interim Dean, School of Public Health
   Gerald Baldasty, Provost and Executive Vice President
   Joel Kaufman, Interim Dean, School of Public Health

4. Trends in Academic Reviews at the University of Washington
   Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Planning, Graduate School
   Robert Stacey, Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
   Keith Nitta, Associate Professor, Interdisciplinary Art & Sciences, UW Bothell

5. Establishing the Master of Science in Business Analytics
   (Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma)
   Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Planning, Graduate School
   Haluk Demirkan, Associate Professor of Service Innovation and Business Analytics
   Howard Smith, Dean, Milgard School of Business

6. Establishing the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship
   (Department of Management and Organization, Michael G. Foster School of Business)
   Rebecca Aanerud, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Planning, Graduate School
   Suresh Kotha, Professor and Chair, Department of Management and Organization
   Daniel Turner, Associate Dean, Masters Programs
7. Enrollment Data for Autumn 2016 New Undergraduate Students
   Philip Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment &
   Undergraduate Admission
   Karl Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor Chief Admissions
   Officer, UW Tacoma
   Steve Syverson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Enrollment
   Management, UW Bothell

INFORMATION A–7

8. Population Health Initiative
   Ali Mokdad, Vice Chair, Population Health Initiative
   Thaisa Way, Faculty Senate Liaison, Population Health
   Initiative
   Derek Fulwiler, Project Director, Population Health
   Initiative

INFORMATION A–8

9. Research Spotlight: Immersive Virtual Reality, a non-
   pharmacologic analgesic for U.S. soldiers during painful burn
   wound cleaning sessions (for combat-related burn injuries)
   Herb Simon, Regent
   Dr. Hunter Hoffman, Research Scientist, Mechanical
   Engineering

INFORMATION A–9

10. Other Business
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
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Finance and Asset Management Committee
Regents Jaech (Chair), Ayer, Benoliel, Blake, Harrell

November 10, 2016
10:55 a.m. to 12:20 p.m.
Husky Union Building, Room 334

Approval of Minutes of Committee Meeting on October 13, 2016

1. Approve Appointment of Insurance Broker of Record
   Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance & Risk Services and Interim Vice President, Finance & Facilities
   
2. Approve Internal Audit Planned Activities for 2017 and Internal Audit Charter
   Kristi Blake, Regent, Chair, Audit Advisory Committee
   
3. Approve Amendments to Debt Management Policy
   Chris Malins, Associate Vice President, Treasury
   
4. Capital and Debt Update
   Chris Malins, Associate Vice President, Treasury
   Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, Capital Planning and Development
   
5. Funding Guideline for Capital Projects with Donor Funding
   Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, Capital Planning and Development
   Chris Malins, Associate Vice President, Treasury
   Connie Kravas, Vice President for University Advancement
   
6. Computer Science & Engineering (CSEII) Funding Strategy
   Hank Levy, Chair, Computer Science and Engineering
   Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, Capital Planning and Development
   Chris Malins, Associate Vice President, Treasury
   
7. Population Health Facility - Stage 1 Approve Alternate Public Works Contracting, Delegated Authority to Award Design/Build Contract, and Pre-Construction Budget
   Mike McCormick, Associate Vice President, Capital Planning and Development
   David Anderson, Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration

COMMITTEE ACTION

1. ACTION F–1

2. ACTION F–2

3. ACTION F–3

4. INFORMATION F–4

5. INFORMATION F–5

6. INFORMATION F–6

7. ACTION F–7
8. **Business Equity Scorecard Project Update**  
   **Rogelio Riojas**, Regent  
   **Angela Battle**, Director, Business Diversity Program, Planning & Management

9. **Approval of UW Housestaff Association Collective Bargaining Agreement – UW Ratification**  
   **Peter Denis**, Assistant Vice President, Labor Relations  
   **Mark Green**, Vice Dean for Administration and Finance, Dean's Office, School of Medicine

10. **Audit Advisory Committee Update**  
    **Kristi Blake**, Regent, Chair, Audit Advisory Committee

11. **UW Medicine Board Update**  
    **Kristi Blake**, Regent  
    **Rogelio Riojas**, Regent

12. **Other Business**
AGENDA

BOARD OF REGENTS
University of Washington

November 10, 2016
12:35 p.m.
Husky Union Building, Room 334

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL: Assistant Secretary Shelley Tennant

III. CONFIRM AGENDA

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

V. BOARD ITEMS

Quarterly Safety Report (Information)
- Jill Lee, Executive Director, Compliance Services
- Kate Leonard, Title IX/ADA Coordinator, Compliance Services
- Ellen Taylor, Associate Vice President, Student Life

Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee Update (Information)
- Herb Simon, Regent, Chair of the Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee
- Randy Hodgins, Vice President of External Affairs
- Bernard Dean, Director of State Relations, Office of External Affairs

Quarterly Compliance Report - Information Compliance (Information)
- Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance & Risk Services and Interim Vice President, Finance & Facilities
- Sue Clausen, Chief Compliance Officer, UW Medicine/Associate Vice President for Medical Affairs, UW
- Kirk Bailey, Chief Information Security Officer and Associate Vice President, Office of the CISO
- Ellen Taylor, Associate Vice President, Student Life

Resolution Regarding Schedule of 2017 Regular Meetings (Action)
- Pat Shanahan, Board Chair

VI. REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS: Regent Shanahan

VII. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT: President Cauce

VIII. CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of October 13, 2016
Establishing the Master of Science in Business Analytics (Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma)  A–5

Establishing the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship (Department of Management and Organization, Michael G. Foster School of Business)  A–6

Approve Appointment of Insurance Broker of Record  F–1

Approve Internal Audit Planned Activities for 2017 and Internal Audit Charter  F–2

Approve Amendments to Debt Management Policy  F–3

Population Health Facility - Stage 1 Approve Alternate Public Works Contracting, Delegated Authority to Award Design/Build Contract, and Pre-Construction Budget  F–7

Approval of UW Housestaff Association Collective Bargaining Agreement – UW Ratification  F–9

IX. STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic and Student Affairs Committee: Regent Rice – Chair

Academic and Administrative Appointments (Action)  A–1

Introduction of New Leadership: Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Minority Affairs (Information only)  A–2

Introduction of New Leadership: Interim Dean, School of Public Health (Information only)  A–3

Trends in Academic Reviews at the University of Washington (Information only)  A–4

Enrollment Data for Autumn 2016 New Undergraduate Students (Information only)  A–7

Population Health Initiative (Information only)  A–8

Research Spotlight: Immersive Virtual Reality, a non-pharmacologic analgesic for U.S. soldiers during painful burn wound cleaning sessions (for combat-related burn injuries) (Information only)  A–9

B. Finance and Asset Management Committee: Regent Jaech – Chair

Capital and Debt Update (Information only)  F–4

Funding Guideline for Capital Projects with Donor Funding (Information only)  F–5

Computer Science & Engineering (CSEII) (Information only)  F–6
X. REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Faculty Senate Chair – Professor Zoe Barsness

Student Leaders:
   ASUW President – Ms. Daniele Menez  
   GPSS President – Ms. Soh Yeun (Elloise) Kim 
   ASUW Tacoma President – Mr. Berkan Koroglu  
   ASUW Bothell President – Ms. Tanya Kumar

Alumni Association President – Mr. Clyde Walker

XI. DATE FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING: Thursday, December 8, 2016

XII. EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

(to discuss with legal counsel litigation or potential litigation as defined in RCW 42.30.110.)

(to review the performance of public employees.)

XIII. ADJOURN
The Board of Regents held its regular meeting on Thursday, November 10, 2016, beginning at 12:35 p.m. in the Husky Union Building, room 334. The notice of the meeting was appropriately provided to the public and the media.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Regent Shanahan called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Assistant Secretary Tennant called the roll. Present were Regents Shanahan (chairing), Ayer, Benoliel, Blake, Jaech, Rice, Riojas, Simon, Wright-Pettibone; President Cauce, Provost Baldasty, Ms. Goldblatt; designated representatives: Professor Barsness, Ms. Kim, Ms. Menez, Mr. Walker.

Absent: Regent Harrell

**CONFIRM AGENDA**

The agenda was confirmed as presented.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Regent Shanahan announced the Board would receive comments from the public. This segment of the meeting provides Board members a chance to hear directly from the public on any subject pertaining to the University. Any Board member who has questions or would like additional information would make a request through staff following the meeting. Regent Shanahan offered the opportunity to comment to people who signed up in advance.

Regents heard comments from a UW student who introduced a group of attendees from Confronting Climate Change and the Students United for Palestinian Equal Rights, who said students are expressing fear for themselves, their families, and communities. The speakers encouraged the Board and administration to listen to students and give them power over the responsible, ethical, and moral investment of University’s funds. The students advocated for divestment from fossil fuels, private prisons, and the Israeli occupation of Palestine.

Regent Shanahan thanked the speakers for expressing their views and for attending the meeting.
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BOARD ITEMS

**Quarterly Safety Report** (Agenda no. B–1) (Information only)

Jill Lee, Executive Director of Compliance Services; Kate Leonard, Title IX/ADA Coordinator, Compliance Services; and Ellen Taylor, Associate Vice President of Student Life, presented the quarterly safety report.

The focus of the report is on Title IX, a federal law prohibiting sex discrimination in any federally funded education program or activity.

- **Overview of applicable areas**
  - Gender equity in athletics;
  - Sex discrimination stereotypes in access to programs;
  - Education for pregnant and parenting students;
  - Protections for transgender students;
  - Sexual harassment in education.

- **Current focus on sexual misconduct**
  In 2011, the Department of Education Office for Civil Rights extended Title IX to acts of sexual violence and laid out expectations that colleges and universities would have the responsibility to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual violence. The UW created a robust Title IX coordinator role and hired a full-time Title IX coordinator in 2012.

- **Accomplishments**
  In 2013 President Young charged a task force on sexual assault prevention and response, chaired by Ellen Taylor. This task force outlined an over-arching goal of a culture change required to change sexual violence on campus. It encouraged active bystanders, student involvement, and a sense of shared responsibility. Specific outcomes included the creation of a position and hiring of a full-time training and education coordinator. Consistent, student-involved programs were created around prevention and education. Over the past four years, the number of students attending training in a program of peer health educators has grown from ten to over sixty. There has been an expanded presence at summer orientation and a growing partnership with First Year Programs. Climate surveys have been conducted to track impact of programs and gather information to improve future initiatives. In March 2016, SANE was implemented and provides sexual assault nurse examiner services at the UW Medical Center. This service was already in place at Harborview and NW Hospital, but is now available closer to campus.

- **UW governance structure and Action Plan**
  President Cauce established a Title IX steering committee, charged with fostering an institution-wide environment of cultural change through a community approach, and ensuring compliance with Title IX and other laws and regulations related to sexual misconduct. The Title IX committee reports to steering committee. Currently under development is an advisory group mainly made up of students. In May 2016, President Cauce announced the creation of a Title IX investigation office and Title IX
panel. Safe Campus has an expanded role as a resource for faculty and staff who receive disclosures of potential Title IX matters with a pending on-line training.

The University will continue its efforts to promote and provide a safe living and learning environment for its students.

See Attachment B–1.

**Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee Update** (Agenda no. B–2) (Information only)

Regent Simon, Chair of the Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee, provided an update on the Committee’s activities. Committee members:

- Herb Simon, Chair
- Regent Joanne Harrell
- Jerry Grinstein
- Rob McKenna
- Mike Egan
- Tony Williams

The Committee plans to add an additional member from Eastern Washington. Regent Wright-Pettibone attends the meetings, along with staff from UW Impact and Government Relations, who provide updates and receive input and direction from committee.

At its recent meeting on Monday, September 26, the committee discussed the following:

- Update on the legislative engagement plan adopted last year. The plan included being more aggressive at the state legislative level, meeting more often with legislators, and working more closely with the UW Impact alumni group;
- Reviewed the Washington Competes proposal, which is the proposed joint legislative agenda for the four-year institutions and community colleges;
- Discussed the general strategic approach to the 2017 legislative session.

The Committee will meet again in early December when they plan to take a deeper dive into the results of the general election, especially regarding new house and senate leadership and committee assignments. Committee members will receive a report on President Cauce’s visit to Olympia on Monday, November 14. They will preview and discuss the Governor’s biennial budget proposal and strategize an approach to the 2017 session.

During the 2017 legislative session, the Committee plans to be involved in the following ways:

- Hold bi-weekly phone meetings to provide “real time” updates on the progress of the UW’s legislative and budget agendas;
- Coordinate the joint “Regents and Trustees Day” in Olympia with the College Promise Coalition;
- Coordinate a “UW Regents Day in Olympia” later in the session.
Regent Simon listed major UW issues expected during the upcoming legislative session:

- Funding for salary increases for faculty, professional staff, and collective bargaining agreements;
- Twenty more medical education slots in Spokane, and the RIDE request to add a second year in Spokane;
- Expand services for students on all three campuses;
- High demand enrollments;
- Population Health Initiative research building and teaching building requests;
- Metro Tract leasehold excise tax issue.

The College Promise Coalition will continue to look at a pathway to a dedicated funding mechanism for higher education and will continue to pursue certainty in higher education funding.

Bernard Dean, Director of State Relations, Office of External Affairs, said he doesn’t expect a lot of changes in Olympia following the recent election. There are five new statewide elected officials. He highlighted other changes and upcoming appointments based on the election. The Sound Transit 3 proposal passed which will provide an opportunity for greater commuter access to the campus in the future.

Regent Rice asked about purchasing from prison industries. Regent Simon replied the Committee would research the state policy related to this, and would report back to the Board.

Randy Hodgins, Vice President of External Affairs, talked about Washington D.C. and described concerns related to the University during the “lame duck” session, which begins on Monday, and in the new administration. There is no permanent budget for federal fiscal year 2017. The continuing resolution expires on December 9. Mr. Hodgins expects congress will pass another continuing resolution to extend funding through Spring 2017. Continuing resolutions preclude the ability for federally-funded researchers and educators to plan. He expects Congress to take up the 21st Century Cures, which is legislation intended to provide a new funding stream for biomedical research nationwide. The Congress is also expected to consider export import bank legislation important to Boeing and the state economy.

The new Congress will face issues including major changes to Affordable Care Act, or a full repeal. This action would cause ripples through the U.S. healthcare system, of which the UW is a part. Tax reform will be on the table. Higher education reauthorization might move forward. Infrastructure funding could potentially have a stimulus-like impact.

See Attachment B–2.

**Quarterly Compliance Report - Information Compliance** (Agenda no. B–3)

(Information only)
Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance & Risk Services and Interim Vice President, Finance & Facilities, introduced Kirk Bailey, Chief Information Security Officer; Sue Clausen, Chief Compliance Officer, UW Medicine and Associate Vice President for Medical Affairs; and Ellen Taylor.

Ms. Cherry said this is the fifth compliance report to the Regents and it presents the results of an information compliance assessment. Two items were selected for mitigation: the Internet of Things and intersection of FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) privacy and the duty to warn obligation imposed by various laws. Ms. Cherry clarified the written materials distributed in advance of the meeting suggest that FERPA includes a duty to warn, which it does not. The written materials have been updated to reflect the clarification and are attached to these minutes.

Dr. Taylor talked about mitigation related to the information compliance assessment, especially as it relates to health and safety and said protection of personally identifiable information is very important. The Registrar has processes in place to insure protection of student data. She explained it is also important to protect the health and safety of UW’s students. Student data should be shared, even without students’ consent, to avoid or respond to a health or safety emergency. This includes only information that needs to be shared and only with those who need to know it to address an immediate emergency situation. Systems are in place to identify and assess students of concern and to provide mental or physical safety or support services. The University navigates the line between protecting students’ privacy and doing all it can to reduce the risk of harm to self or others. It is important that members of the UW community understand the signs and procedures for identifying a student of concern and the clear criteria for knowing when and whether to release student data, and to ensure FERPA rules are followed, including documenting the articulable and significant threat that formed the basis for the disclosure. In addition, the University’s policies must align and comply with federal and state laws. The offices of Student Life and the Registrar will work together with other service provider offices in an eighteen-month mitigation project to enhance knowledge of the services and systems in place and ensure the UW has a “tight” plan moving forward.

Mr. Bailey said in his world of cybersecurity, these are remarkable times during which the Internet of Things has emerged as a set of opportunities and challenges. Innovation allows for operating efficiencies, cost savings, safety enhancements, and more. But, the downside can be disruptive in the area of compliance. He talked about the prevalence of malware attacks. Fortunately, those issues can be mitigated. He is proposing undertaking a mitigation strategy to gain an understanding of how the UW is utilizing internet devices, leverage those opportunities, and set up an oversight framework to manage the process. Statutes that protect data require technology controls and practices around the networks and systems that represent the services. He plans to undertake mitigation efforts as outlined in the materials distributed to the Board in advance of the meeting. He believes the steps in the plan are pragmatic, achievable, and worthwhile.

See Attachment B–3.

**Resolution Regarding Schedule of Regular Board Meetings in 2017** (Agenda no. B–4)

(Action)
Regent Shanahan asked for Board approval of the 2017 schedule of regular meetings. He offered some highlights:

- In January, the Board will meet in Dempsey Hall in the Foster School of Business;
- The Board plans to continue the practice of meeting at both UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses during the calendar year;
- The Governance Standing Committee has four meetings noticed on the Wednesday afternoon before the Board meetings. All Board members are welcome to attend.
- The Board will schedule monthly meetings on the Wednesday evening before the Thursday of the regularly scheduled Board meetings. These are intended to be casual and informative sessions to learn more about the University’s faculty, staff, and students. The meetings will be in 142 Gerberding, and will include a light meal.

**MOTION:** Upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Board and the motion made by Regent Simon, seconded by Regent Rice, the Board voted to approve the Schedule of Regular Meetings for 2017.

See Attachment B–4.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS:** Regent Shanahan

Regent Shanahan reflected on the recent general elections and said as a group, the UW knows what it is and all is not lost. The UW clearly knows where it is going and knows who it is— a strong team of staff, faculty, students, and Board forming a strong group that knows its mission, has a plan, and is not going through the motions. The Board has invested lots of planning time to work toward making its meetings even more effective. The UW is about inclusion and holds meaningful conversations. The Board spends a lot of time to get the right content onto its agendas and he expects it will continue to get better. Not everyone agrees during every conversation, but Board members are committed to practice listening. He encouraged all to be mindful that the institution has scale. The Board intends to support President Cauce’s agenda items around race and equity, innovation, and the population health initiative and really can have an impact on the world. If the Board and administration become distracted, the UW will miss an opportunity. Because of its scale, with focused and collaborative work the University can change the world. Regent Shanahan said the University needs to make sure its operations are functional with the right amount of accountability in place to make sure it runs efficiently and without surprises. Regent Shanahan encouraged the University to stay focused on what’s important knowing there will be a lot of change. It is not a perfect system, but it is the one in place and the Board needs to make it work and move forward. People are counting on the Regents to do this. Regent Shanahan said he is optimistic about the future, adding the University is better when united. He encouraged all to stay focused, deal with issues, solve problems which arise, and celebrate success. He concluded by saying, “Our plan is working and we will make progress.”
President Cauce noted the University is moving forward and has a full agenda for the upcoming legislative session in Olympia, including advocating for faculty compensation to help the UW retain its “fabulous faculty.” The UW plans to link with other four year universities and community colleges. The Faculty Senate has an ambitious agenda that includes stabilizing and enhancing the position of lecturers.

President Cauce praised the event to launch the University’s fundraising campaign, which was followed by meaningful gifts.

It has been a difficult and contentious election season that ended with the popular vote for President differing from the electoral vote. Things seem unsettled and it is important to acknowledge some students are scared, particularly undocumented students. Seattle Mayor Murray made it clear Seattle will remain a sanctuary city. Other students are worried and scared. There have been ugly incidents on other campuses targeting Muslim, gay, and Latino students. President Cauce thanked the Offices of Minority Affairs and Diversity, Undergraduate Academic Affairs, Student Life, and the Ethnic Cultural Center for reaching out to students. She said student leaders have done a great job. She praised the work of the UW Police Department to keep students safe when participants in a community march came onto campus. She reiterated the first concern of the President, Provost, and the faculty is the safety of students.

The President said the administration is beginning work to figure out what the potential effects of the change in administration might be, including conducting an analysis of potential impacts caused by changes to the Affordable Care Act. Also, the administration is exploring potential impacts to GIX, given the tensions about China and trade. And, there may be potential effects on research funding. There still remains much uncertainty, but University administrators are working on preliminary analyses on potential impacts.

President Cauce mentioned Veterans Appreciation week, during which the University honors men and women who have served the country. Peter Chiarelli will receive the Distinguished Alumni Veteran Award and be recognized for seeking care for veterans with unseen injuries and post-traumatic stress syndrome.

Although very serious events are going on in the campus community, the President said it’s important to continue to celebrate life and take comfort in the things that are going well. ESPN will host College GameDay at UW on Saturday, November 11, before a big Husky football game. Go, Dawgs!

CONSENT AGENDA

Regent Shanahan noted there were eight items for approval on the Consent Agenda, and called for a motion.

MOTION: Upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Board and the motion made by Regent Jaech, seconded by Regent Rice, the Board voted to approve the eight items on the Consent Agenda as shown below:
Minutes for the meeting of October 13, 2016

Establishing the Master of Science in Business Analytics (Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma) (Agenda no. A–5)

It was the recommendation of the administration and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee that the Board of Regents grant authority to the Milgard School of Business to offer the Master of Science in Business Analytics (MSBA), effective Autumn Quarter 2017. This degree program will be state-supported. The graduate degree program will have provisional status with a review to be scheduled for the 2022-2023 academic year. At such time that continuing status is granted, a ten-year review cycle would begin.

See Attachment A–5.

Establishing the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship (Department of Management and Organization, Michael G. Foster School of Business) (Agenda no. A–6)

It was the recommendation of the administration and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee that the Board of Regents grant authority to the Department of Management and Organization in the Michael G. Foster School of Business to offer the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship (MSE), effective Summer Quarter 2017. This degree program will be fee-based. The graduate degree program will have provisional status with a review to be scheduled for the 2022-2023 academic year. At such time that continuing status is granted, a ten-year review cycle would begin.

See Attachment A–6.

Approve Appointment of Insurance Broker of Record (Agenda no. F–1)

It was the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents appoint Parker, Smith & Feek as the University’s Insurance Broker of Record for an additional five-year period effective December 1, 2016, subject to satisfactory performance.

See Attachment F–1.

Approve Internal Audit Planned Activities for 2017 and Internal Audit Charter (Agenda no. F–2)

It was the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents, in accordance with the Standards of the Institute of Internal Auditors, approve the University of Washington’s 2017 Audit Plan and Internal Audit Charter.

See Attachment F–2.
Approve Amendments to Debt Management Policy (Agenda no. F–3)

It was the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents adopt the amended Debt Management Policy.

See Attachment F–3.

Population Health Facility - Stage I Approve Alternate Public Works Contracting, Delegated Authority to Award Design/Build Contract, and Pre-Construction Budget (Agenda no. F–7)

It was the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents:
1) Approve Alternative Public Works Contracting (design/build);
2) Delegate authority to award design/build contract;
3) Approve pre-construction budget of $10 million.

See Attachment F–7.

Approval of UW Housestaff Association Collective Bargaining Agreement – UW Ratification (Agenda no. F–9)

It was the recommendation of the Administration that the Board of Regents approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Washington (“UW”) and UW Housestaff Association (“UWHA”) that covers approximately 1,400 residents and fellows in the UW School of Medicine and School of Dentistry (collectively referenced as “Residents”). The duration of this Agreement is from November 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019.

See Attachment F–9.

STANDING COMMITTEES

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE: Regent Rice, Chair

Academic and Administrative Appointments (Agenda no. A–1) (Action)

MOTION: Upon the recommendation of the administration and the motion made by Regent Rice, the Board voted to approve the personnel appointments. Regent Wright-Pettibone abstained from the vote.

See Attachment A–1.

Introduction of New Leadership: Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Minority Affairs (Agenda no. A–2) (Information only)

See Attachment A–2.
Introduction of New Leadership: Interim Dean, School of Public Health (Agenda no. A–3) (Information only)

See Attachment A–3.

Trends in Academic Reviews at the University of Washington (Agenda no. A–4) (Information only)

See Attachment A–4.

Enrollment Data for Autumn 2016 New Undergraduate Students (Agenda no. A–7) (Information only)

See Attachment A–7.

Population Health Initiative (Agenda no. A–8) (Information only)

See Attachment A–8.

Research Spotlight: Immersive Virtual Reality, a non-pharmacologic analgesic for U.S. soldiers during painful burn wound cleaning sessions (for combat-related burn injuries) (Agenda no. A–9) (Information only)

See Attachment A–9.

FINANCE AND ASSET MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE: Regent Jaech, Chair

Capital and Debt Update (Agenda no. F–4) (Information only)

See Attachment F–4.

Funding Guideline for Capital Projects with Donor Funding (Agenda no. F–5) (Information only)

See Attachment F–5.

Computer Science & Engineering (CSEII)) (Agenda no. F–6) (Information only)

See Attachment F–6.

Business Equity Scorecard Project Update (Agenda no. F–8) (Information only)

See Attachment F–8.

Audit Advisory Committee Update (Agenda no. F–10) (Information only)

See Attachment F–10.
**UW Medicine Board Update** (Agenda no. F–11) (Information only)

See Attachment F–11.

**REPORTS TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS**

Regent Shanahan invited ASUW Bothell President Tanya Kumar and ASUW Tacoma President Berkan Koroglu to join the Regents at the table, and asked Professor Barsness to provide a report from the Faculty Senate.

**Faculty Senate Chair:** Professor Zoe Barsness

Professor Barsness reported the Senate has been working on providing resources to faculty to address students’ concerns about the election results. The Senate has an ambitious agenda for the year. It continues its focus on the importance of compensation. In partnership with Provost Baldasty and the Board of Deans and Chancellors, the Senate is working with elected faculty council members in the schools, colleges, and campuses to review budget planning processes and coordinate with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to provide mechanisms to share best practices with each other and provide a framework to articulate ideal compensation systems. The goal is to establish plans to address salary gaps.

Professor Barsness thanked the Provost and the Office of Planning & Budgeting for their help in developing faculty demographic data. The Senate will provide these analytics to units to support their efforts to address diversity, equity, and inclusion goals.

The Leadership Excellence Program accepted its second cohort. The Faculty Senate is working with the Provost’s Office to identity mid-career faculty to participate in this program that supports training and development.

Professor Barsness recently returned from a meeting of the Pac-12 Academic Leadership Coalition, a group of faculty governance leaders from the Pac-12 schools. At the meeting, they explored ways to better collaborate to share information and best practices. The group is gaining traction and focus on particular areas, specifically on issues faced by non-tenure track faculty, such as career paths, voting rights, compensation, and working conditions. She observed the UW has much to share with the other universities about things that work.

**ASUW President:** Ms. Daniele Menez

Ms. Menez told the Regents that given the results of the elections, a majority of UW’s student body does not feel safe. There are vast numbers of students who have communicated with her to express their fear. Students are scared and uncertain about being safe on campus. Given these feelings, she commended President Cauce and OMAD Vice President Rickey Hall for the leadership they’ve shown. There was a town hall meeting at the Ethnic Cultural Center which provided a safe space of healing for students. Ms. Menez reported she issued a statement to the student body on behalf of ASUW reaffirming its commitment to making the campus a safe place for all students, regardless
of their political beliefs. It is timely that next week ASUW’s will sponsor a student safety awareness week involving active shooter training and a UWPD panel about free speech and safe spaces. ASUW plans to promote and raise awareness of health and wellness and safety resources available to students as it keeps moving forward and continues its work.

**GPSS President:** Ms. Elloise Kim

Ms. Kim described how graduate students feel about the election results. In the last two days, they have expressed overwhelming emotions and concern about their safety and well-being. Graduate students who teach classes and lead sections are hearing concerns from undergraduate students. The GPSS officers drafted a letter in support of their peers containing the message that GPSS stands by graduate students with the mission of making the community inclusive, respectful, and understanding. The week before the election the ASUW Office of Government Relations prepared a voting campaign video to encourage students to vote. GPSS participated in the project. The video received more than 2000 views.

Ms. Kim reported on the last GPSS Senate meeting with a high attendance and active conversations. The meeting topic was safety and wellness. UWPD Chief Vinson and UW Health and Wellness staff attended as guests and led a conversation about the campus climate and stress levels. The agenda at the next meeting will focus on professional and career development. GPSS is working with the UWAA and the Career and Internship Center to identify ways current resources can address the needs of graduate students.

In partnership with the Office of Student Life, Ms. Kim expressed the goal of addressing international graduate student service improvements. A focus group has been formed to identify what type of services UW is providing and where it can do better. Ms. Kim convened a focus group of international graduate students to identify the different needs of this group. She thanked Vice President Suite for his support on this issue.

**ASUW Tacoma President:** Mr. Berkan Koroglu

Mr. Koroglu reported on ASUW Tacoma’s activities.

- Exploring the feasibility of open source text books to decrease the cost for students.
- Working to increase student access to facilities by changing the hours of classroom operation, as the library is not open 24 hours.
- Sustainability – Mr. Koroglu serves on the Chancellor’s Sustainability Committee. Students have designed eco-friendly bottles, which they are hoping to distribute to the campus.
- Race and Equity – ASUW Tacoma recently hosted Bree Newsome at a race and equity initiative event.
- Commencement – students are concerned about the number of tickets available to the ceremony, and so convened a focus group to determine what students want and next steps. The focus group recommended holding two commencement
ceremonies on the same day and has asked the Chancellor to recommend this format to the President and Provost.

- Bike Share – exploring a bike share partnership with the city of Tacoma.
- Student Housing – working on ways to increase resident life programs in the on-campus student housing.
- Elections – students held a post-election discussion. They are focused on community and unity with a day of hope event on November 30.

**ASUW Bothell President:** Ms. Tanya Kumar

Ms. Kumar reported students at UW Bothell feel unsafe. They held two discussion forums and plan to host a town hall to reinforce the undivided campus community. She mentioned Regent Wright-Pettibone sent a supportive post-election email message that stated the University’s long-term goals are sustained. Student leaders will work to unite the campus community and promote openness and inclusion on the campus.

ASUW Bothell held three get-out-the-vote events. A ballot box was located on campus. They plan to sponsor a health and wellness awareness week featuring information booths and tables. Another town hall meeting is coming up regarding the City of Bothell police enforcement on campus. ASUW Bothell leadership plans to release statements to reinforce the fact that the campus community stands together.

Recently, ASUW Bothell released a video of best kept secrets at UW Bothell. The video is posted on YouTube at the address below:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jww1qBaNUFU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jww1qBaNUFU)

Ms. Kumar praised the tri-campus vision and community saying together the three campuses are building a stronger community.

**Alumni Association President:** Mr. Clyde Walker

Mr. Walker reminded the Regents the UWAA’s mantra for the year is, “and, we,” which stands for “action informed by dialogue, Washington excels.” UWAA has been focused around a number of activities engaging students and alumni in the areas of:

1) Advocacy
2) Career
3) Learning
4) Mentoring
5) Veteran’s Appreciation

**Advocacy**

Prior to the elections, UW Impact conducted a survey to encourage legislators to commit to support for higher education. Information is attached to these minutes.

This upcoming legislative session will be a critical one for higher education. The message should remind the legislature that the UW’s ambitious fundraising campaign is not a substitute for state support.
In addition to the candidate survey, UW Impact is also conducting a survey of alumni and advocates of public higher education to determine the issues alumni care about and to help shape priorities during the upcoming legislative session.

On Thursday, January 5, UW Impact will host its annual legislative preview event featuring leaders from the UW and higher education.

Career
This is the second year of the Huskies@Work program where UWAA matches approximately 200 students and alumni for a job shadow session where current UW undergraduate students meet alumni in their work spaces to understand what specific careers are about.

Mentoring
As Ms. Kim mentioned, UWAA is working with GPSS and the Graduate School to ensure resources available to undergrads are available to grad students as well.

Learning
The one-credit Race and Equity Seminar called Interrupting Privilege offers interaction between students and alumni during meaningful conversations, including a recent impromptu discussion about the Electoral College.

Veterans Appreciation
General Chiarelli will be recognized as the Distinguished Alumni Veteran. A new event, modeled after the Native American “Coming Home” ceremony which welcomes veterans back to their tribal communities from fields of battle, will take place at the Intellectual House. This unique and moving experience will welcome UW veterans back to their campus home and provide them with an environment of recognition and appreciation.

Mr. Walker reported Homecoming weekend was busy and successful with the following related events:
- The Class of ‘66 held a fun and warm fifty-year reunion.
- The annual Multicultural Alumni Partnership's (MAP) Bridging the Gap Breakfast was held on Saturday, October 22. Younger leaders have become very involved with the Breakfast, and bring new energy to the event.
- The annual Dawg Dash, presented by Alaska Airlines, was an enormous success with more than 4,000 Husky kids and adults running and walking the scenic course through campus. The event raised more than $25,000 for student scholarships.

The past weekend, Mr. Walker traveled with the football team to Cal. Over 1000 spirited Husky supporters attended the warm-up.

DATE FOR NEXT MEETING
Before the meeting adjourned, Regent Simon memorialized State Senator Andy Hill, who died at the end of October, at the age of 52. Regent Simon said Senator Hill was “a real friend of higher education” and praised his dedication to public service.

Regent Shanahan announced the regular meeting scheduled on Thursday, December 8, 2016 is canceled. The next regular meetings of the Board of Regents will be held on Wednesday, January 11, 2017 and Thursday, January 12, 2017, on the Seattle campus.

Following the meeting, Regents were invited to get together with faculty leaders in the Faculty Senate Office, 36 Gerberding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Regent Shanahan announced the Board would hold an executive session to discuss with legal counsel litigation or potential litigation as defined in RCW 42.30.110.

Regent Shanahan announced the Board would hold an executive session to review the performance of public employees.

ADJOURNMENT

The regular meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Joan Goldblatt
Secretary of the Board of Regents

Approved at the meeting of the Board on January 12, 2017.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Academic and Administrative Appointments

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee that the Board of Regents approve the appointments to the University faculty and administration as presented on the attached list.

Attachment

Academic and Administrative Appointments
ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Spanish and Portuguese Studies
Flores, Lauro Hugo
Acting Chair, Spanish and Portuguese Studies, effective 9/16/2016
Continuing Appointments:
• Professor, American Ethnic Studies
• Adjunct Professor, Spanish and Portuguese Studies
Degrees:
• PhD, 1980, University of California (San Diego)
• BA, 1973, University of California (San Diego)

Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy and Governance
Daniel J. Evans School of Public Policy and Governance
Long, Mark Christian
 Associate Dean, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, effective 9/16/2016
Continuing Appointments:
• Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance
• Adjunct Professor, Economics
Degrees:
• PhD, 2002, University of Michigan
• MA, 1998, University of Michigan
• MPP, 1996, University of Michigan
• BA, 1989, Depauw University

School of Medicine
Department of Pharmacology
Scott, John Donald
Chair, Pharmacology, effective 9/1/2016
Continuing Appointments:
• Professor, Pharmacology
Degrees:
• PhD, 1983, University of Aberdeen (United Kingdom)
• BSC, 1980, Heriot-Watt University (United Kingdom)
Department of Radiology
Shuman, William
Acting Chair, Radiology, effective 9/15/2016
Continuing Appointments:
  • Professor without Tenure, Radiology
Degrees:
  • MD, 1973, State University of New York
  • BA, 1969, Yale University

ENDOWED APPOINTMENTS

College of Built Environments
Department of Urban Design and Planning
Stevenson, Simon Andrew Whybert
  John and Rosalind Jacobi Family Endowed Chair for Real Estate, effective 11/1/2016
Continuing Appointment:
  • Professor, Urban Design and Planning
Degrees:
  • PhD, 1997, University College of Dublin (Ireland)
  • MS, 1993, University of Stirling (Scotland)
  • BSC, 1992, Liverpool John Moores University

College of the Environment
School of Oceanography
Keil, Richard George
  Ben Rabinowitz Endowed Professorship in the Human Dimensions of the Environment, effective 7/15/2016
Continuing Appointment:
  • Professor, Oceanography
Degrees:
  • PhD, 1991, University of Delaware
  • BA, 1986, Duke University
School of Public Health
Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences
Kavanagh, Terrance James
Sheldon D. Murphy Endowed Chair in Toxicology and Environmental Health, effective 7/1/2015
Continuing Appointments:
  • Professor, Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences
  • Adjunct Professor, Medicine
Degrees:
  • PhD, 1985, Michigan State University
  • MS, 1980, Michigan State University
  • BS, 1975, University of Michigan

NEW APPOINTMENTS

College of Arts and Sciences
Department of Germanics
Bassler, Hans Moritz
Visiting Professor, Germanics, effective 3/27/2017
Degrees:
  • PhD, 1993, Universität Tubingen
  • MA, 1989, Universität Tubingen

Department of Physics
Han, Junbo
Visiting Professor, Physics, effective 11/1/2016
Degrees:
  • PhD, 2007, Wuhan University
  • BS, 2002, Wuhan University

Department of Psychology
Snyder-Mackler, Noah
Assistant Professor, Psychology, effective 9/16/2017
Degrees:
  • PhD, 2012, University of Pennsylvania
  • MA, 2008, University of Pennsylvania
  • BA, 2007, University of Pennsylvania
School of Art, Art History, and Design
Rice, Tivon Calder
Artist In Residence, Art, Art History, and Design, effective 9/16/2016
Degrees:
- PhD, 2016, University of Washington-Seattle Campus
- MFA, 2006, University of Washington
- BFA, 2000, University of Colorado (Boulder)

School of Dentistry
Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
O'Connor, Ryan Timothy
Clinical Assistant Professor, Dental Pathway, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, effective 11/1/2016
Prior UW Appointment:
- Clinical Instructor, Salaried, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
Degrees:
- DDS, 2009, University of Washington
- BS, 2005, University of Washington

School of Medicine
Department of Family Medicine
Evans, Daniel Reid
Assistant Professor without Tenure, Family Medicine, effective 11/1/2016
Degrees:
- PhD, 2014, University of Kentucky
- MS, 2006, Arizona State University
- BA, 1998, Wesleyan University

Department of Medicine
DePaolo, Randy William
Associate Professor without Tenure, Medicine, effective 10/1/2016
Degrees:
- PhD, 2004, Northwestern University
- BS, 1999, Bates College

Department of Pediatrics
Mallhi, Kanwaldeep Kaur
Assistant Professor without Tenure, Pediatrics, effective 10/1/2016
Degrees:
- MD, 2009, Rosalind Franklin University of Medicine and Science
- BSC, 2005, McMaster University
Petrovic, Aleksandra
Associate Professor without Tenure, Pediatrics, effective 11/1/2016
Degrees:
  • MD, 1997, Oregon Health & Science University
  • BS, 1993, University of Oregon

Mwamba, Khalfani
Lecturer, Full-time, Social Work, effective 10/5/2016
Degrees:
  • Master Of Social Work, 2009, University of Washington
  • BLA, 2005, Evergreen State College
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

**Introduction of New Leadership: Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity**

**INFORMATION**

For information only.

**BACKGROUND**

In November 2015, then-Interim Provost and Executive Vice President Gerald Baldasty convened a search committee with the charge of identifying and recommending candidates for the position of Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity.

The search committee, chaired by Denzil Suite, identified several finalists for campus visits. After those visits, Rickey Hall was invited to join the University of Washington as the new Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer. Rickey Hall has been with UW since August 2016.

**BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH**

**Rickey Hall** was appointed as the eighth vice president for minority affairs and diversity at the University of Washington effective Aug. 1, 2016.

Hall leads the university’s equity, diversity and inclusion efforts, and plays a key role in advancing institutional excellence. He has oversight of the UW Office of Minority Affairs & Diversity (OMA&D) which administers programs that broaden college access, support student success and enhance diversity-related teaching and learning across campus. OMA&D also works collaboratively with and serves as a resource for colleges and administrative units as they establish, coordinate and assess their contributions to institutional diversity goals.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Introduction of New Leadership: Vice President and Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Minority Affairs and Diversity (continued p. 2)

Hall has over 20 years of experience in higher education and is involved with a number of national organizations including the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education and the Association of Public Land-Grant Universities Commission on Access, Diversity and Excellence.

Hall came to the UW after serving as the inaugural vice chancellor for diversity and inclusion at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville for three years. Prior to that role, he served for six years as the assistant vice president for equity and diversity at the University of Minnesota.

Hall was awarded the 2015 Unity in the Community Award from HoLa Hora Latina (Knoxville, Tenn.) and selected as an American College Personnel Association Educational Leadership Foundation 2015 Diamond Honoree.

He earned a bachelor’s degree in American studies and a master’s degree in higher education, both from the University of Iowa. Hall is currently completing a doctor of education degree in organizational leadership at the University of Minnesota.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Introduction of New Leadership: Interim Dean, School of Public Health

INFORMATION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

On September 24, 2016, Provost and Executive Vice President Gerald Baldasty named Joel Kaufman Interim Dean, UW School of Public Health.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Joel Kaufman, M.D., M.P.H., was appointed interim dean for the School of Public Health, effective September 24, 2016. He is a professor of environmental and occupational health sciences, epidemiology and general internal medicine, and is an internationally recognized expert in the relationship between environmental factors and cardiovascular disease. He has been a member of the UW faculty, including the School of Medicine, since 1997.

Dr. Kaufman also has maintained a clinical practice within UW Medicine since 1991, treating patients in primary care, for the prevention of cardiovascular disease, and in managing environmental and occupational factors in health, allergies and asthma. He has led the UW’s Occupational and Environmental Medicine activities since 2002. He is a well-respected physician, named a top doctor by Seattle Met magazine in 2015 and 2016.

His research has been continuously funded by the National Institutes of Health, Centers for Disease Control, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Dr. Kaufman is principal investigator of the Multi-Ethnic Study of Atherosclerosis and Air Pollution (“MESA Air”) and served as principal investigator of a National Institutes of Health-funded Specialized Center for Research on Cardiovascular Disease and Traffic-Related Air Pollution. He
serves on the Environmental Protection Agency’s Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee’s panels on Particulate Matter and Oxides of Nitrogen.

Prior to joining the UW, Dr. Kaufman was associate medical director for research at the Washington State Department of Labor & Industries. He has collaborated extensively over the years with colleagues at federal, state and local agencies with public health and environmental missions.

Dr. Kaufman is the author or co-author of more than 200 scientific journal articles and chapters. He earned his bachelor’s and medical degrees from the University of Michigan and his master’s degree in public health from the UW. He trained in internal medicine at Boston City Hospital, and completed a fellowship in occupational medicine at the UW. He is a fellow of the American College of Physicians and the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine. He is board certified in internal medicine and in preventive medicine (occupational medicine).

Dr. Kaufman has mentored students in several School of Public Health graduate programs, and in 2015 students named him the school’s outstanding faculty mentor. In addition, Dr. Kaufman served as chair of the School of Public Health’s elected faculty council.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Trends in Academic Reviews at the University of Washington

INFORMATION

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

The Graduate School’s Office of Academic Affairs & Planning oversees program reviews for all academic programs approved by the Board of Regents. As new programs have been approved, the Board has expressed interest in understanding more about the program review process and the outcomes of previously approved programs.

This report provides a summary of the academic review process and outcomes of programs reviewed between 2009 and 2015. The report, initially commissioned by the Provost, is meant to inform the board on the program review process and key trends that impact a program's success.

Attachments

1. Academic Reviews 2016 Report
2. UW Graduate School 10-Year Academic Review Process
TRENDS IN ACADEMIC REVIEWS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Every 10 years, each of the University of Washington’s 369 undergraduate and graduate degree programs undergoes a thorough academic program review. This independent, future-oriented and systematic assessment helps the University measure the quality of its programs and, ultimately, the value of individual degrees. Taken together, these reviews provide University leadership with the information and perspective needed for comprehensive decision-making and planning.

For the individual units, reviews are an occasion to learn what other nationally renowned experts think of their programs and to seek a greater and more nuanced understanding of their strengths and opportunities for growth. Yes, reviews are a requirement. And the process demands a great deal of time. But, reviews can be a valuable opportunity for evaluation and long-term planning.

More specifically, reviews generate a clearer understanding of the unit’s quality of instruction, research and public service, as well as illuminate its contributions to students’ general education and their preparation for society. Reviews highlight the unit’s resource requirements, future objectives and how they can be attained, and how effectively it is fulfilling its role within the UW.

THE ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS

This report presents an overview of the academic review process and addresses broad trends in review process, as determined through analysis of all 65 academic program reviews conducted between September 2009 and June 2015. The report’s sections follow the order in which they are addressed during the academic program review:

1. Common unit-defined questions from the self-study
2. Key strengths
3. Chief challenges
4. Review committee recommendations

Stipulated by Executive Order No. 20.4 of the UW Policy Directory and overseen by the Graduate School, the review process typically spans 18 months. The process begins with a self-study in which a unit provides information required for all reviews, such as a list of all degrees offered, details on staffing and a description of how shared governance works within the unit. The unit also explains whether it has a diversity plan and a diversity committee, and describes its outreach strategies and efforts to underrepresented minority students, women, students with disabilities and LGBTQ students. Units address their teaching and learning goals, and related efforts and outcomes, as well as the impact of faculty research and creative work.

Then, the unit addresses its own unit-defined questions, and provides data such as organization charts, budget summaries and information about its faculty. The unit-defined questions, which are described in more detail below, pertain to each unit’s unique focus and work, and are shaped by conversations with deans, directors and chancellors.
The review itself is typically conducted by two UW faculty members, one of whom chairs the committee, as well as two faculty members from peer institutions. This committee is charged with assessing the quality of the unit’s undergraduate and graduate programs and providing faculty with constructive suggestions for strengthening those programs.

Through a site visit, the review committee meets with students, faculty of all ranks, postdoctoral researchers, staff and academic unit leadership, and even alumni and advisory boards. The site visit concludes with a meeting at which the committee shares its initial findings and recommendations with unit members who have been involved with the process and a representative from the Office of the Provost. The second half of the meeting is held in executive session for central administrators and review committee members without the academic unit members present.

Within four weeks of the site visit, the review committee submits its report to the Graduate School. The report is distributed to all participants, including the unit’s dean, chancellor or vice chancellor, the Graduate School Council and the Office of the Provost. (The Graduate School Council is an elected body of faculty from all three campuses that makes recommendations on reviews of existing degree programs, as well as new ones.) The unit responds within one month; and within one quarter, the Graduate School Council reviews all documents generated during the review process, and makes recommendations to the Graduate School dean, who then forwards the report and recommendations to the unit’s leadership.

If the review has gone well, the Graduate School Council will recommend another review in the standard 10 years. Occasionally, the review reveals important shifts either in the academic field at large in which the academic unit is located, or within the academic unit more narrowly. In these cases, the council may recommend another review within a shorter timeframe.

COMMON UNIT-DEFINED QUESTIONS

Unit-defined questions provide an opportunity for academic programs to highlight issues they deem pressing or critical. In other words, what do units hope to learn from the review? After all, as a panel of experts and peers, the review committee is familiar with the discipline at large, best practices and how to best plan for the future. Between 2009 and 2015, the majority of unit-defined questions addressed six broad areas related to:

- Defining program identity and success
  - Some units sought feedback on how to “forge one identity,” while others wanted “a review of the conceptual framework and statement of goals” and assistance with “communicating (its) brand.”
- Maintaining a cutting-edge research profile
  - Departments sought advice on how to define and pursue strategic research areas, maintain excellence in existing programs and increase student exposure and participation in research.
- Maximizing curricular impact
  - For some units, these questions were very specific: “Are courses and mentoring sufficiently rigorous, skill-based and experiential?”
- Responding to resource availability
  - A number of units sought advice on how to buffer the impact of decreased funding on maintaining programmatic and research excellence, the continued ability to recruit and fund leading faculty and top students, and improving facilities
and space.

- Improving partnerships and collaborations
  - One department asked how its program might interact with units across the University, and another inquired how it might “embrace responsibility for practice” within its college and more broadly at the UW.

- Planning for the future
  - While some planning and vision questions tended to broad — “How do we grow and improve in the most effective way in the future?” — others specifically referenced planning for the next decade.

The forward-looking nature of these questions demonstrates how unit-defined questions — and the program review process more broadly — can shape strategic planning and departments’ vision for the future. In general, units wanted review committees to speak to how their fields would evolve, how these changes would impact current and new faculty, the ideal structure of their departments and how the departments’ vision aligns with college-wide strategic plans and visions.

KEY STRENGTHS

In their assessment of academic units, review committees identify and document key strengths, which helps the unit’s leadership recognize and build upon them. At the institutional level, a broad understanding of the common strengths of UW academic units informs decision-making and highlights areas for interdepartmental learning and information-sharing. Between 2009 and 2015, six key strengths emerged:

- Outstanding faculty research
  - Faculty across the UW are doing sophisticated, nationally and internationally recognized research, deemed to be outstanding in quality and quantity.

- Competitive students and educational programs
  - UW academic units recruit top graduate students and provide excellent mentoring, academic and research opportunities for them. Students were described as hard-working, intellectually rigorous, and as productive and innovative researchers.
  - The units are committed to exemplary and innovative teaching of undergraduate- and graduate-level curricula, and student assessments affirm the excellence of the programs.

- High-quality leadership and governance
  - Academic leaders were commonly described as dedicated and hard-working, and were praised for their academic vision and commitment to collaboration and transparency.

- Dedicated staff
  - Motivated and effective staff provide needed advising for students, as well as administrative assistance to faculty — freeing more faculty time for research and teaching.

- Collegial environments
  - Some programs were described as having a strong “culture of collaboration” and collegial learning climates.

- Strong collaborative initiatives
  - Many academic units maintain collaborative partnerships with other faculty and units on campus, with off-campus labs, training sites and other universities.
CHIEF CHALLENGES

The academic program reviews identified six challenges facing UW units:

• Budget and resources
  » Resource challenges have the greatest impact on people — faculty, staff and students. Decreased budgets mean fewer or smaller raises, lower salaries for faculty and staff, and greater difficulty in funding the start-up costs of labs for new faculty.

• Succession management
  » Without succession planning, retirements “have enormous implications” for a program as “unfilled gaps in both the core and instructional research programs” could translate into reduced grants and research opportunities, and, ultimately, the diminished ability to recruit top students.

• Workload pressures
  » Programs today simply try to do more and more — which can lead to burnout, loss of good faculty, and challenges in recruiting new faculty.

• Diversity
  » Common critiques were the lack of women and underrepresented minorities in both faculty and leadership positions, and the struggle to attract a diverse pool of students.
  » Review committees pointed to behaviors ranging from a systematic lack of planning to address diversity to general avoidance of diversity issues.

• Space and facilities
  » An absence of shared common space can be a barrier to unit cohesion, collegiality and focus, especially in interdisciplinary programs.
  » Aging facilities and crowded classrooms and outdated labs not only impact teaching quality and research opportunities, but also constrain growth.

• Unit cohesion
  » A small, yet significant, number of review committees cited a general lack of agreement, cohesion, collective mission and focus.
  » These units also faced at least two other challenges from the categories above, such as space issues, key faculty retirements, budgetary constraints or poor communication within the unit.

REVIEW COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The UW asks the review committees to make recommendations that will lead to continuous improvement and sustained or increased academic excellence. Some suggestions are relatively distinct, such as updating a unit’s website, while others are large-scale, such as rethinking the curriculum for an entire degree program. Although some recommendations were highly program-specific, reviews frequently included recommendations in three areas:

• Vision and strategic planning
  » The most common recommendation was for units to create a strategic plan to articulate key goals, guide decision-making and set priorities.
  » Through their strategic plans, units should address:
    • Program strengths and identity
    • Faculty and governance
• Curriculum
• Students
• Opportunities to collaborate and think creatively

• Communication within the unit and beyond
  » Improved communication within units would enhance transparency, collaboration and the flow of critical information to faculty, students and staff.

• Diversity
  » The University should reflect the rich diversity of Washington state within all academic units.
  » Some committees addressed the need to improve diversity in the curriculum, especially how “ethnic/racial diversity and issues of diversity seem largely absent from the curriculum and pedagogy.”
  » One review noted that a unit “must enhance the curriculum so it better prepares students both for nuanced and sophisticated conversations in the classroom and for effective careers in multicultural and complex environments.”

Above and beyond these constructive suggestions to the academic units, review committees are mandated to make formal recommendations to the UW regarding the continuance of degree programs under assessment. These recommendations may range from suspension of study entry into degree programs to continuing status with a subsequent review in 10 years (the default period). Some committees may recommend that programs be reviewed again before the 10-year period. Only a small proportion of reviews conducted between 2009 and 2015 resulted in recommendations that the next review be conducted sooner. Committees recommended review for one program three years later, seven programs five years later and one program eight years later. Eighteen of the 65 reviews required interim reports to be submitted before the next review.

It is important to note that a shorter review timeframe, or an interim-report requirement, signals significant transitions within the academic unit, such as leadership or curriculum change. A shorter timeframe is not intended to punitive; rather, its purpose is to provide timely guidance to enable the academic unit to remain on track with its goals.

***
UW GRADUATE SCHOOL
10-YEAR ACADEMIC REVIEW PROCESS

Graduate School notifies Dean/Vice Chancellor and academic unit chair to:
• Initiate review
• Confirm timeline

Works with academic unit to:
• Explain process
• Establish reviewer list
• Identify site visit dates

Office of Academic Affairs & Planning (OAAP) works with academic unit to:
• Finalize review committee and site visit dates
• Develop unit-specific questions

Charge meeting:
• OAAP establishes review charge with academic unit representatives, Dean/Vice Chancellor, review committee
• Review dates and process and unit specific questions

Self-study:
• Academic unit writes self-study
• Academic unit establishes site visit agenda

Site visit consists of:
• Committee working dinner
• 1.5 days of meetings with constituents

Exit meeting: part 1
• Preliminary conclusions from review committee
• Opportunity for clarifications and discussion

Exit meeting: part 2
• Executive session
• Recommendation for next review (10 year default)

Reporting:
• Review committee submits report
• Academic unit prepares written response

Final letter:
• Graduate School Council discusses report and response, makes recommendation to Graduate School Dean
• Letter on final recommendation from Graduate School Dean to academic unit chair/director, Dean/Chancellor and Provost.

KEY PARTICIPANTS:
• Academic unit (chair/director, faculty, staff, students)
• College or School Dean/Chancellor
• Graduate School
• Provost’s Office
• Undergraduate Academic Affairs
• Graduate School Council
• GPSS

ATTACHMENT 2
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Establishing the Master of Science in Business Analytics (Milgard School of Business, UW Tacoma)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee that the Board of Regents grant authority to the Milgard School of Business to offer the Master of Science in Business Analytics (MSBA), effective Autumn Quarter 2017. This degree program will be state-supported. The graduate degree program will have provisional status with a review to be scheduled for the 2022-2023 academic year. At such time that continuing status is granted, a ten-year review cycle would begin.

BACKGROUND

In February 2014, the Graduate School received notification of intent from the Milgard School of Business ad UW Tacoma to plan the Master of Business Intelligence and Analytics. After tri-campus stakeholder review and comment, the faculty developed a full proposal. In May 2014, the full proposal was submitted to the Graduate School with a degree title change to Master of Science in Business Analytics. The proposal was reviewed by two external faculty from the College of Business and Information Systems at Dakota State University, and College of Business and Economics at Boise State University. Both reviewers recommended that the graduate degree program be moved forward for approval.

On October 6, 2016, the Graduate School Council considered the Master of Science in Business Analytics proposal. The Council recommended to the Graduate School Dean that the proposal be forwarded to the Board of Regents for final approval.

The Master of Science in Business Analytics will be a state supported, 40-credit graduate program with an initial enrollment of 25 FTE. The proposed tuition-based program is in line with the current initiatives by the UW Tacoma to find innovative ways to adapt to the current budgetary situation while fulfilling our core mission of delivering quality instruction and supporting scholarship that enriches the overall learning experience of our students. The proposed MSBA program will generate synergies both in terms of resources as well as the quality of new students which will support our existing undergraduate and Master of Business Administration, Master of Accounting and Master of Cybersecurity and Leadership programs.
The program’s targeted population will be individuals who have completed an undergraduate degree in business, science, mathematics, computer science, engineering, technology or mathematics. The program will be work compatible which will offer flexible study options for both full- and part-time students.

The MSBA program will provide students collaborative, integrative, and transformative research and core knowledge in the areas of business process management, strategic data and information management, business intelligence, analytics, digital innovation and transformation. Students will acquire the knowledge to understand, manage and make use of data to make effective and efficient business decisions that either solve existing business problems or create new business opportunities, and improve the performance of organizations.

Program graduates will enter the workforce as emerging leaders in the community, industry, government, and not-for-profit organizations and better prepared to tackle the challenges and opportunities in the ever-changing landscape of the 21st century, ultimately contributing to the continued economic development in the region. The MSBA program will meet the existing workforce demand at the local, state and regional levels.

The Dean of the Milgard School of Business, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, and the Provost have reviewed and approved the recommendation to approve the Master of Science in Business Analytics degree program.

Attachment
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New Graduate Degree Proposal – UW Tacoma

IDEA STAGE
Conversations with:
- Faculty/Deans/Chancellors;
- PCE (fee based programs) if needed;
- Office of Planning & Budgeting & Provost office;
- Other stakeholders.

PLANNING NOTICE OF INTENT (PNOI)
- Faculty lead contacts the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning (OAAP) in the Graduate School for proposal guidelines;
- APCC Review & Comment
- Submit PNOI to OAAP.

PNOI COMMENT PERIOD
- 14 day stakeholder comment period (all three campuses);
- includes UW Libraries, GEMS, Registrar’s office, Financial Aid, UWT Main Admin. Units.

EXTERNAL REVIEW
- OAAP sends proposal to external reviewers
- Unit responds to reviewer comments

FULL PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT
- Follows Graduate School proposal guidelines;
- Addresses stakeholders feedback;
- Includes tuition tier (state-funded programs) or draft of MOA (fee based programs);
- Unit contacts Student Financial Aid if needed;
- Submit preliminary draft to OAAP, which provides feedback.
- APCC approves final proposal

FACULTY AND ACADEMIC COUNCIL
- Graduate School Council considers proposal, including final MOA;
- Council makes recommendation to Chancellor and to Graduate School Dean;
- Unit incorporates feedback from faculty council, if needed.

BOARD OF REGENTS
- Degree approval;
- Provost confirms Regents’ approval.

CREATE CODE
- OAAP works with Registrar to create new program code.

PROGRAM LAUNCH
- Unit works with Graduate Enrollment Management Services to create academic profile;
- Degree program 5 year review cycle begins.

Chancellor’s Office endorses proposal development, and notifies OAAP
Establishing the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship (Department of Management and Organization, Michael G. Foster School of Business)

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Academic and Student Affairs Committee that the Board of Regents grant authority to the Department of Management and Organization in the Michael G. Foster School of Business to offer the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship (MSE), effective Summer Quarter 2017. This degree program will be fee-based. The graduate degree program will have provisional status with a review to be scheduled for the 2022-2023 academic year. At such time that continuing status is granted, a ten-year review cycle would begin.

BACKGROUND

In December 2015, the Graduate School received notification of intent to plan the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship from the Department of Management and Organization in the Michael G. Foster School of Business. After tri-campus stakeholder comment, the faculty developed a full proposal. The full proposal was subsequently submitted for external review by faculty in the Department of Management and Organization at the University of Southern California, and the Department of Management in the Lundquist College of Business, University of Oregon. Both external reviewers noted the proposed program will meet an existing need and recommended that the graduate degree program be moved forward for approval.

On October 6, 2016, the Graduate School Council considered the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship proposal. The Council recommended to the Graduate School Dean that the proposal be forwarded to the Board of Regents for final approval.

The Master of Science in Entrepreneurship will be a fee-based program offered by the Department of Management and Organization in the Michael G. Foster School of Business. Enrollment in the first year is projected to be 30 FTE. The curriculum is a 12-month program intended to blend academics and interactions with leading entrepreneurs and industry experts to prepare students to launch or help grow entrepreneurial ventures. The program will equip students with solid business skills, decision-making capabilities, and leadership skills. Potential applicants will include those right out of undergraduate programs or with a few
Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Establishing the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship (Department of Management and Organization, Michael G. Foster School of Business) (continued p. 2)

years of work experience or past entrepreneurial experience, with backgrounds in science and engineering, as well as other educational backgrounds.

The degree program will involve the development of a business from the inception of an idea to cultivating it into a profitable business. It is designed for individuals who can develop innovations that enrich lives globally and will meet a need locally, nationally and internationally.

Seattle is home to a world-class community of entrepreneurs, innovators, and investors. As the leading institution of higher learning in the state, it is appropriate that the University of Washington should offer a program that will best prepare and train individuals who can contribute to the thriving start-up community as well as to larger innovative organizations in the region. A recent article in *Forbes* identified an increased demand for business education that helps students learn to start their own business. Due to the growing interest in entrepreneurship, the potential market is strong.

The Dean of the Michael G. Foster School of Business, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, and the Provost have reviewed and approved the recommendation to approve the Master of Science in Entrepreneurship degree program.

*Attachment*

New Graduate Degree Proposal – UW Seattle
New Graduate Degree Proposal – UW Seattle

**IDEA STAGE**
Conversations with:
- Faculty/Deans/Chancellors;
- PCE (fee based programs);
- Office of Planning & Budgeting & Provost office;
- Other stakeholders.

**PLANNING NOTICE OF INTENT (PNOI)**
- Faculty lead contacts the Office of Academic Affairs and Planning (OAAP) in the Graduate School for proposal guidelines;
- Submit PNOI to OAAP.

**PNOI COMMENT PERIOD**
- 10 day stakeholder comment period (all three campuses);
- Includes UW Libraries, Registrar’s Office and GEMS.

**EXTERNAL REVIEW**
- Unit submits revised proposal to OAAP;
- OAAP sends proposal to external reviewers;
- Unit responds to reviewers’ comments.

**FULL PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT**
- Addresses stakeholders feedback;
- Includes tuition tier (state-funded programs) or draft of MOA (fee based programs);
- Unit contacts Student Financial Aid;
- Submit preliminary draft to OAAP for review and comment.

**GRADUATE SCHOOL**
- Graduate School Dean authorizes proposal development

**GRADUATE SCHOOL COUNCIL**
- Council considers proposal including final MOA;
- After presentation, unit incorporates feedback, if needed;
- Graduate Dean authorizes sending proposal to Board of Regents.

**BOARD OF REGENTS**
- Degree approval;
- Provost confirms Regents’ approval.

**CREATE CODE**
OAAP directs Registrar to create new program code.

**PROGRAM LAUNCH**
- Unit works with Graduate Enrollment Management Services to create academic profile;
- Degree Program 5 year review cycle begins.
Enrollment Data for Autumn 2016 New Undergraduate Students

INFORMATION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

In July 2016, the Regents received Autumn 2016 freshman enrollment projections for all three campuses. Autumn 2016 "10-day census" data on actual enrollment outcomes for all undergraduates (freshman and transfer) is now available for all three campuses. A presentation on Graduate and Professional student enrollment will be presented at the January meeting.

Summary detail is included in the attachment. The attached information includes comparative data about transfer and freshman classes, diversity, and academic profile.

The focus of this presentation will be on key and notable trends in the data, including any notable differences from enrollment projections to enrollment outcomes.

Attachment
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Enrollment Data for Autumn 2016 New Undergraduate Students

- Philip Ballinger, Associate Vice Provost for Enrollment & Undergraduate Admissions
- Karl Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor, Chief Admissions Officer, UW Tacoma
- Steve Syverson, Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management, UW Bothell
FRESHMAN APPLICATIONS, 2012-2016

Freshman Applications, 2012-2016

- 2012: 26,135 total applications, with 6,602 WA residents, 9,595 non-residents, and 9,941 international students.
- 2013: 30,192 total applications, with 7,394 WA residents, 11,878 non-residents, and 10,926 international students.
- 2014: 31,605 total applications, with 7,632 WA residents, 13,520 non-residents, and 10,458 international students.
- 2015: 36,838 total applications, with 8,927 WA residents, 16,636 non-residents, and 11,275 international students.
- 2016: 43,516 total applications, with 10,742 WA residents, 20,975 non-residents, and 11,806 international students.
FRESHMAN ADMITS, 2012-2016

Freshman Admits, 2012-2016

2016 Freshman Admit Rates

WA Resident: 62.9%

US Nonresident: 43.3%

International: 29.9%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>6619</td>
<td>6958</td>
<td>7110</td>
<td>7391</td>
<td>7430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>5985</td>
<td>6734</td>
<td>7306</td>
<td>8762</td>
<td>9089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>2987</td>
<td>3035</td>
<td>3493</td>
<td>3214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT, 2012-2016

Freshman Enrollment, 2012-2016

- 2012: 6049 (Resident 4044, Non-Resident 2005, International 1023)
- 2013: 6255 (Resident 4211, Non-Resident 2044, International 974)
- 2014: 6361 (Resident 4275, Non-Resident 2086, International 910)
- 2015: 6792 (Resident 4283, Non-Resident 2509, International 1116)
- 2016: 6455 (Resident 4403, Non-Resident 2052, International 901)
Middle 50% Test Scores

SAT Composite (CR + M + WR): 1670-1990
  SAT Critical Reading: 530-660
  SAT Math: 570-710
  SAT Writing: 520-650

ACT Composite: 26-32

Average HS GPA: 3.78

Women: 3419 (53%)
Men: 3036 (47%)

Underrepresented Minority for all Undergraduates:\
14.4% of the Freshman Class

Underrepresented Minority for U.S. Undergraduates:\
16.7% of the Freshman Class
# Autumn 2016 Freshman Profile – Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines</th>
<th>Aut 2016</th>
<th>Aut 2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1708</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>2755</td>
<td>-8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>-19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6455</strong></td>
<td><strong>6792</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal reporting guidelines for race & ethnicity require that international (nonresident alien) students are reported only as international; next if a student indicates that they are Hispanic/Latino they are reported as Hispanic/Latino only, even if the student also indicates other race(s); and finally the student is reported based on the race(s) they indicate. An expanded view of race / ethnicity is provided to show the breakdown of students who are classified federally either as just Hispanic/Latino or as Two or More Races.
### Autumn 2016 Freshman Profile – Closer Look at Multiple Responses About Ethnicity

#### Seattle Incoming First Year Expanded Race / Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seattle First Year</th>
<th>By IPEDS Race / Ethnicity Category</th>
<th>Autumn 2016</th>
<th>Autumn 2015</th>
<th>Autumn 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFER APPLICATIONS, 2012-2016

Transfer Applications, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>5103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>5312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2428</td>
<td>5733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>5811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2552</td>
<td>5547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Admits, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>1683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>2312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WA 2-Year Community Colleges: 61.2%
All Other 2-Year & 4-Year Schools: 29.9%
TRANSFER ENROLLMENT, 2012-2016

Transfer Enrollment, 2012-2016

- 2012: 184
- 2013: 198
- 2014: 209
- 2015: 205
- 2016: 191

- 2012: 1474
- 2013: 1533
- 2014: 1549
- 2015: 1442
- 2016: 1397

The chart shows the number of transfers and the number of 2-year and 4-year transfers for each year from 2012 to 2016.
AUTUMN 2016 INCOMING TRANSFER PROFILE

Avg. Transfer GPA: 3.43

Transfer Men: 629 (45.0%)
Transfer Women: 768 (55.0%)

Underrepresented Minority for all Incoming Transfer Undergraduates: 18.5%
Underrepresented Minority for all Incoming U.S. Undergraduates: 21.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines</th>
<th>AUT 2016</th>
<th>AUT 2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Indicated</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1397</strong></td>
<td><strong>1442</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Autumn 2016 Incoming Transfer Profile – Closer Look at Multiple Responses About Ethnicity

### Seattle Incoming Transfer Students Expanded Race / Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seattle Transfers</th>
<th>By IPEDS Race / Ethnicity Category</th>
<th>Not Indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autumn 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>blacks or african american</th>
<th>american indian or alaska native</th>
<th>asian</th>
<th>hispanic or latino</th>
<th>native hawaiian/pacific islander</th>
<th>white</th>
<th>international (nonresident alien)</th>
<th>two or more races</th>
<th>not indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autumn 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>blacks or african american</th>
<th>american indian or alaska native</th>
<th>asian</th>
<th>hispanic or latino</th>
<th>native hawaiian/pacific islander</th>
<th>white</th>
<th>international (nonresident alien)</th>
<th>two or more races</th>
<th>not indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Autumn 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>blacks or african american</th>
<th>american indian or alaska native</th>
<th>asian</th>
<th>hispanic or latino</th>
<th>native hawaiian/pacific islander</th>
<th>white</th>
<th>international (nonresident alien)</th>
<th>two or more races</th>
<th>not indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have record under-represented student diversity this autumn quarter. We believe dedicated outreach efforts and use of new geographical contextual data (Geo-Index) in holistic admissions were primary drivers of this outcome.

- **The freshman class includes 929 URM** or 14.4% of class (compared to 857 or 12.6% last year)
- **The transfer class includes 253 URM** or 18.5% of class (compared to 214 or 14.8% last year)
- **The combined freshman + transfer classes include 1,191 URM** or 15.2% of class (compared to 1,071 or 13.0% last year)

While the freshman class admit rate overall fell below 50% for the first time, the freshman class admit rate for Washington residents was 62.9%.

- Actual enrollment for the freshman class (6,455) was just under a target of 6,500. The primary reason for being slightly under target was higher post-confirmation "melt" among U.S. non-residents. We believe one reason for this was enrollment expansion at University of California campuses this past cycle.
OBSERVATIONS – TRANSFERS

- We increased the offers of admission to transfer applicants from Washington Community Colleges. However, enrollment yield declined slightly. The goal was to enroll approximately 1,250 WA community college students this autumn and final enrollment is 1,206. We will expand Winter quarter admissions to rebalance.

- We will do surveying to better understand this trend. We believe more interest in competitive and capacity-constrained majors may be impacting transfer enrollment. This is a primary area of focus within both the Faculty Senate Enrollment Management Task Force chaired by Prof. Patricia Kramer and the Community College Engagement Initiative led by Paul Rucker.
FRESHMAN APPLICATIONS, 2012-2016

Freshman Applications, 2012-2016

- 2012: 1166
  - Resident: 929
  - Non-Resident: 165
  - International: 72
- 2013: 1198
  - Resident: 969
  - Non-Resident: 175
  - International: 54
- 2014: 1382
  - Resident: 1151
  - Non-Resident: 174
  - International: 57
- 2015: 1577
  - Resident: 1339
  - Non-Resident: 158
  - International: 80
- 2016: 1878
  - Resident: 1532
  - Non-Resident: 248
  - International: 98
FRESHMAN ADMITS, 2012-2016

2016 Freshman Admit Rates

- WA Resident: 85.6%
- US Nonresident: 82.7%
- International: 58.2%

Freshman Admits, 2012-2016

- 2012: Resident 799, Non-Resident 121, International 111
- 2013: Resident 849, Non-Resident 135, International 128
- 2014: Resident 1007, Non-Resident 128, International 138
- 2015: Resident 1158, Non-Resident 120, International 57
- 2016: Resident 1312, Non-Resident 205, International 57
FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT, 2012-2016

Freshman Enrollment, 2012-2016

- 2012: 338 ( Resident: 323, Non-Resident: 13, International: 2 )
- 2013: 409 ( Resident: 389, Non-Resident: 10, International: 0 )
- 2014: 431 ( Resident: 419, Non-Resident: 12, International: 0 )
- 2015: 460 ( Resident: 441, Non-Resident: 15, International: 4 )
- 2016: 533 ( Resident: 505, Non-Resident: 20, International: 8 )
## Autumn 2016 Freshman Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Score Category</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT Composite (CR + M + WR)</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Critical Reading</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Math</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Writing</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Composite</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average HS GPA                      | 3.24        |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>302 (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>231 (43%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Underrepresented Minority for all Undergraduates:\ \%
36.8 % of the Freshman Class

Underrepresented Minority for U.S. Undergraduates\%:
37.3 % of the Freshman Class
### AUTUMN 2016 FRESHMAN PROFILE – ETHNICITY BASED ON FEDERAL REPORTING GUIDELINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines</th>
<th>Aut 2016</th>
<th>Aut 2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>533</strong></td>
<td><strong>460</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal reporting guidelines for race & ethnicity require that international (nonresident alien) students are reported only as international; next if a student indicates that they are Hispanic/Latino they are reported as Hispanic/Latino only, even if the student also indicates other race(s); and finally the student is reported based on the race(s) they indicate. An expanded view of race / ethnicity is provided to show the breakdown of students who are classified federally either as just Hispanic/Latino or as Two or More Races.
# Autumn 2016 Freshman Profile – Closer Look at Multiple Responses About Ethnicity

## Tacoma Incoming First Year Expanded Race / Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tacoma First Year</th>
<th>By IPEDS Race / Ethnicity Category</th>
<th>Autumn 2016</th>
<th>Autumn 2015</th>
<th>Autumn 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Not Indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autumn 2016</th>
<th>Autumn 2015</th>
<th>Autumn 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFER APPLICATIONS, 2012-2016

Transfer Applications, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1932
TRANSFER ADMITS, 2012-2016

2016 Transfer Admit Rates
- WA 2-Year Community Colleges: 79.9%
- All Other 2-Year & 4-Year Schools: 64.8%

Transfer Admits, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFER ENROLLMENT, 2012-2016

Transfer Enrollment, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUTUMN 2016 INCOMING TRANSFER PROFILE

Avg. Transfer GPA: 3.07

Transfer Men: 443 (46.6%)
Transfer Women: 508 (53.4%)

Underrepresented Minority for all Incoming Transfer Undergraduates: 28.9%
Underrepresented Minority for all Incoming U.S. Undergraduates: 30.7%
### Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>AUT 2016</th>
<th>AUT 2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Indicated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>183%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>951</td>
<td>833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Autumn 2016 Incoming Transfer Profile – Closer Look at Multiple Responses About Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tacoma Incoming Transfer Students Expanded Race / Ethnicity</th>
<th>By IPEDS Race / Ethnicity Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Transfers</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXCELLENCE**

533 new students (+15.4%)

3.24 Average High School GPA

1442 Average Composite SAT
- Math Average 488
- Verbal Average 488
- Writing Average 465

27% Transferring Running Start credits

**ACCESS**

95% Washington residents

64% First in their family to earn a 4-year college

44% Pell Eligible

37% Underrepresented minority

16% Dependent of a veteran

46% Pathways to Promise Partnership
**EXCELLENCE**

- 956 new transfer students (+13.4%)
- 3.12 Average Transfer GPA
- 98 Average credits transferred

**ACCESS**

- 90% Washington Resident
- 57% First in their family to earn a 4-yr college
- 48% Pell Eligible
- 29% Underrepresented Minority
- 79% From Washington CC
- 12% Veteran/Active Duty/Reservist/National Guard
FTIC AND TRANSFER COMBINED HIGHLIGHTS

EXCELLENCE
1489 new students (FTIC + Transfer) +14.5%
3.24  Average High School GPA: FTIC only
3.07  Average Transfer GPA: Transfer Only

ACCESS
92%  Washington Residents (All)
60%  First-Generation (All)
46%  Pell Eligible (All)
9%   Veteran/Active Duty/Reservist (All)
32%  Under-represented minority (All)
22.8 Average Age (All)
Freshman Applications, 2012-2016
FRESHMAN ADMITS, 2012-2016

Freshman Admits, 2012-2016

2016 Freshman Admit Rates
- WA Resident: 83.0%
- US Nonresident: 66.0%
- International: 67.9%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Non-Resident</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT, 2012-2016
AUTUMN 2016 FRESHMAN PROFILE

Middle 50% Test Scores

SAT Composite (CR + M + WR): 1340-1680
  - SAT Critical Reading: 440-570
  - SAT Math: 460-600
  - SAT Writing: 420-540

ACT Composite: 20-25

Average HS GPA: 3.30

Women: 384 (47%)
Men: 430 (53%)

Underrepresented Minority for all Undergraduates¹:
  26.9% of the Freshman Class

Underrepresented Minority for U.S. Undergraduates²:
  28.1% of the Freshman Class
### Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Aut 2016</th>
<th>Aut 2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>183.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>820</strong></td>
<td><strong>697</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal reporting guidelines for race & ethnicity require that international (nonresident alien) students are reported only as international; next if a student indicates that they are Hispanic/Latino they are reported as Hispanic/Latino only, even if the student also indicates other race(s); and finally the student is reported based on the race(s) they indicate. An expanded view of race / ethnicity is provided to show the breakdown of students who are classified federally either as just Hispanic/Latino or as Two or More Races.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By PEDS Race / Ethnicity Category</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>International (Nonresident Alien)</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Not Indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bothell First Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2016</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2015</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2014</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFER APPLICATIONS, 2012-2016

Transfer Applications, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>1650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transfer Admits, 2012-2016

2016 Transfer Admit Rates
WA 2-Year Community Colleges: 67.2%
All Other 2-Year & 4-Year Schools: 57.1%

Transfer Admits, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>1109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRANSFER ENROLLMENT, 2012-2016

Transfer Enrollment, 2012-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All other 2 Yr &amp; 4 Yr Transfers</th>
<th>2 Yr WACC Transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

629
763
731
768
859
AUTUMN 2016 INCOMING TRANSFER PROFILE

Avg. Transfer GPA: 3.30

Transfer Men: 406 (47.3%)
Transfer Women: 453 (52.7%)

Underrepresented Minority for all Incoming Transfer Undergraduates: 16.1%
Underrepresented Minority for all Incoming U.S. Undergraduates: 19.9%
### Ethnicity Based on Federal Reporting Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>AUT 2016</th>
<th>AUT 2015</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Not Indicated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 859 vs 768
### Autumn 2016 Incoming Transfer Profile – Closer Look at Multiple Responses About Ethnicity

#### Bothell Incoming Transfer Students Expanded Race / Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By IPEDS Race / Ethnicity Category</th>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>International (Nonresident Alien)</th>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Not Indicated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bothell Transfers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 2016</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn 2015</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Autumn 2014</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (Nonresident Alien)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Observations – Freshmen**

- The admissions, acceptance, and yield rate increased for freshman, notably a 2% increase in yield rate. We believe this was due to assertive follow-up by admissions staff and a higher completion rate due, in part, to shifting the designation of English Proficiency as a completion requirement to an admission requirement. We are serving 100 more Washington residents compared to last year.

- Notably, increases in the size of the class is primarily accounted for by increases in two groups: domestic students of color, with the largest contributions to the latter coming from the Asian-American and African-American populations; and international students. Despite growth in our international student population, the overall proportion of international students in the incoming class remains small.
The number of transfer applicants was identical to last year, but a higher admitted and enrollment rate of 16% resulted in a cohort that is 12% larger compared to last year. We believe that the introduction of majors in Educational Studies and Physics drove this growth. As with the freshmen, the increase was composed of domestic students of color, particularly Asian-Americans, and international students.
The diversity of the class has increased. Students from traditionally underrepresented ethnic groups represent 24% of the domestic students and Asian-Americans represent nearly 29%. White students (and those of unknown ethnicity) comprise 47% of the domestic students (compared to 50% last year), and international students comprise 10% of the student body.
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BACKGROUND

On May 3, 2016, President Ana Mari Cauce launched the groundbreaking Population Health Initiative by inviting the University community and partners to join in developing a 25-year vision to advance the health and well-being of people around the world by leveraging capabilities and opportunities at the UW and beyond.

As she noted, the health of an individual or a community is shaped by more than just the absence of disease. Issues from poverty and equity, to health care access, to climate change, and governance all combine to affect the health and well-being of populations around the world. To truly and productively respond to today’s population health challenges requires innovative collaborations that engage faculty, staff, and students from diverse fields and practices across our campuses in groundbreaking ways.

This presentation is intended to expand on President Cauce’s May 3rd address by offering an overview of the concept of population health, a description of the initiative and its organization, and highlights of some of the early work of the initiative.

Please visit www.uw.edu/populationhealth for additional information.
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What is the definition of population health?

> The health outcomes of a group of individuals, including the distribution of such outcomes within the group*

> Determinants of population health include:
  - Medical care
  - Public health interventions
  - Aspects of the social and physical environments
  - Genetics
  - Individual behavior
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What is the Population Health Initiative?

> The UW believes improving population health is a moral imperative
  > President Cauce convened the initiative as a presidential priority

> Through the initiative, we will:
  > Create a 25-year vision to advance human health and well-being worldwide
  > Build upon what exists to develop new ideas

> Allows us to expand ability to turn understanding of health determinants into actionable:
  > Policies, reforms, interventions, innovations
How does the UW see population health?

> A broad concept encompassing:
  - Not just the elimination of diseases and conditions, but also
  - Intersecting and overlapping factors that influence health

> Influencing factors include:
  - Climate change
  - Poverty
  - Urban planning
  - Racism
  - Health-care access
  - Governance
  - And many more
How do we describe population health?

> Influencing factors revolve around three pillars:

- Human health
- Environmental resiliency
- Social and economic equity

> Collectively affecting billions of lives world-wide
How have we organized the initiative?

Around five key areas:

1. Education and capacity building
2. Diagnostics and critical assessment
3. Developing and testing innovations
4. Implementation science
5. Strategy and planning
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How is the initiative moving forward?

> Visioning work is underway this fall
> Work is driven by an interdisciplinary and tri-campus executive council, with input from key internal constituencies:
  – Faculty, students, and staff
> Guidance will also be drawn from:
  – An external advisory board
  – Partner organizations and institutions
  – Local, national, and international experts
What are some already completed activities?

Resource Directory
- Inventory of expertise for collaboration and partnering
- Ability for faculty to add themselves or their centers

Letters of Support
- Available for grant applications
- Signed by the president and provost

Small Pilot Funds and Awards
- Piloting relationships and processes
- For undergrads, grads, faculty

Available via uw.edu/populationhealth
Questions?
Every day, thousands of University of Washington students, faculty, and staff across our three campuses work to improve the lives of individuals locally and around the world. This work occurs in every single one of our schools and colleges, with each finding different and unique ways to improve human health and well-being.

While it would be easy to label every one of these efforts simply by the discipline in which it lives, at the UW we see this work as part of a larger, collaborative moral imperative: population health.

Through our collective efforts, we work not only toward elimination of diseases and afflictions, but also to address the intersecting and overlapping factors that influence health in a broader context. In the pages that follow, you will see a range of efforts currently under way to better address population health in three major themes: social and economic equity, environmental resiliency and human health.

To strengthen our combined efforts under these three themes, President Ana Mari Cauce has brought together the UW community and others to embark on a groundbreaking new Population Health Initiative. This initiative commits the UW to a 25-year vision of becoming the preeminent institution of higher learning for addressing population health, directed by our public mission of service to all.

The UW is one of the few institutions in the world positioned to tackle these issues so effectively, and the potential for us to work together to address the factors that contribute to human health and well-being is nearly limitless.

Over this next quarter century, we see five areas for focused interdisciplinary development, collaboration and achievement in population health. You will read about them in this report along with information about areas in which you can immediately participate in the work of this initiative.

Thank you for your collective dedication to improving the health of people and our planet. We look forward to working with you, and shaping together the work of this exciting and critically important initiative in the months and years ahead.
SOCIAL & ECONOMIC EQUITY

Social and economic inequity has lasting effects on societies and the health of populations. UW scholars from a wide range of disciplines are addressing equity in innovative ways. Solutions range from addressing income inequality to education quality, poverty to criminal justice reform, and many other equity issues that directly and indirectly affect human health and well-being.

Minimum Wage Study examines the impact of Seattle’s $15 minimum wage | Evans School of Public Policy & Governance and Social Work

Since Seattle passed legislation providing for an increase in the minimum wage to $15 an hour, the nation has been watching and waiting to see the effects on the local economy and quality of life. Tracking these effects and more is the Minimum Wage Study, a five-year research effort led by investigators from the Evans School of Public Policy & Governance with the School of Social Work.

The team seeks to answer such questions as, does a higher minimum wage improve quality of life measures, including health, nutrition, and family daily life? As more cities anticipate hikes in their minimum wage, this research will inform future decisions about the effects on workers, their families, employers, and the community.

Learn More >

Innovative, low cost NIFTY™ Cup seeks to save millions of lives | Dentistry

Each year, there are millions of babies in developing countries born prematurely or with oral clefts who struggle to breast feed. These babies are often at high risk for malnourishment, infection, and often death. Thanks to Christy McKinney, a clinical assistant professor of oral health sciences, a new feeding aid is now readying for widespread distribution across Africa. In partnership with PATH and Seattle Children’s, McKinney developed the NIFTY™ cup (Neonatal Intuitive Feeding Technology), a low-cost silicone cup with a small reservoir and spout that allows mothers to easily and safely feed these vulnerable newborns. This innovative intervention has the potential to solve a major global challenge, which could save millions of lives.

Learn More >

States with punitive justice systems have higher rates of foster care, study finds | Sociology

Why do some states place more kids into foster care than others? A new study connects the hidden dots between a state’s approaches to social problems and their rate of foster care. Author Frank Edwards is a UW doctoral student in sociology who found that states with more punitive criminal justice systems remove children from their homes far more frequently than states with more generous welfare programs. This means that two states with similar rates of child abuse and neglect could have very different rates of foster care entry, significantly impacting the futures of already vulnerable children.

Learn More >
What does it mean to be homeless in the U-District? Drama students created “Skies Over Seattle,” original theater pieces inspired by the intersection of volunteerism and artistic creation in pursuit of understanding that question. Graduate students in acting, design and directing, as well as several undergraduates, volunteered for three community organizations that serve the homeless around the UW’s Seattle campus. Over the course of a year, their lessons learned and questions asked inspired the students to write, design and perform original pieces that challenge assumptions about the communities that share the space beneath one sky.

Learn More >

"We want the community to know that we’re not giving them a voice — they already have a voice.”
AJ Friday, Professional Actor Training Program student

New UW program aims to foster better education for Native learners | Education

Education is known to correlate to lifelong health, yet the underrepresentation of Native American teachers across the United States often negatively impacts young Native students. The new Native Education Certificate seeks to address that challenge by providing a knowledge base for non-Native teachers to create a culturally relevant curriculum for Native students. Mixing online learning and community projects, the 10-unit program is designed to reduce the disconnect between non-Native teachers and Native children, making public schools more inclusive.

Learn More >

Map-a-thon collaboration helps sidewalks be accessible | TCAT and DSSG

Inadequate sidewalks and navigational infrastructure can be a nuisance to anyone, but for people with mobility limitations or low vision, these conditions can not only feel insurmountable, but become hazardous. The Taskar Center for Accessible Technology and the OpenSidewalks team from the UW eScience Institute’s Data Science for Social Good program held a Map-a-thon to address these issues. Data collected by Seattle community members will be integrated with the OpenStreetMap open source platform to offer more robust sidewalk information and navigational assistance for those with limited mobility.

Learn More >

UW Nurse Camp inspires underrepresented high school students to become the next generation of nurses | Nursing

Less than 20 percent of the U.S. nursing workforce are from low income or underrepresented backgrounds — yet the patients those future nurses will serve are increasingly likely to be minorities. The UW School of Nursing is widening the pathway to nursing for minority students through the UW Nurse Camp. Each summer, high school students get hands-on experience in the world of nursing. Not only do they gain insight into medical career options, many begin to see earning a degree as a real option for the first time, something many low-income or underrepresented students may struggle to visualize.

Learn More >
ENVIRONMENTAL RESILIENCY

There is no question that our environment and its resources impact human health and well-being. The exact extent of the impact, however, is not always clear. From energy production to pollution, from natural disasters to overfishing, the Population Health Initiative encourages connections across disciplines to seek a better understanding of environmental sustainability.

Connecting to nature is key for healthy urban living | Psychology and Environmental and Forest Services

UW researcher Peter Kahn says that city dwellers are unaware of how their minimal connection to nature is putting our health and the survival of wildlife and wild areas at great risk. Kahn coauthored a new book exploring how "environmental generational amnesia" is partly due to multiple generations shifting away from meaningful interactions with the great outdoors. But nature can be incorporated within cities, the authors say. “Cities designed well, with nature in mind and at hand, can be understood as natural, supportive of both ecosystem integrity and public health.”

Learn More >

A groundbreaking concept for a fusion reactor could reduce our carbon footprint and change the energy game | Aeronautics and Astronautics

The cost of producing fusion power has traditionally not penciled out in comparison to current energy sources, placing this zero-emission power source out of reach for wide-scale development. UW researchers believe they have now designed a concept for fusion power built on existing technology that will render that traditional cost structure obsolete. With a successful prototype in hand, they are now turning to further development and expansion of the device to create the needed power output to be a viable replacement for the fossil fuels that endanger our planet's health.

Learn More >

UW develops earthquake early warning tools | Earth and Space Science

As populations continue to grow on the West Coast, earthquakes remain a top threat. At the White House Earthquake Resilience Summit in February 2016, the UW received new funding for early warning systems. The UW-based Pacific Northwest Seismic Network is helping develop ShakeAlert, an alert system that could save lives by triggering automated and human actions just before an earthquake hits. And in a partnership with the U.S. Geological Survey, UW researchers will examine how a network of sensors on the ocean floor can provide early warnings from the volatile Cascadia subduction zone.

Learn More >
Smoke from open indoor cooking fires and cookstoves in developing countries is believed to cause millions of illnesses and premature deaths each year. Long journeys to gather all that fuel often expose adults and children to further dangers. To overcome these challenges, UW engineers partnered with the nonprofit BURN Design Lab to develop a much cleaner-burning and more efficient cookstove, known as the Kuniokoa. This innovative stove will be manufactured by local workers in Nairobi, Kenya, and its designers believe the Kuniokoa will successfully reduce harmful particulate pollution by as much as 67 percent.

Learn More >

When overfishing, polluted waters and shoreline changes led to the extinction of the Olympia oyster from Puget Sound, it changed the nature of our local ecosystem. UW Tacoma associate professor Bonnie Becker is leading undergraduate researchers in a collaborative effort to reintroduce the native oyster to its original environment. Her teams monitor microscopic larvae to identify sites where Olympia oysters can naturally seed the area and be self-sustaining. Reintroducing native oysters can improve the habitat for other plants and animals, including salmon prey, and help restore the natural balance of the sound for the health of our region.

Learn More >

Smoke from open indoor cooking fires and cookstoves in developing countries is believed to cause millions of illnesses and premature deaths each year. Long journeys to gather all that fuel often expose adults and children to further dangers. To overcome these challenges, UW engineers partnered with the nonprofit BURN Design Lab to develop a much cleaner-burning and more efficient cookstove, known as the Kuniokoa. This innovative stove will be manufactured by local workers in Nairobi, Kenya, and its designers believe the Kuniokoa will successfully reduce harmful particulate pollution by as much as 67 percent.

Learn More >

Researchers have long understood that lengthy exposure to air pollution is directly linked to an increased risk of heart disease. Thanks to the result of a 10-year study led by Professor Joel Kaufman, we now have a greater understanding of the biological responses to pollution that lead to heart disease, and that air pollution at levels — even below regulatory standards — can accelerate the hardening of human arteries. The study’s results are being used to push for new action in controlling pollution levels worldwide.

Learn More >

“Through this initiative, I hope that we educate all our students to understand, integrate and apply population health principles and knowledge in their personal and professional lives regardless of whether they choose a career in this field.”

David Reyes, Assistant Professor Nursing & Healthcare Leadership Program, UW Tacoma

Air pollution accelerates plaque build-up in arteries to heart | School of Public Health

Air pollution monitors like this tracked pollutants in more than 1,500 locations across six metro areas between 2005 and 2009. Then researchers developed computational models to generate accurate pollution concentrations affecting people’s health.
HUMAN HEALTH

Over the last 25 years, we have seen some of the greatest advances in medicine in the history of humankind. In the next 25 years, the greatest transformations will come as a result of interdisciplinary collaborations in the areas of clinical care, public health interventions, public policy, technology and more.

Community engagement leads to new vision screening law | UW Bothell

The routine distance-vision eye test has long been a staple of public school education in the state of Washington. Yet near-vision problems have not traditionally received the same scrutiny. This will soon change thanks to a new law signed by Gov. Jay Inslee earlier this year. The law grew out of a vision and learning symposium organized in 2014 by Associate Professor Bill Erdly, who helped bring together the experts, advocates and legislators needed to collaboratively develop a solution to the shortcomings of the routine test.

Learn More >

Reconnecting veterans to life through farming | Social Work

Christopher Brown, a three-time Marine combat veteran and master of social work graduate, created a sustainable local farming organization for veterans in the name of holistic mental health. Growing Veterans, a thriving nonprofit, seeks to transform the lives of veterans through satisfying work and an opportunity to reconnect with one another and their communities to help reduce feelings of isolation and prevent suicide.

Learn More >

Developing a long-acting antiretroviral treatment for HIV | Pharmacy and Medicine

Current oral drug therapies for HIV can greatly reduce the presence of the virus in the blood stream. However, limitations prevent these therapies from reducing the presence of HIV in the tissues of a body, and to work in the blood stream, patients must strictly adhere to daily dosing regimens for the rest of their lives. To address these shortcomings, Professor Rodney J. Y. Ho, pharmacy, and Professor Ann Collier, medicine, have partnered to develop a new, seven-day long-lasting HIV therapy that seeks to overcome drug insufficiency in tissues while also improving patient adherence.

Learn More >

“I hope that my work advances interdisciplinary connections in support of legal and policy reforms that improve community health as broadly conceived, enhance the patient experience of care, and provide better value for our health care dollars.”

Sallie Thieme Sanford
Associate Professor
UW School of Law

“I hope the initiative will increase awareness of disparities in health, healthcare, and health-care access among different populations, and causes underlying these disparities.”

Ceci Giachelli, W. Hunter and Dorothy Simpson Endowed Chair and Professor
Bioengineering
Creating devices that reanimate paralyzed limbs | Center for Sensorimotor Neural Engineering

Researchers at the UW’s Center for Sensorimotor Neural Engineering are developing groundbreaking new medical devices intended to help restore function and mobility in individuals stricken by spinal cord injury or stroke. Through interdisciplinary collaboration, these researchers have developed implantable devices that can detect brain signals and transmit that information to other parts of the body’s nervous system. The center’s goal is to develop a successful demonstration of this concept in humans in the next five years, which will then allow regulatory approval to occur for wider dissemination.

Learn More >

Decoding dyslexia with non-invasive brain imaging | Speech and Hearing Sciences

The brain has evolved over thousands of years to allow humans to communicate through language. Reading is a relatively new skill for the brain, however, which leads Assistant Professor Jason Yeatman to wonder if dyslexia is a byproduct of visual systems being wired slightly differently in some humans. With the aid of non-invasive brain imaging technology, Yeatman and his team are studying developing brains to identify the changes that occur as reading skills are required. Through this research, they hope to expand treatment options for dyslexia.

Learn More >

Creating a mobile app that tests lung capacity | CoMotion, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering

People suffering from lung diseases in developing worlds often do not have a good way to track lung functioning without visiting the doctor. Through the work of UW researchers, many may soon be able to measure their lung function simply by blowing into any type of phone due to SpiroCall, a new health sensing tool, which was found to meet the medical community’s standard for accuracy. With this proof of concept in hand, the research team can now plan for additional data collection and determine how to best communicate results to patients.

Learn More >
THE NEXT 25 YEARS: FOCUS AREAS FOR GROWTH

On May 3, 2016, President Ana Mari Cauce launched a groundbreaking Population Health Initiative by inviting the University community and partners to join in developing a 25-year vision to advance the health and well-being of people around the world. By working across disciplines, we can strengthen our combined efforts to improve population health in the areas of social and economic equity, human health, and environmental resiliency.

We have identified five areas for focused interdisciplinary development and optimal achievement in population health over the next quarter century. These focus areas build on projects like those highlighted in this report, and will expand our ability to turn our understanding of health determinants into actionable policies, reforms, interventions and innovations. Together, we can ensure that every individual — whether in the Pacific Northwest or in the poorest countries of the world — has the chance for a truly boundless future.

What is Population Health?

Population health is a broad concept encompassing not only the elimination of diseases and afflictions, but also the intersecting and overlapping factors that influence health. These influencing factors include climate change, poverty, racism, transportation, health-care access, urban planning, governance and many more. Together, these issues revolve around three major pillars—social and economic equity, environmental resiliency and human health—and affect the lives of billions of people around the world.

EDUCATION AND CAPACITY BUILDING

The UW will foster the next generation of leaders, thinkers and doers by developing collaborative and innovative education opportunities that address the complexities of population health. By engaging broadly across campuses, we will strengthen the impact of a UW education by recruiting and supporting the world’s best teachers. We will educate students for the increasingly interdisciplinary workforce in health, spur innovation and offer more diverse experiences in local, national, and global research. Finally, even for those students who do not choose a career in population health, their experience will inspire them to improve lives in new ways.

DIAGNOSTICS AND CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

To improve our understanding of the world’s most pressing health needs and the determinants shaping health outcomes, we will expand and strengthen our ability to extract knowledge from data by drawing on data science and field research. As home to the world’s preeminent health measurement institution, the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, we are committed to creating a world where using the best evidence is the basis for informed decision making and the guide to productive innovations and practices in public health and beyond. Through these efforts, we will strengthen the democratization, dissemination and use of data; reveal the complex intersections between human health and its social determinants; and create the most complete picture possible of the keys to increasing social equity and environmental resiliency.

In the name of holistic mental health, Christopher Brown, ’16, created Growing Veterans, a non-profit that connects veterans by growing sustainable produce for farmers markets and food banks.
DEVELOPING AND TESTING INNOVATION

Innovation is at the heart of our university. We hope to bring together the remarkable talents of our faculty and students in problem-focused research to respond to the challenges of population health. We are already well-positioned to develop, field and assess new interventions, processes and organizational mechanisms. We can bring to bear our experience and scale to deliver innovative preventive measures and care.

IMPLEMENTATION SCIENCE

In the United States, it takes 17 years on average — almost a generation — to turn original research into widespread practice and large-scale policies that benefit population health, such as through community interventions and/or changes in health care programs. And typically, only 15 percent of research evolves into practice and policy. In many low- or middle-income countries, research translation takes much longer. The UW is a global leader in implementation science, with our cutting-edge education and training programs being complemented by collaborative research activities in a range of programs. We will leverage our expertise in this rapidly changing research paradigm to ask and answer questions about how to deliver effective interventions to people who need them with greater speed, efficiency and quality. Implementation science is a rapidly changing research paradigm that provides a scientific approach to ask and answer questions about how to deliver effective interventions to people who need them with greater speed, efficiency, and quality.

STRATEGY AND PLANNING

The 21st century has dawned with new patterns of immigration, greater workforce mobility and increased influence from private philanthropy. Through research and engagement, we are poised to empower governments, industry and donors with evidence, tools and the decision-making support they need to make the choices that benefit the most people, most efficiently. This scale of impact requires timely and well-informed strategy and planning. The UW has a unique expertise in strategy and planning, through the Evans School, the Jackson School, Economics, Computer Science & Engineering, Environmental Studies, the Foster School of Business, big data analysis and more. We are committed to inclusive, comprehensive long-range and data-driven planning to ensure the greatest influence and impact over the next 25 years.

“I hope the Population Health Initiative will raise awareness of the social determinants of health and how those factors influence overall public health. In addition to raising awareness, I'd like to see some of the most disadvantaged local communities benefit from actions designed to improve their health and well-being.”

Eric King, Graduate/Professional Student Representative, Population Health Initiative Executive Council

Get Involved: The Population Health Initiative offers resources to support students, faculty and staff across our three campuses as they work across these areas of focus. To learn more about this groundbreaking initiative and how you can participate, please visit the initiative website at www.uw.edu/populationhealth.
CONTINUING THE CONVERSATION

The goal of the Provost’s Leading Change in Public Higher Education report series is to broaden and connect conversations on the UW’s three campuses, share best practices, highlight areas of priority for the UW, and provide common reference points to inform our plans for the future. To join the conversation or learn more, visit the Population Health Initiative website at www.uw.edu/populationhealth.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Over the course of the UW’s 25-year vision for the Population Health Initiative, the president and provost recognize the need to stay nimble with respect to the leadership of, and the individuals involved with, this effort. The current Executive Council represents all three UW campuses as well as the undergraduate and graduate student populations. Its members are:

Ana Mari Cauce, president; chair
Gerald J. Baldasty, provost and executive vice president
Ali Mokdad, professor of Global Health, Epidemiology, and Health Services (IHME); vice chair
Thaisa Way, associate professor of landscape architecture; Faculty Senate liaison
David Anderson, executive director, Health Sciences administration
Kendra Canton, undergraduate student representative
Alison Cullen, professor, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance, and adjunct professor, School of Public Health and College of the Environment
Sara Curran, professor, Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies, and director, Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology
David L. Eaton, dean and vice provost, Graduate School
James Fogarty, associate professor, Computer Science and Engineering
Ceci Giachelli, professor and W. Hunter and Dorothy Simpson Endowed Chair, Department of Bioengineering
Eric King, graduate/professional student representative
Vicky Lawson, professor of geography; director of University Honors
Hedwig Lee, associate professor of sociology
Joe Lott, associate professor of educational leadership and policy studies
India Ornelas, assistant professor of health services, School of Public Health
David Reyes, assistant professor of nursing & healthcare leadership, UW Tacoma
Sallie Sanford, associate professor of law and adjunct associate professor of health services
Jane Simoni, professor of psychology and adjunct professor of global health
Clarence Spigner, professor of health services, School of Public Health
Bruder Stapleton, professor and chair, Department of Pediatrics, Seattle Children’s Hospital and UW Medicine
Emiko Tajima, associate dean for academic affairs and associate professor, School of Social Work
LuAnne Thompson, professor of oceanography
Wadiya Udell, associate professor, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW Bothell
Jurgen Unutzer, professor and chair, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences
Judy Wasserheit, professor and William H. Foege Endowed Chair, Department of Global Health
Lee Heck, associate vice president of individual giving programs, University Advancement; ex officio
Mary Gresch, chief marketing and communications officer, University Marketing & Communications; ex officio
Derek Fulwiler, director of project strategy and communications, Office of the President and Provost; project director

“By identifying and addressing the causes and impacts of a broad swath of health indicators for populations of people – from neighborhoods to countries – we have an opportunity to truly impact health and well-being in profound ways, here and worldwide.”

Ana Mari Cauce
President
Professor of Psychology
Chair, Population Health Initiative
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“I strongly believe that President Cauce has challenged us all to rise together to collaboratively deliver on this 25-year vision. I am amazed at the energy and engagement I have seen so far from all over the University, and I look forward to a vigorous exchange of ideas and innovative approaches as we move together to tackle the population health challenges faced by the world today.”

Ali Mokdad
Vice Chair, Population Health Initiative Executive Council

“No longer limited by disciplines, colleges, or professions, we are coming together to have collective impact here and around the world. This is the university of the future; one that tackles the biggest challenges by bringing together brilliant, creative, and caring people.”

Thaisa Way
Faculty Senate Liaison, Population Health Initiative Executive Council
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Dr. Way is the faculty senate liaison for the Population Health Initiative, Executive Director of Urban@UW, and an urban landscape historian teaching history, theory, and design at the University of Washington, Seattle. She has published and lectured on feminist histories of design and in particular the role of women as professionals and practitioners. Her current area of research is directed at urban design history.
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STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Research Spotlight: Immersive Virtual Reality, a non-pharmacologic analgesic for U.S. soldiers during painful burn wound cleaning sessions (for combat-related burn injuries)

INFORMATION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

Virtual Reality (VR) Analgesia technique invented by Hoffman and Patterson at the UW helps reduce pain of U.S. soldiers during painful severe burn wound cleaning sessions.

In 1996, Hunter Hoffman and David Patterson co-originated the new technique of using immersive VR for pain control and began collaborating with Sam Sharar, MD shortly thereafter. Hunter is a VR researcher from the UW Human Interface Technology Laboratory with a background in human cognition and attention. Since 1993 he has been exploring ways to increase the illusion of going inside virtual worlds (presence), how VR affects allocation of attentional resources, and therapeutic applications of VR.

SnowWorld, developed at the University of Washington HITLab in collaboration with Harborview Burn Center, was the first immersive virtual world designed for reducing pain. SnowWorld was specifically designed to help burn patients. Patients often report re-living their original burn experience during wound care, SnowWorld was designed to help put out the fire.

This interdisciplinary team puts burn patients, including veterans, into VR during wound care and physical therapy. Although this line of research is just beginning (with funding from NIH, the Paul Allen Foundation), Dr. Hoffman and his team are already finding significant drops in how much pain the patients experience during their short visit to virtual reality.

More information about Dr. Hoffman's work and Snow World can be found here.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic and Student Affairs Committee

Research Spotlight: Immersive Virtual Reality, a non-pharmacologic analgesic for U.S. soldiers during painful burn wound cleaning sessions (for combat-related burn injuries) (continued p. 2)

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

As an undergrad at the University of Tulsa, Hunter studied memory with Pawel Lewicki, magical thinking with Leonard Zusne (foreshadowing Hunter's later interest in VR) and bio-electromagnetics with Dr. O'Connor (foreshadowing Hunter's current interest in fMRI). Prior to grad school, Hunter then spent a year conducting memory research with Marcia Johnson at Princeton University on "reality monitoring": How people separate memories of real from memories of imagined events. He also studied perception using "illusory conjunctions" with Bill Prinzmetal. Marcia helped him get into graduate school at the University of Washington in Seattle where he worked with legendary eyewitness memory expert Elizabeth Loftus, famous for her research on the malleability of human memory for crimes, accidents, and childhood events, e.g., memory distortions caused by information encountered after the memory was formed. In grad school, he also studied the relation between attention and memory with Geoff Loftus, which influenced his future research in VR analgesia.

Hunter received a PhD in Cognitive Psychology (human memory and attention) at UW in 1992 and continued his post-doctoral research on social influences on memory with Larry Jacoby in Canada. In 1993, Hunter returned to Seattle and began virtual reality research at the UW Human Interface Technology Laboratory (HIT), one of the largest VR research laboratories in the world. The HIT laboratory was founded and is directed by Professor Tom Furness, one of the fathers of virtual reality.

Attachments
1. Pain Control During Wound Care for Combat-Related Burn Injuries, Journal of CyberTherapy and Rehabilitation, Summer 2008
2. Virtual-Reality Therapy, Scientific American, August 2004
3. Immersive Virtual Reality: Additional Information for Board of Regents
We describe the first two cases where virtual reality was added to usual pain medications to reduce excessive pain during wound care of combat-related burn injuries. Patient 1 was a 22 year old male who suffered 3rd degree burns on 32% of his body, including his right hand, during a roadside bomb terrorist attack in Iraq. The nurse administered wound care to half of the right hand during VR and the other half of the same hand during no VR (treatment order randomized). This patient was the first to use a unique custom articulated robotic-like arm mounted VR goggle system. Three 0-10 graphic rating scale pain scores for each of the two treatment conditions served as the primary dependent variables. The patient reported less pain when distracted with VR. "Time spent thinking about pain" dropped from 100% during no VR to 15% during VR, "pain unpleasantness" ratings dropped from "moderate" (6/10) to "mild" (4/10). Wound care was "no fun at all" (0/10) during no VR but was "pretty fun" (8/10) during VR. However, Patient 1 reported no reduction in worst pain during VR. Patient 2 suffered 2nd and 3rd degree burns when his humvee was hit by a terrorist's rocket propelled grenade in Iraq. During his wound care debridement, "time spent thinking about pain" was 100% (all of the time) with no VR and 0 (none of the time) during VR, "pain unpleasantness" ratings dropped from "severe" (7/10) to "none". Worst pain dropped from "severe" (8/10) to mild pain (2/10). And fun increased from zero with no VR to 10 (extremely fun) during VR. Although preliminary, using a within-subjects experimental design, the present study provided evidence that immersive VR can be an effective adjunctive nonpharmacologic analgesic for reducing cognitive pain, emotional pain and the sensory component of pain of soldiers experiencing severe procedural pain during wound care of a combat-related burn injury.

INTRODUCTION.

U.S. soldiers injured in Iraq with significant burns are treated at the U.S. Army Institute of Surgical Research (USAISR) at Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, TX. The mean length of inpatient stay for burn patients at this medical center is approx 25 days. (Kauvar et al.) Recovery often involves extensive outpatient physical therapy rehabilitation. Soldiers often move to San Antonio to continue their outpatient physical therapy for six months, a year or longer. Currently, wounded warfighter inpatients with severe burn wounds may have their bandages removed each day, so the wound can be inspected, cleaned and kept free of infection. Wounded warriors with severe burns remain conscious during daily wound care. Typically, they receive strong short-acting opioid analgesics and anxiolytics about twenty minutes prior to debridement (cleaning of dead skin from their healing burn wound). Despite early, aggressive
use of opioid analgesics, patients frequently experience severe to excruciating pain during daily burn wound care. (Carrougher et al.) Excessive pain can increase the amount of time it takes caregivers to complete the wound care, and can increase how long the patient remains in the hospital before discharge. Clinical and laboratory studies of civilians have shown large drops in subjective pain during virtual reality, (Hoffman et al., 2008 & Hoffman, 2004) and fMRI results with healthy volunteers show reductions in pain-related brain activity during VR analgesia. (Hoffman et al., 2004) If VR reduces procedural pain in patients with combat-related injuries, this would be a valuable advance in combat casualty care with potential widespread military applications in the future. The two patients in this case report are the first to quantify whether VR distraction can reduce high levels of subjective pain reports in soldiers with combat-related burn injuries undergoing wound care and dressing change. Both patients used a unique articulated robotic-like arm that allowed the VR goggles to be placed near the patient weightlessly, eliminating the need for the patient to put on a VR helmet and reducing the amount of surface contact needed with the patient (see Figure 1A and 1B).

**Figure 1A and 1B.** U.S. Army soldier receiving immersive Virtual Reality to reduce his pain during severe burn wound care, using our unique articulated arm mounted VR goggles designed by Hoffman and Magula, that hold the displays near the patient’s eyes. Photos and copyrights Hunter Hoffman, U.W.

**Subject**

Patient 1 was a U.S. Army soldier medically evacuated from Iraq to USAISR after suffering severe burns covering 32% of his body approximately 45 days prior to this intervention. While a passenger in a vehicle that was attacked by an improvised explosive device (roadside bomb), he experienced full thickness burns on his hands, arms, anterior and posterior chest and distal thighs. In the following weeks, donor skin was harvested from unburned portions of his body and transplanted as skin grafts to many of his severe burn wounds. In keeping with the standard practice, continuous wound care and frequent dressing changes were required to optimize the healing process.

A 10 minute segment of wound care to the patient’s right hand, identified from previous days’ procedures as being

excessively painful, was divided into two equivalent five minute wound care segments. Pre-medication with two per-
cocet tablets by mouth approximately 20 minutes prior to wound care served as the opioid analgesic for this session.
During one of the five-minute sessions he received no VR distraction (i.e., standard pre-medication only). During the
other five-minute treatment session, the participant looked into the articulated arm mounted VR goggles and under-
went wound care while experiencing immersive, interactive VR (randomized to receive VR first or second).

During two brief pauses in the wound care procedure (once after each five minute wound care period), the patient
completed three subjective pain ratings using Graphic Rating Scales (GRS) labeled 0 – 10 with respect to the preced-
ing 5 minutes of wound care. "Please indicate how you felt during the past five minute session by rating your response
on the following scales." Each question was accompanied by a pictorial example of the labeled graphic rating scale
such as the “worst pain” rating shown below.

How much TIME did you spend thinking about your pain during the past five minutes? I thought about my pain
during Virtual Reality 0 = none of the time, 1-4 = some of the time, 5 = half of the time, 6-9 = most of the time,
and 10 = all of the time. How UNPLEASANT was your pain during the Virtual Reality (a similar 10-cm line with
numeric and word descriptors beneath it: 0 = not unpleasant at all, 1-4 = mildly unpleasant, 5-6 = moderately unpleas-
ant, 7-9 = severely unpleasant, and 10 = excruciatingly unpleasant)? Rate your WORST PAIN during the past 5 minutes.

How much FUN did you have during Virtual Reality (10-cm line with numeric and verbal descriptors: 0 = no fun at
all, 1-4 = mildly fun, 5-6 = moderately fun, 7-9 = pretty fun, 10 = extremely fun)? To what extent (if at all) did you feel
NAUSEA for any reason during Virtual Reality (10-cm line with numeric and verbal descriptors: 0 = no nausea
at all, 1-4 = mild nausea, 5-6 = moderate nausea, 7-9 = severe nausea, and 10 = vomit)? While experiencing the vir-
tual world, to what extent did you feel like you WENT INSIDE the computer-generated world (10-cm line with
numeric and verbal descriptors: 0 = I did not feel like I went inside at all, 1-4 = mild sense of going inside, 5-6 = mod-
erate sense of going inside, 7-9 = strong sense of going inside, 10 = I went completely inside the virtual world)? After
wound care with no VR, each patient was asked the same questions but "during Virtual Reality" was replaced by
"without Virtual Reality". After-wound care with no VR, patients were not asked the question about presence.

Such pain rating scales have been shown to be valid through their strong associations with other measures of pain
intensity, as well as through their ability to detect treatment effects. (Jensen, 2003 & Jensen et al., 2001) The specific
measures used in the current study were designed to assess the cognitive component of pain (amount of time spent
thinking about pain), the affective component of pain (unpleasantness), and the sensory component of pain (worst
pain). Affective and sensory pain are two separately measurable and sometimes differentially influenced components
of the pain experience. (Gracely et al., 1978) Gracely et al., have shown ratio scale measures such as the labeled
Graphic Rating Scales used in this study to be highly reliable. In addition, a GRS rating of ‘fun’ during wound care
was measured. (Hoffmann et al., 2008)

Patient 2, a 21-year-old male, was injured when his humvee was hit by a terrorist’s rocket propelled grenade in Iraq.
The explosion caused 2nd and 3rd degree burns on 15% of his body: lower back, flank, buttox, bilateral hands, bilat-
eral upper arms. A 12-minute segment of wound care to the patient’s left and right arms identified from previous days’
procedures as being excessively painful was divided into two equivalent six-minute wound care segments. Pre-medication with one fentanyl lollypop (400 mic) and two percocet tablets by mouth approximately 20 minutes prior to wound care served as the opioid analgesic for this session. During one of the six-minute wound care sessions he received no VR distraction (i.e., standard pre-medication pharmacologies only). During the other six minute wound care session the participant looked into the articulated arm mounted VR goggles and underwent wound care while experiencing immersive, interactive VR (randomized to receive VR first or second). During two brief pauses in the wound care procedure (once after each six minute wound care period), the patient completed three subjective pain ratings using Graphic Rating Scales (GRS) labeled 0 – 10 with respect to the preceding 6 minutes of wound care, using the same measures described above for patient 1.

For both patients, the VR system consisted of a Voodoo Envy laptop with NVIDIA GForce Go 7900 GTX (512 MB) video card; Intel Core 2 Duo (T7400) CPU @ 2.16 GHz, 2 GB RAM @ 994 MHz. While in High Tech VR, each subject followed a pre-determined path, "gliding" through an icy 3-D virtual canyon (Figure 2). He ‘looked’ around the virtual environment and aimed via a mouse. He pushed a mouse trigger button to shoot virtual snowballs at virtual snowmen, igloos, and penguins (see www.vrpain.com). Each subject saw the sky when he looked up, a canyon wall when he looked to the left or right, a flowing river when he looked down, and heard sound effects (e.g., a splash when a snowball hit the river) mixed with background music by recording artist Paul Simon. Participants looked into a pair of Rockwell Collins SR-80 VR goggles (see www.imprintit.com) with a custom made neoprene blinder on top and sides, which largely blocked his view of the real world. These VR goggles afforded approximately 80° diagonal field of view for each of the rectangular eyepieces with 100% overlap between the right and left eye images. The goggles were held in place near the patient’s eyes by a custom made articulated arm mounting system.

**Results**

As shown in Figure 3 below, Patient 1 reported less pain when distracted with VR (e.g., "time spent thinking about pain" dropped from "all the time" during no VR to "some of the time" 1.5 (15%) during VR, "pain unpleasantness"
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Figure 3. Patient 1 reported large reductions in amount of time thinking about pain during VR (shown in blue) compared to no VR (shown in red) during severe burn wound care of burn injury resulting from an Improvised Explosive Device (roadside bomb) attack/explosion.
ratings dropped from "moderate" (6/10) to "mild" (4/10). VR did not reduce Worst pain (0% drop) in Patient 1. Wound care during VR was "pretty fun" (8/10) vs. "no fun at all" (0/10) during no VR and the patient reported having a "moderate sense of going inside the computer-generated world" (6/10).

As shown in Figure 4 below, Patient 2 reported that during his wound care debridement, Time spent thinking about pain was 100% with no VR and 0 with VR, "pain unpleasantness" ratings dropped from "severe" (7/10) with no VR to "none" during VR. Worst pain dropped from "severe" (8/10) with no VR to mild pain (2/10) during VR. And fun increased from zero with no VR to 10 during VR. Patient 2 reported having "a strong sense of going inside the computer-generated world" (8/10). Both patients and their wound care nurses noted that they would prefer VR be available for subsequent dressing changes as they found it to be helpful as an adjunctive modality for pain control. Patient 2 was very determined to continue playing SnowWorld as long as possible. And the wound care nurse of patient 1 spontaneously remarked she was pleasantly surprised to see that when in VR, the patient was not pulling his hand away from her as she worked on his hand, a "protective" behavior he consistently exhibited during daily wound care of his hand with No VR.

![Figure 4](image.png)

**Figure 4.** Patient 2 reported large reductions in pain during VR (shown in blue) compared to no VR (shown in red) during burn wound care of a severe burn injury resulting from a rocket-propelled grenade attack/explosion.

**Discussion**

The results of these two case studies demonstrate that immersive VR reduced the reported amount of time patients with a combat-related burn injury spent thinking about their pain and VR reduced pain unpleasantness. VR did not reduce patient one's worst pain rating during his burn wound care. But VR did reduce patient two's worst pain from severe (a rating of 8) down to mild (a rating of 2). Although case studies are scientifically inconclusive and controlled studies are needed, these results provide the first available evidence that VR can reduce severe acute pain during medical procedures (wound care and dressing changes) in patients with combat-related burn injuries. Because excessive acute pain during medical procedures for combat-related injuries remains a widespread medical problem, and our preliminary results support the notion that VR might prove valuable for pain control in combat trauma patients, additional research on this modality with this patient population is warranted.
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VIRTUAL-REALITY THERAPY

Patients can get relief from pain or overcome their phobias by immersing themselves in computer-generated worlds

BY HUNTER G. HOFFMAN

BURN PATIENT participates in a virtual-reality program to relieve the pain of his wound care at Harborview Burn Center in Seattle (above). Wearing a headset and manipulating a joystick, the patient maneuvers through the program called SnowWorld (right), which was specifically designed to ease the pain of burn victims. Studies show that virtual-reality programs are more effective than ordinary video games in distracting patients from the often excruciating pain of wound care.
In the science-fiction thriller *The Matrix*, the heroes “plugged in” to a virtual world. While their bodies rested in reclining chairs, their minds fought martial-arts battles, dodged bullets and drove motorcycles in an elaborately constructed software program. This cardinal virtue of virtual reality—the ability to give users the sense that they are “somewhere else”—can be of great value in a medical setting. Researchers are finding that some of the best applications of the software focus on therapy rather than entertainment. In essence, virtual reality can ease pain, both physical and psychological.

For the past several years, I have worked with David R. Patterson, a pain expert at the University of Washington School of Medicine, to determine whether severely burned patients, who often face unbearable pain, can relieve their discomfort by engaging in a virtual-reality program during wound treatment. The results have been so promising that a few hospitals are now preparing to explore the use of virtual reality as a tool for pain control. In other projects, my colleagues and I are using virtual-reality applications to help phobic patients overcome their irrational fear of spiders and to treat post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in survivors of terrorist attacks.

At least two software companies are already leasing virtual-reality programs and equipment to psychologists for phobia treatment in their offices. And the Virtual Reality Medical Center, a chain of clinics in California, has used similar programs to successfully treat more than 300 patients suffering from phobias and anxiety disorders. Although researchers must conduct more studies to gauge the effectiveness of these applications, it seems clear that virtual therapy offers some very real benefits.

**FEW EXPERIENCES are more intense than the pain associated with severe burn injuries. After surviving the initial trauma, burn patients must endure a long journey of healing that is often as painful as the original injury itself. Daily wound care—the gentle cleaning and removal of dead tissue to prevent infection—can be so excruciating that even the aggressive use of opioids (morphine-related analgesics) cannot control the pain. The patient’s healing skin must be stretched to preserve its elasticity, to reduce muscle atrophy and to prevent the need for further skin grafts. At these times, most patients—and especially children—would love to transport their minds somewhere else while doctors and nurses treat their wounds. Working with the staff at Harborview Burn Center in Seattle, Patterson and I set out in 1996 to determine whether immersive virtual-reality techniques could be used to distract patients from their pain. The team members include Sam R. Sharar, Mark Jensen and Rob Sweet of the University of Washington School of Medicine, Gretchen J. Carrougher of Harborview Burn Center and Thomas Furness of the University of Washington Human Interface Technology Laboratory (HITLab).

Pain has a strong psychological component. The same incoming pain signal can be interpreted as more or less painful depending on what the patient is thinking. In addition to influencing the way patients interpret such signals, psychological factors can even influence the amount of pain signals allowed to enter the brain’s cortex. Neurophysiologists Ronald Melzack and Patrick D. Wall developed this “gate control” theory of pain in the 1960s [see “The Tragedy of Needless Pain,” by Ronald Melzack; Scientific American, February 1990].

Introducing a distraction—for example, by having the patient listen to music—has long been known to help reduce pain for some people. Because virtual reality is a uniquely effective new form of distraction, it makes an ideal candidate for pain control. To test this notion, we studied two teenage boys who had suffered gasoline burns. The first patient had a severe burn on his leg; the second had deep burns covering one third of his body, including his face, neck, back, arms, hands and legs. Both had received skin-graft surgery and staples to hold the grafts in place.

We performed the study during the removal of the staples from the skin grafts.

**Overview/Virtual-Reality Therapy**

- One of the best ways to alleviate pain is to introduce a distraction. Because virtual reality immerses users in a three-dimensional computer-generated world, it is uniquely suited to distracting patients from their pain.
- Burn patients undergoing wound care report that their pain drops dramatically when they engage in virtual-reality programs. Functional magnetic resonance imaging shows that virtual reality actually reduces the amount of pain-related activity in the brain.
- Virtual-reality programs can also help phobic patients overcome their fear of spiders, heights, flying or public speaking. A specially designed program is now being used to treat post-traumatic stress disorder in survivors of the September 11 attacks.
The boys received their usual opioid medication before treatment. In addition, each teenager spent part of the treatment session immersed in a virtual-reality program and an equal amount of time playing a popular Nintendo video game (either Wave Race 64, a jet-ski racing game, or Mario Kart 64, a race-car game). The virtual-reality program, called Spider-World, had originally been developed as a tool to overcome spider phobias; we used it for this investigation because it was the most distracting program available at the time and because we knew it would not induce nausea. Wearing a stereoscopic, position-tracked headset that presented three-dimensional computer graphics, the patients experienced the illusion of wandering through a kitchen, complete with countertops, a window and cabinets that could be opened. An image of a tarantula was set inside the virtual kitchen; the illusion was enhanced by suspending a furry spider toy with wiggly legs above the patient’s bed so that he could actually feel the virtual spider.

Both teenagers reported severe to excruciating pain while they were playing the Nintendo games but noted large drops in pain while immersed in Spider-World. (They rated the pain on a zero to 100 scale immediately after each treatment session.) Although Nintendo can hold a healthy player’s attention for a long time, the illusion of going inside the two-dimensional video game was found
Virtual reality is not just changing the way patients interpret incoming pain signals; the programs actually reduce the amount of pain-related brain activity.

to be much weaker than the illusion of going into virtual reality. A follow-up study involving 12 patients at Harborview Burn Center confirmed the results: patients using traditional pain control (opioids alone) said the pain was more than twice as severe compared with when they were inside SpiderWorld.

Why is virtual reality so effective in alleviating pain? Human attention has been likened to a spotlight, allowing us to select some information to process and to ignore everything else, because there is a limit to how many sources of information we can handle at one time. While a patient is engaged in a virtual-reality program, the spotlight of his or her attention is no longer focused on the wound and the pain but drawn into the virtual world. Because less attention is available to process incoming pain signals, patients often experience dramatic drops in how much pain they feel and spend much less time thinking about their pain during wound care.

To increase the effectiveness of the virtual therapy, our team created SnowWorld, a program specifically customized for use with burn patients during wound care. Developed with funding from Microsoft co-founder Paul G. Allen and the National Institutes of Health, SnowWorld produces the illusion of flying through an icy canyon with a frigid river and waterfall, as snowflakes drift down [see illustration on pages 58 and 59]. Because patients often report that they are reliving their original burn experience during wound care, we designed a glacial landscape to help put out the fire. As patients glide through the virtual canyon, they can shoot snowballs at snowmen, igloos, robots and penguins standing on narrow ice shelves or floating in the river. When hit by a snowball, the snowmen and igloos disappear in a puff of powder, the penguins flip upside down with a quack, and the robots collapse into a heap of metal.

More recent research has shown that the benefits of virtual-reality therapy are not limited to burn patients. We conducted a study involving 22 healthy volunteers, each of whom had a blood pressure cuff tightly wrapped around one arm for 10 minutes. Every two minutes the subjects rated the pain from the cuff; as expected, the discomfort rose as the session wore on. But during the last two minutes, each of the subjects participated in two brief virtual-reality programs, SpiderWorld and ChocolateWorld. (In ChocolateWorld, users see a virtual chocolate bar that is linked through a position sensor to an actual candy bar; as you eat the real chocolate bar, bite marks appear on the virtual bar as well.) The subjects reported that their pain dropped dramatically during the virtual-reality session.

What is more, improving the quality of the virtual-reality system increases the amount of pain reduction. In another study, 39 healthy volunteers received a thermal pain stimulus—delivered by an electrically heated element applied to the right foot, at a preapproved temperature individually tailored to each participant—for 30 seconds. During this stimulus, 20 of the subjects experienced the fully interactive version of SnowWorld with a high-quality headset, sound effects and head tracking. The other 19 subjects saw a stripped-down program with a low-quality, see-through helmet, no sound effects, no head tracking and no ability to shoot snowballs. We found a significant positive correlation between the potency of the illusion—how strongly the subjects felt they were immersed in the virtual world—and the alleviation of their pain.

Seeing Pain in the Brain Of course, all these studies relied on the subjective evaluation of the pain by the patients. As a stricter test of whether virtual reality reduces pain, I set out with my colleagues at the University of Washington—including Todd L. Richards, Aric R. Bills, Barbara A. Coda and Sam Sharar—to measure pain-related brain activity us-
Healthy volunteers underwent a brain scan while receiving brief pain stimulation through an electrically heated element applied to the foot. When the volunteers received the thermal stimuli without the distraction of virtual reality, they reported severe pain intensity and unpleasantness and spent most of the time thinking about their pain. And, as expected, their fMRI scans showed a large increase in pain-related activity in five regions of the brain that are known to be involved in the perception of pain: the insula, the thalamus, the primary and secondary somatosensory cortex, and the affective division of the anterior cingulate cortex [see illustration on page 61].

Creating virtual-reality goggles that could be placed inside the fMRI machine was a challenge. We had to develop a fiber-optic headset constructed of nonferrous, nonconducting materials that would not be affected by the powerful magnetic fields inside the fMRI tube. But the payoff was gratifying: we found that when the volunteers engaged in SnowWorld during the thermal stimuli, the pain-related activity in their brains decreased significantly (and they also reported large reductions in subjective pain ratings). The fMRI results suggest that virtual reality is not just changing the way patients interpret incoming pain signals; the programs actually reduce the amount of pain-related brain activity.

Encouraged by our results, two large regional burn centers—the William Randolph Hearst Burn Center at New York Weill Cornell Medical Center and Shriners Hospital for Children in Galveston, Tex.—are both making preparations to explore the use of SnowWorld for pain control during wound care for severe burns. Furthermore, the Hearst Burn Center, directed by Roger W. Yurt, is helping to fund the development of a new upgrade, SuperSnowWorld, which will feature life-like human avatars that will interact with the patient. SuperSnowWorld will allow two people to enter the same virtual world; for example, a burn patient and his mother would be able to see each other’s avatars and work together to defeat monstrous virtual insects and animated sea creatures rising from the icy river. By maximizing the illusion and interactivity, the program will help patients focus their attention on the virtual world during particularly long and painful wound care sessions. Now being built by Ari Hollander, an affiliate of HITLab, SuperSnowWorld will be offered to medical centers free of charge by the Hearst and Harborview burn centers.

Virtual-reality analgesia also has the potential to reduce patient discomfort during other medical procedures. Bruce Thomas and Emily Steele of the University of South Australia have found that virtual reality can alleviate pain in cerebral palsy patients during physical therapy after muscle and tendon surgery. (Aimed at improving the patient’s ability to walk, this therapy involves exercises to stretch and strengthen the leg muscles.) Our team at the University of Washington is exploring the clinical use of virtual reality during a painful urological procedure called a rigid cystoscopy. And we have conducted a study showing that virtual reality can even relieve the pain and fear of dental work.

**Fighting Fear**

Another therapeutic application of virtual reality is combating phobias by exposing patients to graphic simulations of their greatest fears. This form of therapy was introduced in the 1990s by Barbara O. Rothbaum of Emory University and Larry F. Hodges, now at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, for treating fear of heights, fear of flying in airplanes, fear of public speaking, and chronic post-traumatic stress disorder in Vietnam War veterans. Like the pain-control programs, exposure therapy helps to change the way people think, behave and interpret information. Working with Albert Carlin of HITLab—the Virtual Reality Analgesia Research Center at the University of Washington Human Interface Technology Laboratory (HITLab) in Seattle.
Lab and Azucena Garcia-Palacios of Jaume I University in Spain (a HITLab affiliate), our team has shown that virtual-reality exposure therapy is very effective for reducing spider phobia. Our first spider-phobia patient, nicknamed Miss Muffet, had suffered from this anxiety disorder for nearly 20 years and had acquired a number of obsessive-compulsive behaviors. She routinely fumigated her car with smoke and pesticides to get rid of spiders. Every night she sealed all her bedroom windows with duct tape after scanning the room for spiders. She searched for the arachnids wherever she went and avoided walkways where she might find one. After washing her clothes, she immediately sealed them inside a plastic bag to make sure they remained free of spiders. Over the years her condition grew worse. When her fear made her hesitant to leave home, she finally sought therapy.

Like other kinds of exposure therapy, the virtual-reality treatment involves introducing the phobic person to the feared object or situation a little at a time. Bit by bit the fear decreases, and the patient becomes more comfortable. In our first sessions, the patient sees a virtual tarantula in a virtual kitchen and approaches as close as possible to the arachnid while using a handheld joystick to navigate through the three-dimensional scene. The goal is to come within arm’s reach of the virtual spider.

During the following sessions, the participant wears a glove that tracks the position of his or her hand, enabling the software to create an image of a hand—the cyberhand—that can move through the virtual kitchen. The patient maneuvers the cyberhand to touch the virtual spider, which is programmed to respond by making a brief noise and fleeing a few inches. The patient then picks up a virtual vase with the cyberhand; when the patient lets go, the vase remains in midair, but an animated spider with wiggling legs comes out. The spider drifts to the floor of the virtual kitchen, accompanied by a brief sound effect from the classic horror movie Psycho. Participants repeat each task until they report little anxiety. Then they move on to the next challenge. The final therapy sessions add tactile feedback to the virtual experience: a toy spider with an electromagnetic position sensor is suspended in front of the patient, allowing him or her to feel the furry object while touching the virtual spider with the cyberhand.

After only 10 one-hour sessions, Miss Muffet’s fear of spiders was greatly reduced, and her obsessive-compulsive behaviors also went away. Her success was unusually dramatic: after treatment, she was able to hold a live tarantula (which crawled partway up her arm) for several minutes with little anxiety. In a subsequent controlled study of 23 patients diagnosed with clinical phobia, 83 percent reported a significant decrease in their fear of spiders. Before treatment, these patients could not go within 10 feet of a caged tarantula without high anxiety; af-
ter the virtual-reality therapy, most of them could walk right up to the cage and touch its lid with only moderate anxiety. Some patients could even remove the lid.

Similar programs can be incorporated into the treatment of a more serious psychological problem: post-traumatic stress disorder. The symptoms of PTSD include flashbacks of a traumatic event, intense reactions to anything symbolizing or resembling the event, avoidance behaviors, emotional numbing, and irritability. It is a debilitating disorder that affects the patient’s social life and job performance and is much more challenging to treat than specific phobias. Cognitive behavioral therapy protocols, such as the prolonged exposure therapy developed by University of Pennsylvania psychologist Edna Foa, have a high success rate for patients with PTSD. The exposure therapy is thought to work by helping patients process and eventually reduce the emotions associated with the memories of the traumatic event. The therapist gradually exposes the patient to stimuli that activate these emotions and teaches the patient how to manage the unwanted responses.

Researchers are now exploring whether virtual-reality programs can be used to standardize the therapy and improve the outcome for patients, especially those who do not respond to traditional methods. JoAnn Difede of Cornell University and I developed a virtual-reality exposure therapy to treat a young woman who was at the World Trade Center during the September 11 attacks and later developed PTSD. During the therapy, the patient put on a virtual-reality helmet that showed virtual jets flying over the towers and crashing into them with animated explosions and sound effects. Although the progress of the therapy was gradual and systematic, the scenes presented by the software in the final sessions were gruesomely realistic, with images of people jumping from the burning buildings and the sounds of sirens and screams. These stimuli can help patients retrieve memories of the event and, with the guidance of a therapist, lower the discomfort of remembering what happened.

Our first patient showed a large and stable reduction in her PTSD symptoms and depression after the virtual-reality sessions. Other patients traumatized by the tower attacks are now being treated with virtual-reality therapy at Weill Cornell Medical College and New York Presbyterian Hospital. I am also collaborating with a team of researchers led by Patrice L. (Tamar) Weiss of Haifa University in Israel and Garcia-Palacios to create a virtual-reality treatment for survivors of terrorist bombings who develop PTSD.

**Virtual Reality by the Hour**

Because dozens of studies have established the efficacy of virtual-reality therapy for treating specific phobias, this is one of the first medical applications to make the leap to widespread clinical use. Virtually Better, a Decatur, Ga.–based company that was co-founded by virtual-reality pioneers Hodges and Rothbaum, has produced programs designed to treat an array of anxiety disorders, including fear of heights, fear of flying and fear of public speaking. The company is leasing its software to psychologists and psychiatrists for $400 a month, allowing therapists to administer the treatments in their own offices. A Spanish firm called PREVI offers similar programs. Instead of reclining on a couch, patients interactively confront their fears by riding in virtual airplanes or by standing in front of virtual audiences.

In contrast, more research is needed to determine whether virtual reality can enhance the treatment of PTSD. Scientists have not yet completed any randomized, controlled studies testing the effectiveness of virtual-reality therapy for treating the disorder. But some of the leading PTSD experts are beginning to explore the virtues of the technology, and the preliminary results are encouraging.

Large clinical trials are also needed to determine the value of virtual-reality analgesia for burn patients. So far the research has shown that the SnowWorld program poses little risk and few side effects. Because the patients use SnowWorld in addition to traditional opioid medication, the subjects who see no benefit from virtual reality are essentially no worse off than if they did not try it. Virtual reality may eventually help to reduce reliance on opioids and allow more aggressive wound care and physical therapy, which would speed up recovery and cut medical costs.

The high-quality virtual-reality systems that we recommend for treating extreme pain are very expensive, but we are optimistic that breakthroughs in display technologies over the next few years will lower the cost of the headsets. Furthermore, patients undergoing less painful procedures, such as dental work, can use cheaper, commercially available systems. (Phobia patients can also use the less expensive headsets.)

The illusions produced by these programs are now nearly as sophisticated as the world portrayed in the Matrix films. Yet virtual reality has matured enough so that it can be used to help people control their pain and overcome their fears and traumatic memories. And as the technology continues to advance, we can expect even more remarkable applications in the years to come.

**MORE TO EXPLORE**


More information about virtual-reality therapy can be found on the Web at www.hitl.washington.edu/ and www.e-therapy.info
Immersive Virtual Reality: Additional Information for Board of Regents

http://motherboard.vice.com/read/play-the-pain-away

Optional news articles below.

http://www.npr.org/2012/02/12/146775049/virtual-penguins-a-prescription-for-pain
https://essentialhospitals.org/pokemon-go-helps-patients-heal/
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Approve Appointment of Insurance Broker of Record

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents appoint Parker, Smith & Feek as the University’s Insurance Broker of Record for an additional five-year period effective December 1, 2016, subject to satisfactory performance.

BACKGROUND:

The University uses insurance brokers to obtain the best possible insurance coverage from worldwide insurance carriers and to consult on risk management and insurance matters. Over time, the Board of Regents has appointed Parker, Smith & Feek, a privately owned firm based in Bellevue, for all lines of coverage, including construction-related, property, casualty, and student health insurance. The firm’s services and expertise has fully satisfied the University’s requirements. The current five-year appointment was approved in 2011 after a competitive proposal process and will expire on December 1 of this year. It contained an option to extend for an additional five-year period.

To prepare a recommendation about that extension, Compliance and Risk Services staff consulted with various University departments that use Parker, Smith & Feek’s services and found a high level of satisfaction as well as interest in continuing the relationship. A consultant was hired to compare the firm’s compensation to national standards and its recommended modifications have been agreed upon, as has a draft contract containing performance expectations.

Parker, Smith & Feek has demonstrated its commitment to the University by its excellent service delivery, attention to quality and market-responsive compensation arrangements. Its regional depth and breadth of expertise is enhanced by its membership in Assurex, an international insurance brokerage consortium which has been useful in placing coverage for the University’s global activities. It pays special attention to the emerging regulatory issues affecting the University’s policies in order to remain in full compliance with all relevant laws. It provides excellent consultation as needed on the University’s single parent captive insurance company, Portage Bay Insurance. Its total compensation for the past fiscal year was $1.1M on a premium volume of $35M.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Approve Internal Audit Planned Activities for 2017 and Internal Audit Charter

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents, in accordance with the Standards of the Institute of Internal Auditors, approve the University of Washington’s 2017 Audit Plan and Internal Audit Charter.

BACKGROUND

Established in 1941, the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) is an international professional association with global headquarters in Altamonte Springs, Florida. The IIA is the internal audit profession’s global voice, recognized authority, acknowledged leader, chief advocate, and principal educator.

The IIA provides a framework for performing internal auditing, through the publication of International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing. It is considered industry best practice to comply with the IIA standards.

- Standard 2020 requires that the Executive Director of Internal Audit communicate internal audit plans and resource requirements to senior management and the board for review and approval.

- Standard 1000 requires that the Executive Director of Internal Audit periodically review the internal audit charter and present it to senior management and the board for approval.

In order to comply with the above mentioned IIA standards, the Executive Director of Internal Audit is presenting the 2017 Audit Plan and Internal Audit Charter for approval. There have been no changes in the Internal Audit Charter since it was approved in November 2015.

Attachments
1. 2017 Audit Plan
2. University of Washington Internal Audit Charter
2017 Audit Plan

Finance and Asset Management Committee
Board of Regents

November 2016
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Executive Summary

The 2017 Audit Plan contains key information on our planned audit activity for calendar year 2017. The plan was based on the results of our annual risk assessment process.

Audit Goals

Internal Audit’s major goals for 2017 are:

- Complete audits focused on areas identified within Internal Audit’s Risk Assessment;
- Provide the University with value added recommendations to improve controls, mitigate identified risks and increase efficiency of operations;
- Continue our student intern program;
- Implementation of Internal Audit Strategic Plan;
- Operate and refine processes regarding the newly implemented University-wide financial fraud and ethics reporting hotline;
- Contribute to the Compliance Support Program through participation as an advisor on the Compliance Coordination Team; and
- Continue to participate on major system implementations as an advisor on oversight committees and complete pre/post implementation reviews.

Audit Plan 2017

The University of Washington Internal Audit Plan for 2017 is designed to provide audit coverage across the entirety of the University, deploying Internal Audit resources in an effective and efficient manner.

We continue to focus our audit plan and related projects on the highest risk areas identified in our Internal Audit risk assessment. The risk assessment includes the review of:

- Strategic plans and initiatives of the University;
- Changes impacting the major operating units within the University (Schools, Colleges and Central Administrative units);
- Top risks of the University identified in the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) report to the Board of Regents;
- Emerging risks within higher education, healthcare and information technology as shared with Internal Audit while attending national conferences throughout 2016;
- Interviews with senior management; and
- Financial and historical information regarding the University.

The Audit Plan documents presented here include:

- Overview of the Audit Plan;
- Analysis of Audit Coverage of University Auditable Units from 2012 – 2017;
- Analysis of Audit Coverage of University Highest Risks;
- Listing of Planned Audit Projects; and
- Allocation of Audit Resources.
Internal Audit engages in three primary activities – audits, management advisory services, and investigations. Our focus is to actively work with the schools, colleges and UW Medicine to assist management in addressing strategic, financial, operational, and compliance risks and exposures. Internal Audit focuses on both university-wide and departmental level processes and control systems. In order to focus our audit resources, we consider the work completed by other audit professionals and compliance officers across the University such as KPMG LLP, Peterson Sullivan LLP, State Auditor’s Office, UW Medicine Compliance and other regulatory agencies in setting our overall audit plan and in planning the work conducted on any specific project. Additionally, we provide liaison services between the University and external audit parties to assist in the effective conduct of outside auditor’s projects.

Internal Audit’s goals for 2017 are:

- Complete audits focused on areas identified within Internal Audit’s Risk Assessment;
- Provide the University with value added recommendations to improve controls, mitigate identified risks and increase efficiency of operations;
- Continue our student intern program;
- Implementation of Internal Audit Strategic Plan;
- Operate and refine processes regarding the newly implemented University-wide financial fraud and ethics reporting hotline;
- Contribute to the Compliance Support Program through participation as an advisor on the Compliance Coordination Team;
- Continue to participate on major system implementations as an advisor on oversight committees and complete pre/post implementation reviews;
- Continue to strengthen our audit team through focused industry training;
- Participate in roundtables / conferences with peer institutions to discuss emerging risks;
- Provide training on internal controls, WA Ethics Law and other related subjects; and
- Continue to lead the Pacific Northwest Higher Education Internal Audit Conference.

The UW Internal Audit Plan for 2017 is designed to provide audit coverage across the entirety of the University, deploying Internal Audit resources in areas of increased risk or operations we have not audited in the recent past. The methodology that we utilized for performing our risk assessment and developing our audit plan is included in the Appendix.

To enable us to focus on the appropriate areas, we considered the top risks identified in the annual ERM report to the Board of Regents and the strategic plans and significant initiatives of the University, such as the Be Boundless Campaign, Population Health Initiative, Transforming Administration Program, Human Resources/Payroll system implementation, Finance Transformation, One Capital Plan and the UW Medicine Accountable Care Network. We have also acknowledged increasing external forces (increasing compliance oversight by federal government, data breaches and changes to state funding) that could adversely impact the internal controls processes previously developed within the University.
Analysis of Audit Coverage of University Auditable Units

The University auditable units, listed below, are ranked from high to low in terms of the risk based on the 2017 risk assessment performed by Internal Audit (IA). Additionally, we have included the rankings from previous risk assessments. The previous year columns identify the IA risk ranking in those periods and the type of audit work conducted within the respective unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUDITABLE UNIT</th>
<th>2016/2017 Rank</th>
<th>Audit Coverage</th>
<th>2015/2014 Rank</th>
<th>Audit Coverage</th>
<th>2013/2012 Rank</th>
<th>Audit Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine Clinical Entities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Information Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Administration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Planning and Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the President/Provost</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Planning and Management</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Accounting and Analysis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Financial Aid</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Reg</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Reg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoMotion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum College</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Advancement</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Office</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Food Services</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ext</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster School of Business</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Services</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>IA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information School</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Built Environment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>IA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans School of Public Affairs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>IA*</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:  IA - Audited by Internal Audit  
IA* – Audited by Internal Audit as part of a university-wide process audit  
Ext – Audited by KPMG LLP or Peterson Sullivan LLP  
Reg – Audited by regulatory agencies, including State Auditor’s Office
Analysis of Audit Coverage of University Highest Risks as defined in the ERM Report

The chart below links our audit plan with the 26 highest risks identified in the UW Enterprise Risk Management 2013/2014 Annual Report presented to the Board of Regents in January 2015. We identified areas where we have conducted audit procedures in previous years (2014 – 2016) and for those areas we plan on including in the 2017 Audit Plan. Risks for which we have not completed audits within the last four years will be considered for projects in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Ranking</th>
<th>Risk Title</th>
<th>Risk Area</th>
<th>Internal Audit Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Information systems assurance</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safety of students, faculty, staff, visitors</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age of IT systems</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Age of facilities</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Recruit and retain top faculty, and maintain research</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>competitiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Changing revenue streams</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Federal grant regulations</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Crime on or near campus</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Minors on campus</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Environmental and occupational health, lab safety and</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hazardous materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Information security and back up</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Academic, scientific misconduct, research integrity, and</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conflict of interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Student wellness</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Healthcare regulations</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Investments in capital reduce financial flexibility for</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Enrollment and yield rates</td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Emergency and disaster preparedness</td>
<td>Mega/External</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Student athlete code of conduct</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Animal research regulations</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Patient safety</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Online learning capabilities</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Human resource regulations</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>International student regulations</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>NCAA compliance</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Alliances, affiliations, industry consolidations</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Recruit and retain top graduate students</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Audit Coverage of University Highest Risks as defined in the ERM Report (continued)

Heat Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Ranking of University Top Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost certain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact**

- Insignificant
- Minor
- Moderate
- Major
- Critical

Planned Audit Projects

We will continue to focus on the high risk areas as identified in the UW Enterprise Risk Management 2013/2014 Annual Report and in our risk assessment. We identified both audit units and university-wide processes within which to focus our audit activities during 2017. As part of our risk assessment, we continued our focus on audit projects whose results could be shared across the campus to improve control effectiveness. Additionally, based on risk and controls reviews conducted in the audit planning process, we may validate and/or expand upon the areas of focus and risks in each respective audit unit. We will conduct audits in the units identified in the chart on the following page.

Our risk assessment process will be further refined for the UW Medicine clinical entities to include a more in-depth identification of audit units and possible audit projects within the system. This process will include expanded meetings with the executives within the UW Medicine clinical entities, operational management and meetings with the Boards of UW Medicine and the respective medical centers.
## Planned Audit Projects (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Unit</th>
<th>Audit Focus</th>
<th>ERM Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine clinical entities (10)</td>
<td>Drug diversion, payroll, charge capture (multiple units), supply chain - procurement, charity care, IT and additional audit projects.</td>
<td>1, 6, 11, 14, 20, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>Federal grant compliance and business operations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics – 2016</td>
<td>Compliance with NCAA Standards</td>
<td>18, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Administration</td>
<td>Center on Human Development &amp; Disability</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Planning and Development</td>
<td>Review of Capital Planning Oversight</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>HRP Post Implementation</td>
<td>1, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>School of Business - Executive Education</td>
<td>6, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>Federal Grant Compliance - Health Services</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>Course Fees</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
<td>Federal Grant Compliance - Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Engineering</td>
<td>IT General Controls Review</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Research</td>
<td>Office of Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>5, 6, 7, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoMotion</td>
<td>Oversight of Support Outside Organizations</td>
<td>6, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>Federal Grant Compliance &amp; Business Ops</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuum College</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>6, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>HIPAA</td>
<td>11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Travel &amp; Entertainment Expenditures</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Business Operations - Centers</td>
<td>7, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Services</td>
<td>IT Electronic Media Disposal</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Unit Audit</td>
<td>Title IX</td>
<td>2, 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following projects were identified as higher risk by Internal Audit and management but not significant enough to be included in the 2017 planned audits due to current resource constraints. We will include certain of these audits in our 2017 audit projects as staffing permits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Unit</th>
<th>Audit Focus</th>
<th>ERM Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine clinical entities</td>
<td>Valley Epic User Access, ALNW, UW Medicine ITS Network Security</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Information Technology</td>
<td>Audit Logs</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>IT General Controls</td>
<td>1, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Administration</td>
<td>IACUC</td>
<td>7, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Planning &amp; Management</td>
<td>User Fees / Deficit Policy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>KUOW</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>Student Technology Fee - Selection &amp; Reporting</td>
<td>6, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Unit Audit</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Audit Resources

The audit plan for calendar year 2017 is based on a professional staffing complement of 18 FTE, which includes the addition of one professional staff in late 2016/early 2017 to assist with the IT audit work. This position is funded by the UW and part of an overall growth process to bring UW Internal Audit to a full complement of staff at 21 FTE over the next four years. We will also augment our staff by continuing our IA Internship Program in which we currently employ two UW students and look for ways to expand this program.

Approximately 52% of the Internal Audit’s available resources are committed to the completion of planned audit projects and follow-up audit procedures. The annual audit plan is designed to provide appropriate coverage utilizing a variety of audit methodologies: audits of individual units on campus and within the UW Medicine clinical entities, functional and process audits, University-wide reviews, and information system projects. Internal Audit semi-annually conducts follow-up audit procedures to ensure that management is implementing controls as described within their responses to Internal Audit report findings.

We have a number of audit projects begun in 2016 which will carryover for completion in early 2017. Additionally, we continue to refine our planning process and quarterly reporting to the Audit Advisory Committee to ensure our own accountability and minimize audit slippage. The amount of carryover work is in line with a normal audit process where audits begun in the last few months of the year are completed and issued early in the following year.

The remainder of our FY 2017 audit resources is allocated as follows:

- 18% to accommodate requests from the President, the Board, or other executive management and consultations with University departments. Additionally we plan to incur hours conducting investigations into whistleblower claims, regulatory, ethics and fraud allegations; especially as we began the University wide Fraud, Waste and Abuse Reporting Hotline in the Summer of 2016.
- 10% for employee professional development, internal quality improvement projects and ongoing expansion and maintenance of our electronic work paper system. Additionally, we participate in national roundtables with peer institutions (large research universities with medical centers). We also participate in one to two Quality Assessment Reviews of peer institutions annually.
- 6% for risk mitigation efforts such as the audit liaison function for the University, advisory services regarding WA State Ethics regulations, training provided to University personnel, and University risk mitigation committee work.
- 14% has been further allocated for internal administrative functions, including employee performance evaluations, interviews of Internal Audit candidates and manager/staff meetings.
Appendix

Risk Assessment Methodology / Development of Annual Plan

We use a two year risk assessment model to prioritize audit coverage and ensure timely reviews of high exposure areas. 2017 is the second year of the current two year cycle. The Audit Plan is a calendar year plan to align with the finalization of budget data and annual approval processes of the Board of Regents.

We began the process in year one by utilizing previous Internal Audit risk assessments as a starting point. We identified the risk categories to be considered in the risk assessment and updated the categories to acknowledge the changing profile of the University.

The following risk categories were considered in the development of our annual plan:

- **Strategic Risk**  
  Impairment to the strategic mission of the University.

- **Operational Risk**  
  Impairment of the ability to carry out the operations of the University.

- **Compliance Risk**  
  Failure to comply with laws, regulations and policies of the University.

- **Financial Risk**  
  Loss of financial resources or assets.

- **Reputational Risk**  
  Risk that public image or reputation is damaged by actions of a unit or individual connected to the University.

We reviewed risk assessment models and processes used by peer institutions and utilized their experience and knowledge of university and medical center operations to ensure our risk assessment model included factors relevant to the University of Washington and UW Medicine clinical entities.

We reviewed the top risks to the University that were identified in the UW Enterprise Risk Management 2013/2014 Annual Report to the Board of Regents, gathered information about any trends or emerging risks, significant changes in organizations, information systems complexity, prior audits/results, and obtained input from key senior management regarding high risk areas. We reviewed new and developing information being provided to the University from the President and Provost offices over the last twelve months. We then evaluated both the financial and budgetary data for all audit units identified and updated our current risk assessment model and related risk rankings identified during prior years.

In completing the 2017 Risk Assessment, we continued to link the risks identified in the Universities ERM process to our audit coverage over the last three years on page 4. Our proposed audit projects for 2017 were selected from a number of the highest ranked auditable units on page 3 and the risks included in the ERM report. The list of the proposed audit projects is included in the audit plan on page 6.
University of Washington
Internal Audit Charter

Mission - The mission of Internal Audit is to assist the Board of Regents and University management in the discharge of their oversight, management and operating responsibilities. This is achieved by providing independent assurance, consulting and education services to the University community. Our services add value by improving the control, risk management and governance processes to help the University achieve its business objectives.

Authority - Internal Audit functions under the authority of the Finance and Asset Management Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of Washington.

Internal Audit is authorized to have full, free, and unrestricted access to information including records, computer files, property, and personnel of the University. Internal Audit is free to review and evaluate all policies, procedures and practices of any University activity, program or function.

In performing the audit function, Internal Audit has no direct responsibility for, or authority over any of the activities reviewed. Therefore, the internal audit review and appraisal process does not in any way relieve other persons in the organization of the responsibilities assigned to them.

Scope - The scope of the internal audit activity encompasses:

1. Assurance Services. Assurance services are objective examinations of evidence for the purpose of providing an independent assessment. This includes assessing and reporting on the adequacy and effectiveness of the internal controls and the quality of performance in carrying out assigned responsibilities. The scope includes reviewing and evaluating:

   - Internal controls established to ensure compliance with applicable policies, plans, procedures, laws, regulations, and contracts;
   - The means with which assets are safeguarded;
   - The reliability and integrity of financial and operating information;
   - The economy, efficiency, and effectiveness with which resources are employed; and
   - IT systems to determine if they are appropriately managed, controlled, and protected.

2. Management Advisory Services. Advisory and related client service activities, the nature and scope of which are agreed with the client, are intended to add value and improve an organization’s governance, risk management, and control processes without the internal auditor assuming management responsibility. Examples include counsel, advice, facilitation, and training.
3. Investiagative Engagements. Investigations evaluate allegations of unethical business practices and/or financial and operational misconduct to determine if allegations are substantiated and to prevent future occurrences.

**Independence** - To permit the rendering of impartial and unbiased judgment essential to the proper conduct of audits, internal auditors will be independent of the activities they audit. This independence is achieved through organizational status and objectivity.

**Organizational Status:** The Executive Director of Internal Audit is responsible to the Treasurer, Board of Regents, whose scope of responsibility and authority assures that audit findings and recommendations will be afforded adequate consideration and the effectiveness of action will be reviewed at an appropriate level. The Executive Director of Internal Audit has direct access to both the President and the Board of Regents, and may take matters to them that are believed to be of sufficient magnitude and importance to require their immediate attention.

**Objectivity:** Because objectivity is essential to the audit function, an internal auditor does not develop and install procedures, prepare records, or engage in any other activity which the auditor would normally review and appraise and which could reasonably be construed to compromise the auditor’s independence. The auditor’s objectivity is not adversely affected, however, by determining or recommending standards of control to be adopted in the development of systems and procedures under review.

**Responsibility** - The internal audit staff has a responsibility to report to University management on the areas examined and to evaluate management’s plans or actions to correct reported findings. In addition, the Executive Director of Internal Audit has a responsibility to report at least annually to the Board of Regents Finance and Asset Management Committee and to inform the Board of any significant findings that have not been reasonably addressed by University management.

The Executive Director of Internal Audit will coordinate internal and independent outside audit activities to ensure adequate coverage and minimize duplication of effort.

**Standards** - The responsibility of Internal Audit is to serve the University in a manner that is consistent with the standards established by the internal audit community. At a minimum it shall comply with the relevant professional audit standards and the Institute of Internal Auditors’ (IIA) mandatory guidance including the *Definition of Internal Auditing*, the *Code of Ethics* and the *International Standards for the Professional Practice of Internal Auditing*.

Approved by Board of Regents - November 10, 2016
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Approve Amendments to Debt Management Policy

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents adopt the amended Debt Management Policy.

BACKGROUND

The University’s Debt Management Policy guides the University’s debt issuance and portfolio management activities, including the management of the Internal Lending Program (ILP). The Debt Management Policy was first adopted on September 19, 2002 and last revised on July 9, 2015. As the ILP evolves and additional programs are established, the policy requires updates and clarifications.

In addition to various housekeeping items, there are two key amendments to the Debt Management Policy:

1. Creation of a program to provide bridge funding for gift funded projects. Residing within the ILP, this program will provide short-term funding at market-based interest rates.

2. Clarification of delegated authority for various actions to go to the President or his/her designee.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Bridge Loan Program (the “Bridge”) addresses the timing gap between capital project expenditures and the receipt of gift funds and establishes parameters around how ILP reserves will be lent for gift-funded capital projects.

Below are the basic principles and terms of the Bridge:

- The Bridge will be funded from the ILP Residual Account
- The Bridge can only be used for a Board approved or Board delegated capital project with all funding sources identified
- Bridge loans will be charged market-based interest rates with a maximum term of five years
- Interest will be paid monthly
- There will be no fees for cost of issuance
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- The minimum loan size will be $2 million
- The maximum loan size:
  - Shall be no greater than the uncollected pledge amount at the date of project approval
  - Will be limited by available Residual Account sufficiency
- The borrower may be required to hold unrestricted reserves as long as the loan is outstanding
- Treasury will report program status to the Board as part of the Semi-Annual ILP Report

Since the Bridge will be funded from the Residual Account of the ILP, it is prudent to ensure program sufficiency before any loans are made. Sufficiency is calculated annually using the following guidelines:

- There is a positive cash balance in the Residual Account in the current year, and
- Residual Account balances remain positive each year for the five years after the Bridge Loan is made

Use of the Bridge will have no impact on institutional debt capacity.

The following is an example of how the Bridge would be used for a hypothetical $100 million capital project:
STANDING COMMITTEES
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Loan Program Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100 million project ($000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Construction Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of Pledges Received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pledge Summary**

| Pledge Beginning Balance | 60,000 | 30,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 |
| Pledges Used for Construction | (40,000) | (30,000) | (10,000) | - | - |
| Pledges Used for Repayment | - | - | - | (10,000) | (10,000) |
| Pledge Ending Balance | 20,000 | - | - | - | - |

**Bridge Loan Summary**

| Bridge Loan Beginning Balance | - | - | 10,000 | 20,000 | 10,000 |
| Bridge Loan Used for Construction | - | 10,000 | 10,000 | - | - |
| Repayment from Pledges | - | - | - | (10,000) | (10,000) |
| Bridge Loan Ending Balance | - | 10,000 | 20,000 | 10,000 | - |
| Interest Accrued and Paid @3% | - | 300 | 600 | 300 | - |
| Total | - | 1,200 |

**REVIEWS AND APPROVALS**

This item has been reviewed and approved by the interim Vice President for Finance and Facilities and the Associate Vice President, Treasury.

*Attachment*

UW Debt Management Policy, Statement of Objectives and Policies – Annotated Draft
University of Washington
Debt Management Policy
Statement of Objectives and Policies

Approved by the Board of Regents, September 19, 2002

Amended July 16, 2004; May 15, 2008; July 12, 2012; February 13, 2014; May 8, 2014; July 10, 2014; and July 9, 2015; and November 10, July 14, 2016

Overview

This statement of objectives and policies addresses the University's Internal Lending Program ("Program") and the active management of the institution's external debt portfolio.

The Internal Lending Program will make loans to internal borrowers at a uniform internal lending rate. These internal loans will be funded through the issuance of University General Revenue debt obligations and from University reserves.

The University's internal loan portfolio will include the outstanding loans to internal borrowers, while the institution's external debt portfolio will be comprised of the institution's outstanding short-term and long-term external debt obligations, and borrowing from University reserves. The external debt portfolio will be actively managed to reduce the institution's cost of capital and to achieve stability and predictability in the internal lending rates. Active management of the external debt portfolio will entail the use of risk-evaluated debt structures and debt management techniques to achieve the lowest risk-adjusted cost of capital consistent with market conditions and institutional credit considerations.

The management of the Internal Lending Program and the external debt portfolio will be performed in accordance with policies set forth in this document and University debt management guidelines.

The diagram below outlines the relationship between the University's internal borrowers, the Internal Lending Program, and the external debt market:
This statement of objectives and policies includes:

A. **Introduction**. Statement of overall objectives, management, and reporting.

B. **Internal Lending Program**. Description of Program scope, loan categories, internal lending rates, loan agreement, and Program fund.

C. **Debt portfolio management**. Description of external debt portfolio management objectives, institutional credit rating, core financial benchmarks, debt structure, refunding bonds, and financial derivatives.

D. **Roles and responsibilities**. Description of roles and responsibilities relating to the management of the Program and the University’s external debt portfolio.

**A. Introduction**

1. **Objectives**. The primary objectives of the Internal Lending Program and active management of the University’s external debt portfolio are to provide internal borrowers with access to funds at more stable and predictable interest rates and to reduce the institution’s risk-adjusted cost of capital.

2. **Management**. The Program and the University’s external debt portfolio will be managed by the Treasury Office under authority granted to the President by the Board of Regents.

3. **Reporting**. A report on the Program and the University’s
external debt portfolio will be presented annually to the Finance and Asset Management Committee of the Board of Regents.

B. Internal Lending Program

The Internal Lending Program will make funds available to internal borrowers at a uniform interest rate that reflects the University’s cost of capital.

1. Program scope. The Program will encompass all institutional financing needs, except as noted below. Alternative arrangements for any other financing action will require the approval of the Board of Regents.

Financing actions exempted from participation in the Internal Lending Program:

a. Debt repaid from appropriated University local funds (e.g., debt supported by Metro Tract revenue)

b. Debt issued by an external entity on behalf of the University (e.g., 63-20, public-private, conduit financings)

c. Financings consisting solely of personal property

d. Credit lines

2. Loan Types. Loan types for internal borrowing will include:

a. Large capital expenditures (above $15 million and above). The approval of the Board of Regents will be required for capital expenditure loans exceeding of $15 million and above. The maximum term of these loans will be 30 years after facility opening (or the estimated useful life of the facilities).

b. Small capital expenditures (less than $15 million). The approval of the President or his or her designee will be required for capital expenditure loans up to $15 million. The maximum term of these loans will be 15 years after facility opening (or the estimated useful life of the facilities).

c. Operating loans. Short-term working capital loans up to $25 million and with a maximum term of two years will be available. Operating loans up to $15 million will require the approval of the Treasurer of the Board of Regents. Operating

Conforms dollar thresholds to BOR Standing Order regarding Delegation of Authority; clarifies commencement date of ILP loan terms.

Delegates to President or his or her designee for
loans exceeding $15 million and above will require the approval of the Board of Regents. An additional 200 basis points (2.0 percent) above the prevailing internal lending rate will be charged on outstanding balances and a commitment fee of 10 basis points (0.10 percent) will be charged on any unused balance. The aggregate total of operating loan commitments will not exceed 30 percent of the University’s commercial paper line of credit without the approval of the Treasurer of the Board of Regents.

President or his or her designee.

c-d. Bridge financing. The approval of the Board of Regents will be required for loans to bridge gift-funded capital projects with a project amount of $15 million and above. The approval of the President or his or her designee will be required for loans to bridge gift-funded capital projects with a project amount less than $15 million. Bridge loans may be made in an amount less than or equal to uncollected pledges on the date of approval of the project. The maximum term of these loans will be five years.

3. Internal lending rates. An internal lending rate will be uniformly applied to all loans for large and small capital expenditures under 2.a. and 2.b. above approved after Program implementation (the “standard internal lending rate”). The internal lending rate for all bridge financing will be a market-based rate (the “bridge internal lending rate”). The standard internal lending rate will reflect the external debt portfolio’s weighted average interest rate and will include funding for Program operating costs and a rate stabilization account.

a. Rate adjustment. The standard internal lending rate will be reviewed annually and will be subject to adjustment by the Board of Regents. Any adjustment will comply with Program fund policies described in this document. Any preliminary indication of a rate increase will be announced to Program participants twelve months in advance of the effective date of the increase. Any formal proposal for a final rate adjustment will be announced to Program participants six months in advance of the effective date of the adjustment and updated internal repayment schedules reflecting the new rate will be distributed to Program participants within 45 days of this announcement.

b. Application. Adjustments to the standard internal lending rate will apply to all applicable Program debt, including outstanding debt obligations incurred prior to
Program implementation.

4. Program fund policies. Payments to the Internal Lending Program will be made monthly and held in a Program fund. External debt service payments will be made from the Program fund and all interest earnings will be retained in the Program fund. The Program fund will be managed according to the policies set forth below. Exceptions to these policies will require the approval of the Board of Regents.

a. Operating level. The Program fund will be maintained at a level that enables the University to meet its Program obligations, including Program operating costs, debt portfolio management expenses, principal and interest on external debt, and a rate stabilization account maintained as described below. An accounting of Program fund activities will be included in the Debt Management report to the Board of Regents.

b. Rate stabilization account (RSA). The rate stabilization account will be managed to preserve the stability of the internal lending rate after considering forecasted external borrowing, changes in financial market conditions, and Program operating requirements.

c. Program operating expenses. Program operating expenses, including the costs of staffing, facilities, equipment, supplies, and fees, will be paid from the Program fund.

d. Loans funded from reserves. Program reserves may be used to fund internal loans. Bridge financing is subject to the availability of short-term funds, and will be limited by current and projected balances after consideration of other reserve requirements.

e. Debt portfolio management expenses. Expenses associated with actively managing the University’s external debt portfolio, including the costs of debt issuance, loan restructuring, and financial derivative transactions, will be paid from the Program fund.

f. Other University purposes. Withdrawals from the Program fund for University purposes other than those described in this section, will require the approval of the Board of Regents. A list of Program fund withdrawals will be included in the annual Program report to the Board of Regents.

Notes that bridge financing is subject to availability of short-term funds.
5. Internal Borrower Responsibilities.

   a. Agreement. Borrowers will be required to enter into an internal financing agreement for all loans describing the loan structure and repayment terms.

   b. Reporting. Annual reviews and/or audits of financial condition and performance will be provided by the borrower.

   c. Loan covenants. Loan covenants may include specific operating benchmarks to be achieved and/or maintained by the borrower during the term of the loan, which could include cash reserve targets and/or debt coverage, among others. Failure to comply with loan covenants will require the following actions by the borrower:

      i. Borrower must present a mitigation plan for approval by the Board during the October Board meeting (unless otherwise determined); and
      ii. Periodic reviews will be conducted to measure progress and compliance with mitigation plan.

C. Debt Portfolio Management

The University’s external debt portfolio will be actively managed to maintain the stability of the standard internal lending rate and to minimize the University’s risk-adjusted cost of capital over the long term. The University will use short-term and long-term fixed and variable interest rate debt obligations, bond refundings, and financial derivatives to achieve this goal within the following guidelines:

1. Objective. The objective of actively managing the University’s external debt portfolio will be to achieve the lowest risk-adjusted cost of capital consistent with market conditions and credit rating parameters set forth below. Active management decisions will take into consideration relevant risks and terms that include, but are not limited to, market conditions, bond refunding savings, call options, variable interest rate bond remarketing and auction expenses, and liquidity, tax, and counterparty risks.

2. Portfolio credit standard. The University will manage its external debt portfolio to maintain a minimum “A” category credit rating on its General Revenue obligations as

   Standard ILP rate managed for stability; bridge financing rate is market-based.
evaluated by Moody's Investors Service and Standard & Poor's rating agencies.

3. **Debt structure.** The University may issue fixed-rate, variable-rate (up to 20 percent of the external debt portfolio), non-amortizing, and other forms of short-term and long-term debt to achieve its external debt portfolio management objectives.

4. **Refunding bonds.** The University may issue current and advance refunding bonds to lower or maintain the University's cost of capital over time. Refunding bonds will be issued to capture economic benefit and to restructure the debt portfolio in order to achieve longer-term strategic objectives.

5. **Financial derivatives.** The University may enter into financial derivative transactions to manage the institution's exposure to interest rate risk, reduce all-in borrowing costs of the external debt portfolio, and/or to manage other risks of the external debt portfolio that could adversely affect the standard internal lending rate or the Internal Lending Program. The University will enter into financial derivative transactions following guidelines in the University's Interest Rate Swap Policy. The University will not enter into financial derivative transactions for speculative purposes.

6. **Private Use.** At least every five years, the University will identify any changes in, or other factors relating to, facility occupancy or facility/equipment use that could affect the tax-related status of University debt.

7. **Core financial ratios.** The University will use the following core financial ratios as performance benchmarks to evaluate institutional debt capacity as compared to a public higher education peer group. These ratios will be calculated and reported annually.

   a. **Expendable resources-to-debt.** This balance sheet ratio measures the availability of unrestricted funds to cover all outstanding debt.

   \[
   \text{Expendable Financial Resources}^* \over \text{Direct University Debt}
   \]

   b. **Debt service-to-operations.** This statement-of-activities ratio measures the level of debt service on all outstanding debt as a percentage of overall operating expenses. (For non-amortizing bonds, principal will be
assumed to be repaid in equal annual amounts).

\[
\frac{\text{Peak Annual Debt Service}^*}{\text{Total Operating Expenses}}
\]

(*As defined by Moody's Investors Service)

c. Debt service coverage. This statement-of-activities ratio measures actual margin of protection for annual debt service payments from annual operations.

Annual operating surplus (deficit) plus interest and depreciation expenses plus additional, unusually large non-cash expenses, divided by actual principal and interest payments.

\[
\frac{\text{Adjusted Annual Operating Surplus}}{\text{Annual Debt Service}}
\]

D. Roles and Responsibilities

1. Board of Regents
   a. Approves policies that guide the operation of the Internal Lending Program and the management of the University's external debt portfolio

   b. Approves the annual bond resolution for the issuance of external debt and internal borrowing, delegating to the President and his or her designee authority to approve external debt up to the maximum amount and within other parameters set forth in the resolution

   c. Approves financing plans for loans above of $15 million and above; approves bridge financing loans for projects of $15 million and above

   d. Delegates to the President or his or her designee the authority to enter into agreements to complete debt financing transactions up to $15 million or the amount approved by the Board of Regents

   e. Approves exemptions of eligible financing transactions from participation in the Internal Lending Program

   f. Approves the adjustment of the standard internal lending rate

   g. Approves exceptions to Program fund policies

Clarifies that annual bond resolution delegates external debt issuance to President or designee within parameters.

Conforms to dollar threshold in BOR Standing Order (regarding Delegation of Authorities) unless specifically approved by the Board of Regents.

Standard ILP rate is fixed from time to time; bridge financing rate is market-based.
h. Approves withdrawals from the Program fund for University purposes other than those described in Sections B.4.c, B.4.d and B.4.e above

i. Approves increases in the size of the commercial paper program

2. Finance and Asset Management Committee

a. Recommends proposed financing actions to the Board of Regents

b. Receives annual reports on the Internal Lending Program and the University’s external debt portfolio

3. President

a. Delegates authority to enter into agreements to complete debt financing transactions

b. Delegates authority to approve loans up to $15 million, lines of credit up to $15 million or the amount approved by the Board of Regents, and bridge financing loans for projects up to $15 million

4. Treasurer of the Board of Regents

a. Reviews all financing actions

Approves loans up to $15 million (as delegated)

b. Approves aggregate operating loan commitments that exceed 30 percent of the University’s commercial paper line of credit

c. Approves the selection of bond counsel, financial advisor, and other financial services providers

5. Senior Associate Treasurer

a. Oversees the day-to-day activities of the University’s Internal Lending Program and external debt portfolio

b. Consults with the Attorney General’s Office in the selection of bond counsel

Conforms delegation to dollar thresholds for each type of loan.

Further delegations are addressed by Administrative Order, Presidential Order or other designation by the President.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Capital and Debt Update

INFORMATION ITEM

This item is being presented for information only.

BACKGROUND

This is a standing agenda item.

Notable highlights and changes compared to last month include:

- The Harborview Hall lease was eliminated from the One Capital Plan
- The Active Capital Projects Summary is in a new format
- The Semi-Annual Lending Program Report is included this month. This report typically comes with the Semi-Annual borrowers report (presented October 2016), but was inadvertently excluded last month.

Attachments
1. One Capital Plan (2017-2023)
2. Active Capital Projects Summary (as of September 30, 2016)
3. Capital Project Approval Process
5. Semi-Annual ILP Report, As of 6/30/16
# One Capital Plan (2017-2023)

## Funding in $ Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Wide Planning Targets:</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STUDENT EXPERIENCE

**Improving the Learning Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Classroom Improvements (6 year plan)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Population Health Education Facility (T-Wing addition)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 T-Wing Renovation Phase 2 (pre-design)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 UW Library Storage / Repurpose on-campus space</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Schmitz Hall Improvements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Evans School - Parrington Hall Remodel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Foster School of Business - MacKenzie Hall Replacement</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Miller Hall Renovation (predesign / design)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Anderson Hall Renovation (design)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accommodating Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Computer Science &amp; Engineering Building 2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 College of Engineering - Interdisciplinary Education and Research</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 UW Bothell Phase 4 - Academic STEM Building</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 UW Bothell Campus Development - Add'l. Academic Space</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 UW Tacoma Phase 4 - Academic Building</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 UW Tacoma Campus Development - Add'l. Academic Space</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Providing Quality Student Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Student Housing - North Campus Phase 4b</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>355,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 UW Bothell Housing - Student Housing &amp; Dining</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 UW Tacoma - Student Housing - Court 17 Acquisition</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 UW Tacoma Housing - Private Development</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INNOVATION MINDSET

**Leveraging Interdisciplinary Strengths**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Population Health Sciences Building</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 UW Medicine - South Lake Union Phase 3.3</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>262,000</td>
<td>262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 UW Medicine - Harborview Hall Lease</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 College of Arts &amp; Sciences - Kincaid Hall Backfill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Developing an Innovation District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 Center for Advanced Materials and Clean Energy Technologies</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>172,000</td>
<td>172,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Industry District Partnership Lab Development</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC AS A PHILOSOPHY

**Sharing with the Community**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Burke Museum</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Intellectual House Phase 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>8,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Burke Gilman Trail Improvements - Phase 3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Improving the Public Realm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 West Campus Park</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Waterfront Improvements in South Campus &amp; the Cut</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 UW Tacoma - Soil Remediation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funding in $ Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Budget</th>
<th>Previous</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 UW Tacoma - Soil Remediation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**subtotal:** $912

**subtotal:** $910

**subtotal:** $145
# One Capital Plan (2017-2023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Project Funding</th>
<th>Previous State Debt</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>O&amp;M</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total GSF</td>
<td>New GSF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMING ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidating to Make Room for Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 University District Development at Sound Transit</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 UW Medicine - South Lake Union Rosen Remodel</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>60,375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 UW Seattle - Parking garage(s) - Add'l. 500 Spaces</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 UW Bothell - Parking Garage</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing Critical Renewal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 UW Medicine IT Core Applications and Infrastructure</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Enterprise Information Systems (financial system)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 UW Medicine - Core Research Facilities</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Seismic Improvements (6-year plan)</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Fuel Switching / Power Plant Upgrade</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Minor Capital Repair</td>
<td>$208</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 UW Seattle - Parking lot improvements (6-year plan)</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$824</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,791</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,636,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,185,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>$108</strong></td>
<td><strong>$338</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,425</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$100</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Item numbers do not represent priorities.
## Active Capital Projects Summary

(As of September 30, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Financial Details</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Business Equity</th>
<th>Project Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>Over/Under</td>
<td>Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Research and Care Facility</td>
<td>ZGF/Skanska</td>
<td>$123.5</td>
<td>$137.6</td>
<td>$14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Engineering Exp.</td>
<td>LMN Architects/Mortensen</td>
<td>$105.5</td>
<td>$110.2</td>
<td>$4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluke Hall Renovation</td>
<td>HDR/Hoffman</td>
<td>$37.0</td>
<td>$36.6</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIX Tenant Improvements</td>
<td>Wright Rumstad</td>
<td>$19.6</td>
<td>$23.4</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences Building</td>
<td>Perkins &amp; Skanska</td>
<td>$164.8</td>
<td>$162.7</td>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nano Engineering and Sciences Building</td>
<td>ZGF/Hoffman</td>
<td>$87.4</td>
<td>$85.4</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Burke Museum</td>
<td>Olsen Kundig/Skanska</td>
<td>$79.0</td>
<td>$78.7</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Housing Phase 4a</td>
<td>Kieran Timberlake/W.G. Clark</td>
<td>$240.0</td>
<td>$242.3</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Campus Housing Phase 4b</td>
<td>Kieran Timberlake/W.G. Clark</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.4</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine South Lake Union 3.2</td>
<td>Vulcan/Perkins &amp; Will/Lease Crutcher Lewis</td>
<td>$143.0</td>
<td>$151.3</td>
<td>$8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma Urban Solutions Center</td>
<td>Miller Hull/Mortensen</td>
<td>$28.0</td>
<td>$28.0</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medical Center Expansion Phase II</td>
<td>NBBJ/Mortenson</td>
<td>$186.3</td>
<td>$198.0</td>
<td>$11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus Utility Plant</td>
<td>Miller Hull/Mortensen</td>
<td>$44.2</td>
<td>$44.2</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Payroll Modernization</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75.9</td>
<td>$75.9</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,344.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,384.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 40.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,182.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

Green = on track; Yellow = recovery plan in place; Red = unrecoverable

Arrows represent change from last month: Arrow up = positive; Arrow down = negative; Circles = no change

* = Forecasts have been modified since last report
n/a = data not available at this time

**Notes:**

The Animal Research and Care project is over budget and additional funding will be needed to complete the project. UW Medical Center Expansion Phase II is also over budget and adjustments in scope and funding will be needed to complete the project.
This document is intended to explain the process by which the University and Board of Regents authorizes the physical development of the university.

Process goals:
- Ensure controls are in place → establish and standardize processes
- Ensure capital plan is in place → establish and update One Capital Plan
- Manage & implement the plan → prioritize projects and identify funding or financing → establish project budget and manage to the plan

### Institutional Strategy & Project Prioritization
- Identify projects
- Categorize projects
- Prioritize projects
- Develop overall funding strategies

### Stage 1 Approval
- Board of Regents – Information
  - Institutional objective
  - Business case
  - Estimated budget and financing strategy
  - Benchmarks & Metrics
  - Estimated schedule
- Board of Regents – Actions
  - Approve site selection
  - Approve architect
  - Approve contractor
  - Approve pre-construction budget

### Stage 2 Approval
- Board of Regents – Information
  - Schematic design
  - Project Budget
  - Financing plan
  - Benchmarks & Metrics
  - Schedule
  - Naming plan
- Board of Regents – Actions
  - Approve financing plan
  - Approve project budget
  - Approve naming plan

### Stage 3
- Board of Regents – Reporting
  - Project status
  - Budget vs. forecast
  - Schedule vs. forecast
  - Business equity rates
Recent Events

- Long-term interest rates remain low, with the current 30 year weighted average fixed borrowing cost estimated to be 3.58%\(^{(1)}\)
- Short term interest rates continue to rise. The University repriced commercial paper on October 6th and 12th at 0.93% and 0.80% respectively
- The University priced bonds on October 18th at an all-in rate of 3.40%. The bonds consisted of $200 million of proceeds for capital projects (including refunding $45 million of commercial paper) and $38.2 million to refund the 2008 GRBs producing average annual debt service savings of $310,000. This change will be reflected in the January Monthly Debt Report

Estimated Project Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2016-2021 (in millions)</th>
<th>As of 9/30/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Debt Capacity</td>
<td>$755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Remaining CAP(^{(2)})</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Authorized Projects(^{(3)})</td>
<td>(430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Capacity</td>
<td>$425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Projects authorized this year(^{(4)})</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Project Capacity</td>
<td>$405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A project capacity update was presented at the May 2016 Regents meeting based on 2015 audited financial statements and projections
- Figures represent the estimated amount of additional debt the University can issue over the next five years while aligning with peer minimum ratios
- $405 million of project capacity is available of which $305 million can come from debt

External Debt Portfolio - $2,266 Million

- The University has $2,266 million of external debt outstanding. This is approximately $67 million lower than the previous report (6/30/2016) due to $33 million of principal payments, $45 million of new debt through commercial paper, and the exclusion of approximately $78 Million of Valley Medical Center debt
- Weighted average cost of capital: 3.41%
- Portfolio Composition: 96% fixed rate; 4% variable rate
- $142 million in internal funding provided by the CAP is excluded from the external debt portfolio

Annual Debt Service\(^{(5)}\)

- Figure represents the estimated amount of additional debt the University can issue over the next five years while aligning with peer minimum ratios
- $405 million of project capacity is available of which $305 million can come from debt

---

\(^{(1)}\) 80/20 weighting between the tax-exempt and taxable 30 year long term interest rates to accurately reflect the University's portfolio

\(^{(2)}\) 10% of the Invested Funds (IF), less previously allocated Capital Assets Pool (CAP) dollars

\(^{(3)}\) Projects approved before the May debt capacity analysis, including Life Sciences, Housing Phase 4a and other authorized projects

\(^{(4)}\) Includes Court 1\(^{7}\)

\(^{(5)}\) Excludes Valley Limited Tax General Obligation Bonds and Revenue Bonds

\(^{(6)}\) Excludes principal payments on Commercial Paper
### Outstanding External Debt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Final Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Engineering Building</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempsey Hall</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>2041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foege Building</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell Phase 3</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William H. Gates Law School</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAALAC</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>2035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Hall</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Research and Care Facilities</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny Hall</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Sciences</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics-Astronomy</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Instruction and Research</td>
<td>Instruction and Research</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Instruction and Research</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>361.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake Union (Ph I, II, 3.1, &amp; 3.2)</td>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>395.8</td>
<td>2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWMC Expansion</td>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>201.0</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Hospital</td>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWMC Surgery Pavilion</td>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UW Medicine</td>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal UW Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>740.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Expansion</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>392.4</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husky Union Building</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMA Building</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford Court Apartments</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>2032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordheim Court</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>2033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell Student Center</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Cultural Center</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>2043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma YMCA</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Student Life</td>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Student Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>654.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tower</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>106.6</td>
<td>2037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb Building</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Payroll Modernization</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4225 Roosevelt</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4545 Building</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Campus Utility Plant</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Support</td>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Academic Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>247.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husky Stadium</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>228.5</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husky Ballpark</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Athletics</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Athletics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>246.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Proceeds</td>
<td>Unallocated</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total University Outstanding Debt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,265.6</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Will not exactly match ILP balances due to bond premiums and use of the CAP
Semi-Annual ILP Report
As of 6/30/16

**ILP Committed Capital Reserves**<sup>(1)</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Loan Balance</th>
<th>In Compliance as of 6/30/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Food Services</td>
<td>$547</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics&lt;sup&gt;(1)(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total at 6/30/16 **$1,774**<sup>(3)</sup>

---

**Capital Assets Pool (CAP)**

CAP may be used for University capital projects with amortizations up to thirty years. The CAP target allocation is 10% of the Invested Funds Pool, with a range of 0-15% to allow for market fluctuations. CAP funds are borrowed through the ILP.

- Invested Funds Pool Balance: **$2,345**
- Target Allocation (10%): **$235**
- Utilized to Date (33%)<sup>(1)</sup>: **($123)**
- Allocation Remaining: **$112**

---

**ILP Borrowers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Loan Balance</th>
<th>In Compliance as of 6/30/15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Food Services</td>
<td>$547</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Medicine</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>$359</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate Athletics&lt;sup&gt;(1)(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Life</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Services</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dentistry&lt;sup&gt;(2)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total at 6/30/16 **$1,774**<sup>(3)</sup>

---

**ILP Projected Funding Needs**

- **FY17**: $200
- **FY18**: $210
- **FY19**: $16

Based on projects approved by Board of Regents as of 6/30/16. Total project funding needs total $426M. $200M of this debt will be issued in November 2016.

---

(1) Preliminary unaudited financial reports show ICA in compliance as of 6/30/16

(2) Financial Stability Plans for the School of Dentistry and Intercollegiate Athletics were approved by the Board at the April and June meetings

(3) Only reflective of outstanding debt within the ILP
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Funding Guideline for Capital Projects with Donor Funding

INFORMATION

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

After the economic crisis in 2008, many universities adopted funding guidelines for capital projects with donor funding in order to minimize their exposure and risk. After assessing the guidelines of many UW peers, Capital Planning & Development, Advancement, and Treasury have worked together to create a similar guideline for capital projects with donor funds at the UW.

It is the intent of the administration to use this guideline to frame and assess the financial plan for individual capital projects with donor funding as they come to the board for approval. In cases where projects do not meet the guideline, an additional risk assessment will be performed and mitigation proposal will be developed for Stage 2 approval of the project.

A detailed overview of the proposal and comparable policies at peer institutions is included in the attachment.

Attachment
Funding Guideline for Capital Projects with Donor Funding
Funding Guideline for Capital Projects with Donor Funding

Background

After the economic crisis in 2008, many universities adopted guidelines around donor funding for capital projects in order to minimize their exposure. The cumulative effect of having to backstop anticipated donor funding on several projects as endowment values plummeted – as happened in 2008 - resulted in significant issues at several universities. After assessing the guidelines of many of our peers, Capital Planning & Development, Advancement, and Treasury have worked together to create the following guideline for gift funding in capital projects at the UW.

Before a capital project with a gift funding component is brought to the Board for final budget approval, 100% of the pledges should be in place, the pledges should be expected within five years of Board approval, and the cash flow of the project must be analyzed against the cash flow of the gifts.

100% of Pledges

Most capital projects utilize a combination of funding sources. This guideline is simply meant to make sure a firm funding plan is in place before proceeding into construction – one that is not reliant on future fundraising. If the valid pledges in place at the time of Board approval are less than originally envisioned, the project can still meet this guideline by identifying other sources of funding such as ILP or cash reserves that essentially serve as a backstop.

Pledges within 5 years

UW’s donors, particular those supporting capital projects, are extremely reliable and nearly all of valid pledge commitments to buildings have been met - a fulfillment rate of more than 95%. However, to manage the timing of gifts for capital project, all pledges should convert to cash within five years of project approval. This loosely associates the timing of the gifts with the construction draws. The Bridge Program, managed by the Treasury Office, can assure that the project can be fully funded during construction by offering a short term loan to manage project funding/gift realization timing differences.

Alignment of Cash and Gift Flows

In order to assure that the gift fund flows align with the project draws and to manage use of the Bridge Program, Advancement will work with donors to match the timing of gifts to project needs to the best extent possible. Any timing differences in funding will be made from the Bridge program. This analysis will be done on a project by project basis and be an aspect of Regents project approval.
### Peer Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Policy/Guideline</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Before approval, 100% pledges / 50% cash in hand. Bridge loan options for outstanding pledges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Before construction, 100% irrevocable pledges in-hand. Considering charging schools and colleges interest on outstanding pledges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Before construction, the sponsoring unit(s) must have 70% of pledges + cash in hand. Of that, 20% must be in cash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Before approval for fully gift funded projects, 100% of the pledges identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Before construction, 100% of funding must be identified and legally binding pledges must mature in five years or less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Before construction, 100% of funding must be identified. If gift funding, 100% of the gifts identified or an appropriate backstop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Before construction, 75% of pledges in hand. Goal is to fund new construction with 75% gift funding, renovations with 50% gift funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Before construction, 100% of the pledges in hand and 50% of the cash. Campuses may take on short term debt during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>Guideline</td>
<td>Before construction, 100% of gifts are identified. Schools and Colleges must demonstrate ability to backstop gift funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Before design, 50% total funding committed. Before construction, 100% funding committed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Computer Science & Engineering Expansion (CSE II)

INFORMATION

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

An update will be provided on the project status and on the fundraising relative to funds needed to start construction as scheduled in January 2017.

FUTURE ACTIONS

January 2017: Stage 2 Approval
   Project Budget
   Financing Plan

Attachments
1. Computer Science & Engineering Expansion (CSE II) Project Summary
2. Computer Science & Engineering Expansion (CSE II) Building Renderings
3. Computer Science & Engineering Expansion (CSE II) Funding Strategy
Computer Science & Engineering Expansion (CSE II)

Regent Actions

- Delegate authority to award design contract to LMN Architects
- Approve alternative public works contracting (GC/CM)
- Delegate authority to select the GC/CM and award preconstruction contract
- Approve site (Development Site 16c)
- Approve preferred development alternative and mitigation effort
- Approve budget, financing plan, and naming plan
- Delegate authority to award construction contract

Objective

To provide collaborative research and teaching space to meet increasing demand for growth in the Computer Science and Engineering program for the next ten years and enable the program to remain competitive.

Description

Design and construct an approximately 135,000 gross square foot building to provide space for an additional 30 full-time faculty, associated postdocs, graduate students and researchers. The facility will have an undergraduate focus and foster interdisciplinary research and collaboration. The program includes 16 labs, a lecture hall, two classrooms, 3 seminar rooms, an event space, communal and study spaces, office and support spaces, and is planned for LEED Silver.

Financials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Services</th>
<th>$9,503,368</th>
<th>9%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$77,430,674</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF&amp;E &amp; Other Cost</td>
<td>$12,020,943</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$3,318,737</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>$3,226,278</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Financing</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Costs</strong></td>
<td>$105,605,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Funds</th>
<th>$17,500,000</th>
<th>17%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW Building Fund</td>
<td>$15,000,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Central Funds</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Dept. Funds</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Funding</td>
<td>$45,300,000</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Cash Reserves (backstop)</td>
<td>$18,700,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding plan as of Nov. 1 - see attached financing strategy

Costs escalated to 2017 (project costs)
Cornell University, William and Melinda Gates Hall ($887/NSF)
University of Texas Austin, Bill & Melinda Gates Computer Science Complex ($1,048/NSF)
Carnegie Mellon, Gates Center for Computer Science ($608/NSF)
University of Washington, Paul G. Allen Center for Computer Science and Engineering ($713/NSF)

Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Assignable SF</td>
<td>77,366</td>
<td>77,006</td>
<td>Construction Cost/NSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross SF</td>
<td>135,401</td>
<td>133,820</td>
<td>Project Cost / GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency (NASF/NSF)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>Operating Cost / GSF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metrics & Indicators

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qtr 3</td>
<td>Qtr 4</td>
<td>Qtr 1</td>
<td>Qtr 2</td>
<td>Qtr 3</td>
<td>Qtr 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding plan as of Nov. 1 - see attached financing strategy

**Net Assignable SF:**
77,366
77,006

**Gross SF:**
135,401
133,820

**Efficiency (NASF/NSF):**
57%
58%

**Construction Cost/NSF:**
$572
$579

**Project Cost / GSF:**
$779
$788

**Operating Cost / GSF:**
$12.22
-
Funding Strategy

Computer Science is the #1 first-choice major of confirmed incoming UW freshmen, and has a bachelors-level workforce gap in our state that is greater than all other fields combined. CSE2 will provide space for UW’s highly-ranked Department of Computer Science & Engineering to double its degree production. The goal is to break ground on this high priority project early in 2017 and complete construction in 2019. Total project budget is $105.5M. Of this, $32.5M was appropriated by the state and $9M comes from UW sources, leaving $64M to be raised privately.

Private fundraising was impeded by the fact that the availability of the site was not confirmed until July 2016. Since that time, progress has been rapid. Microsoft President Brad Smith leads the 14-person CSE Campaign Committee, working closely with CSE professor Ed Lazowska. Of the $64M to be raised privately, we currently have $45.3M pledged leaving $18.7M to be raised.

Although confidence is high that the full $64M will be raised, in order to minimize risk to the UW, we are assessing the financial viability of the project against the funding guideline for capital projects. In this case, we would test the conservative assumption that no more fundraising will be done. This would require a commitment of a combination of central university and CSE cash reserves to fill in the remaining $18.7M. The chart below illustrates the difference between the planned funding for the project, and the more conservative approach according to the funding guideline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Funds</th>
<th>Expected Plan</th>
<th>Funding Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Equity Contribution</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Building Account Appropriation</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Equity (1)</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts (2)</td>
<td>64,000,000</td>
<td>45,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE/Central Reserves (if necessary)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105,500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 105,500,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Includes $4 million from Provost, $3 million from CSE, $2 million from College of Engineering
(2) Reflects gifts committed as of 11/1/2016
Many of the donors for this project are particularly “credit worthy”, making the commitments themselves less risky. In addition, the projected use of funds as shown in the cash flow diagram below means any potential “gap” funding will not be required for approximately 18 months, allowing additional time to fundraise:
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Population Health Facility - Stage 1 Approve Alternate Public Works Contracting, Delegated Authority to Award Design/Build Contract, and Pre-Construction Budget

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the administration and the Finance and Asset Management Committee that the Board of Regents:

1) Approve Alternative Public Works Contracting (design/build)
2) Delegate authority to award design/build contract
3) Approve pre-construction budget of $10 million

BACKGROUND

Detailed project information is included in the attachment.

FUTURE ACTIONS

April 2017: Stage 1 Approval
Site Selection

November 2017: Stage 2 Approval
Full Project Budget
Financing Plan
Naming Plan

Attachment
Population Health Facility Stage 1 Project Summary
Population Health Facility Stage 1

Regent Actions

- Approve alternative public works contracting (design/build)
- Delegate authority to award design/build contract
- Approve pre-construction budget of $10M
- Approve final site selection
- Approve project budget
- Approve financing plan
- Approve naming plan

Objectives

1. Serve as a physical hub and catalyst for Population Health endeavors across all three UW campuses, the region, and the world.
2. Be an idea laboratory and collaboration incubator for students, faculty, staff, and visitors from a wide range of population health disciplines.
3. House the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME), the Department of Global Health (DGH), and selected portions of the School of Public Health (SPH).

Description

The new facility will create space for on-going collaborative interactions between IHME, DGH, and selected portions of SPH, and with students and faculty from across the university. The goal is to create interdisciplinary innovation in Population Health and the investigation of the biomedical, social behavioral, cultural, environmental, and physical factors affecting the health of populations across the globe. The estimated size of the facility is 300,000 SF. We anticipate the program to include offices, rooms for collaborative group work, active learning environments, technology rich spaces to accommodate data visualization and on-line interactive global teaching and training. Other possibilities include retail space to complement the program. Research wet laboratories are not part of the scope.

Financials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td>ILP Debt Funds $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 12,103,084</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>Donor Funds $ 210,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 163,583,540</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF&amp;E &amp; Other Costs</td>
<td>Equity Contribution $ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 9,809,200</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
<td>State Funds $ 20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 15,230,254</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>Other Funds $ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 6,564,530</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalation</td>
<td>Total Funds $ 230,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 22,709,392</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost $ 230,000,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Donor funds to be disbursed annually per agreed upon schedule

Benchmarks

- University of Washington Mackenzie Hall Study: $475/SF Construction & $689/SF Project
- Stanford Benchmark Average: $583/SF Construction & $788/SF Project
- Commercial Office Benchmark (data from 6 construction firms for class A office space in SLU): $350-450/SF Construction & $500-$643/SF Project

Metrics & Indicators

- Net Assignable SF 180,000
- Gross SF 300,000
- Efficiency (NASF/GSF) 60%

Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qtr1</td>
<td>Qtr2</td>
<td>Qtr3</td>
<td>Qtr4</td>
<td>Qtr1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Team Development</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Move In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENT
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Business Equity Scorecard Project Update

INFORMATION ITEM

This item is being presented for information only.

BACKGROUND

In conjunction with a Regent workgroup, the University’s Business Diversity Program, Capital Planning & Development and Procurement Services is in the process of developing a Business Equity Scorecard to report and reflect activities associated with business diversity. This work follows and is consistent with the adoption of the Regent Statement of Business Equity, Policy 16.

One key barrier to Business Equity Scorecard development was the availability and reliability of realistic and meaningful data to inform appropriate scorecard metrics and goals. As such, the first goal of the workgroup was to create a scalable, automated process to increase the accuracy of supplier data and purchasing spend reports.

Since the workgroup originally convened, significant progress has been made on this goal. The purpose of this item is to provide the Board with a brief update of progress to date and next steps in scorecard development.

Attachment

Business Equity Spend, Fiscal Year 2016
## BUSINESS EQUITY SPEND

### FISCAL YEAR 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payment Method</th>
<th>Total Spend</th>
<th>Available Spend</th>
<th>Federally Classified Small Business Spend*</th>
<th>% of Available Spend</th>
<th>State OMWBE Certified Diversity Spend**</th>
<th>% of Available Spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchasing and Accounting System (PAS)</td>
<td>$1,446,394,953.82</td>
<td>$1,278,088,125.52</td>
<td>$420,610,661.75</td>
<td>32.91%</td>
<td>$23,332,269.94</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCARD Credit card issued to individual departments. Used primarily for small dollar purchases up to $3500</td>
<td>$130,362,835.19</td>
<td>$118,334,941.43</td>
<td>$4,687,637.86</td>
<td>3.96%</td>
<td>$5,184,127.88</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel PROCARD-CTA</td>
<td>$21,339,858.67</td>
<td>$2,004,052.23</td>
<td>$133,445.92</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>$42,893.20</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,598,097,647.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,398,427,119.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>$425,431,745.53</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,559,291.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.04%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Spend** = All University direct spend based on payments made during the reporting period.

**Available Spend** = Some exclusions have been taken from the total spend to create this available spend category. Current exclusions include, but are not limited to: Utilities, Payments to Universities and Colleges, Other State Agencies, Non-profits, Travel Reimbursements Paid to Employees.

**Federal Small Business/Diversity Spend & OMWBE Certified Diversity Spend** does not include 2nd tier spend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Federally Classified Small Business Spend</th>
<th>Businesses meeting Small Business (SBA) definition of a small business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State OMWBE Spend</strong></td>
<td>Businesses certified by the State Office of Minority and Women Business Enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Approval of UW Housestaff Association Collective Bargaining Agreement – UW Ratification

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

It is the recommendation of the Administration that the Board of Regents approve the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Washington (“UW”) and UW Housestaff Association (“UWHA”) that covers approximately 1,400 residents and fellows in the UW School of Medicine and School of Dentistry (collectively referenced below as “Residents”). The duration of this Agreement is from November 1, 2016 through June 30, 2019.

BACKGROUND:

This is the first collective bargaining agreement for this bargaining unit negotiated pursuant to RCW 41.56. The new contract was ratified by the union by a vote of 857-3 on October 28th, 2016. Per Standing Orders, the Board must approve an initial collective bargaining agreement with representatives of a newly certified bargaining unit.

Following is a summary of the critical elements of the Agreement:

Efficiencies:

- The parties agreed to a management rights clause delineating the broad range of clinical, educational, and operational rights and responsibilities vested in the UW.

- The parties agreed to language promoting increased consistency across programs to better enable internal and external moonlighting.

- Stipends will be supplemented during required research years to maintain pay levels matching Residents’ post-graduate year level on the GME Stipend Schedule, increasing consistency and equity across programs.

- Numerous enhancements to stipends and fringe benefits help maintain UW’s competitiveness among programs nationally.
Compensation (Stipends):

November 1, 2016
- Recalibration and adjustment of the Resident stipend schedule to average a 3 percent across-the-board stipend increase.

July 1, 2017
- 3 percent across-the-board stipend increase.

July 1, 2018
- 3 percent across-the-board stipend increase.

Other Benefits with Financial Implications:

Ratification Lump Sum Payment

November 1, 2016
- UW will provide Residents with a one-time lump sum payment:
  - $455 for Residents in R-years R1-R5.
  - $715 for Residents in R-years R6-R7.
  - $1,430 for Residents in R-year R8 or qualifying Residents who progressed at least one research training year.

Professional Development and Licenses

Each Year of the Agreement
- UW will allocate $350 per year per Resident for professional development.
  - Residents will be reimbursed for Washington State Medical license fees, USMLE Step III, and other required certifications not provided by the residency program.

Home Call Stipend

First Full Pay Period following Ratification
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Approval of UW Housestaff Association Collective Bargaining Agreement – UW Ratification (continued p. 3)

- Residents will receive a $900 lump sum payment to recognize Residents’ unique need to report to training sites on short notice.

First Pay Period of Academic Year 2017-2018
- Residents will receive a $1,150 lump sum payment to recognize Residents’ unique need to report to training sites on short notice.

First Pay Period of Academic Year 2018-2019
- Residents will receive a $1,150 lump sum payment to recognize Residents’ unique need to report to training sites on short notice.

Transportation

Each Year of the Agreement
- Residents will receive a $750 annual travel allowance to help with Residents’ unique transportation costs, in lieu of such costs being reimbursed individually.

- UW will allocate $50,000 annually to support a bike program available for all Residents.

Childcare Fund

Each Year of the Agreement
- UW will allocate $50,000 each year to support childcare needs of qualifying Residents.

Attachment

Collective Bargaining Agreement by and between Board of Regents of the University of Washington and the University of Washington Housestaff Association – November 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

BY AND BETWEEN

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

AND THE

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON HOUSESTAFF ASSOCIATION

November 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
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Article 1: Childcare

1. Purpose. The University and the Residents are committed to working together to address the challenges of obtaining affordable, flexible, and reliable childcare for Residents with children given the high cost of quality childcare and the demanding, and often unpredictable, nature of residency work hours.

2. UW Children's Centers. Four (4) Children's Centers at the University of Washington's Seattle campus serve faculty, staff, and students by providing year-round, on-site, infant, toddler, and preschool childcare. The Children's Center at West Campus serves primarily UW faculty and staff. The Children's Centers at Radford Court and Laurel Village serve students, faculty and staff at the University, yet give priority to UW students in family housing. The UW Children's Center at Harborview Medical Center primarily serves those located at Harborview Medical Center, but is available to all UW faculty, staff, and students. Each of these centers has its own waitlist and enrollment policies.

3. Access to the highly desirable, affordable UW Children's Centers is limited. To reduce the higher financial burden of seeking childcare outside of the University Centers, UW will create a fund to assist in childcare expenses, making available $50,000 per year to a Resident childcare fund. The UWHA will be responsible for determining eligibility criteria for appropriate distribution based on Resident need. The University will be responsible for distributing these funds. The eligibility criteria to be utilized by the UWHA will be provided to the University at the beginning of each year.

4. UW will contribute an amount equal to the difference in waitlist fees between UW Children’s Centers and other affiliated childcare centers. Other affiliated childcare centers include Bright Horizon childcare centers, or other childcare centers or agencies with which the University may establish a formal relationship. Residents will receive priority access to Bright Horizon childcare centers, and the priority access fee will be partially waived.

5. If the University of Washington has an active contract for Sick Child Care Services, Residents shall be able to fully participate. The University shall underwrite the entire daily fee. Residents shall only pay a one-time registration fee of $5 for each child.

6. Residents with dependents will be eligible to participate in any Nanny Share Programs and/or discounts offered to UW employees. Such networks will help to coordinate background checks, matching, and nanny sharing agreements.

7. An UWHA-endorsed representative and an alternate will be appointed annually to the Childcare Advisory Group, which provides input to the Director of WorkLife and Childcare Development on work/life issues to further the goal of improving access to affordable on-site childcare for Residents.
8. At the request of either party, the UWHA and the University will continue to meet and
discuss childcare-related improvements for Residents with children or those whom plan
to have children.
Article 2: Committee Memberships and Hospital Committee

The following committees, or their respective substitutes, as long as such committees exist, shall include at least one (1) Resident designated by the UWHA:

UWMC
1. Medical Services Administrative Committee (MSAC)
2. Patient Safety Committee
3. Clinical Systems Advisory Committee (CSAC)
4. Quality Oversight Committee
5. Medical Leadership Council
6. Mortality Oversight Meeting
7. QISDA/Pay for Performance
8. Core Measures Oversight
9. Physician Engagement Team
10. UWMC Board Facilities, Finance and Joint Conference Committee
11. Inpatient Clinical Performance Council ICPC
12. Medical Quality Improvement Committee (MQIC)

HMC
1. Medical Executive Board (MEB)
2. Medical Quality Improvement Committee (MQIC)
3. Critical Care Council
4. Trauma Council
5. Surgical Council
6. OR Coordinating Committee
7. HMC Patient Safety Committee
8. HMC Quality Improvement Committee
9. HMC QI Metrics Meeting
10. HMC Quality Improvement and Safety Data Analysis
11. Acute Care Council
12. Ambulatory Quality and Safety Committee
13. Infection Prevention and Control Committee

The UWHA reserves the right for final selection and/or approval for each Resident committee member when said Resident committee member will, in general, serve as an UWHA representative. At least one (1) UWHA-endorsed Resident member shall be designated to each committee listed above, with the exception of the GME Committee, which shall have up to three (3) peer-selected Resident members. Given the potential for unpredictable service responsibilities of the Resident at times when the committees may meet, one (1) or more additional UWHA-endorsed Resident may be appointed to the above committees in order to facilitate Resident member attendance at committee meetings, if the presence of multiple or alternate Resident members is agreed upon mutually by both the UWHA and the respective Committee Chair. It is understood that the voting rights of the Resident committee members may vary by committee and may not exist in certain committees, and that multiple or alternate Resident members on a
committee shall, in general, have one (1) collective vote, except in the case of Resident members of the GME Committee, or when otherwise mutually agreed upon by both the Resident member(s) and the respective Committee Chair.

Resident committee members will brief the UWHA on updates from committee meetings as needed. Minutes, communications, and agendas of listed committees, or their respective substitutes, will be available upon request to the UWHA.

The UWHA shall furnish the University, to the best of its ability through its Administrator, with the names of the Resident member(s) of each of the listed committees and shall promptly notify the respective Committee Chair of any changes. At least annually, through the JOC, the University shall provide an updated list of committees including newly formed committees and committee substitutes, name changes, or changes in the Committee Chairs.

In the event that a new committee pertinent to the learning and working environment for Residents is established, the University and the UWHA, by mutual agreement, may include an UWHA-endorsed Resident committee member on the new committee. If a Resident is not appointed to a committee, alternative means for soliciting Resident input on issues of concern to the Residents and the UWHA shall be agreed upon mutually.

It is understood that when a committee agenda includes a subject concerning the University’s relationship (existing or potential) with any union, or involves the administration of any collective bargaining agreement or wages or benefits for any employee, whether or not members of this bargaining unit, Residents in attendance may be excused from that portion of the committee meeting by the Chair of the Committee.
Article 3: Definitions

Chief Resident: Typically, a position in the final year of the residency (e.g., surgery) or in the year after the residency is completed (e.g., internal medicine and pediatrics).

Dentist: References to physicians will herein include dentists and references to ACGME will herein include CODA.

Educational/Training Programs: Curriculum, including didactic and clinical components, defined by and arranged within a department, sometimes in partnership with multiple departments, of the University in which Residents participate to further their Graduate Medical Education.

Fellow: Generally, a physician in a program of graduate medical education accredited by the ACGME/CODA who has completed the requirements for eligibility for first board certification in the specialty. The term "subspecialty residents" is also applied to such physicians. Other uses of the term "fellow" require modifiers for precision and clarity, e.g., research fellow.

Fellowship: see "subspecialty program."

Graduate Medical Education: The period of didactic and clinical education in a medical specialty which follows the completion of a recognized undergraduate medical education and which prepares physicians for the independent practice of medicine in that specialty, also referred to as residency education. The term "graduate medical education" also applies to the period of didactic and clinical education in a medical subspecialty which follows the completion of education in a recognized medical specialty and which prepares physicians for the independent practice of medicine in that subspecialty.

Graduate-Year Level: Refers to a resident's current year of accredited (or non-accredited) GME training. This designation may or may not correspond to the resident's particular year in a program. For example, a resident in pediatric cardiology could be in the first program year of the pediatric cardiology program but in his/her fourth graduate year of GME (including the 3 prior years of pediatrics.) Also referred to as 'post graduate year' or "PGY." Graduate-Year Level or PGY may vary from Appointment Level.

On-Call: A period of time, typically outside the formal business hours of the institution, during which a resident is available to perform patient visits, respond to patient-care related matters, or evaluate a change in a patient's clinical situation. This responsibility may be fulfilled by the resident while they are primarily at home, also known as "home call," or fulfilled by the resident while they are present in the institution, also known as "in-house call."
Program: A structured educational experience in graduate medical education designed to conform to the Program Requirements of a particular specialty/subspecialty, the satisfactory completion of which may result in eligibility for board certification.

Program Director: The one (1) physician designated with authority and accountability for the operation of the residency/fellowship program.

Program Year: Refers to the current year of education within a specific program; this designation may or may not correspond to the resident’s graduate year level. See Graduate-Year Level.

Residency: A program accredited to provide a structured educational experience designed to conform to the Program Requirements of a particular specialty.

Resident: Any physician in an accredited graduate medical education program, including interns, residents, and fellows.

Rotation: An educational experience of planned activities in selected settings, over a specific time period, developed to meet goals and objectives of the program.

Specialty Program: A structured educational experience in a field of medical practice following completion of medical school and, in some cases, prerequisite basic clinical education designed to conform to the Program Requirements of a particular specialty; also known as ‘core’ programs.

Sponsoring Institution: The organization (or entity) that assumes the ultimate financial and academic responsibility for a program of GME. The sponsoring institution has the primary purpose of providing educational programs and/or health care services (e.g., a university, a medical school, a hospital, a school of public health, a health department, a public health agency, an organized health care delivery system, a medical examiner’s office, a consortium, an educational foundation).

Subspecialty Program: A structured educational experience following completion of a prerequisite specialty program in GME designed to conform to the Program Requirements of a particular subspecialty.
Article 4: Disciplinary Action and Just Cause

Residents may only be subject to discipline for just cause. A focus of concern is not considered a disciplinary action, and is therefore not grievable.
Article 5: Dues Deduction, Fair Share, and UWHA Membership

1. All Residents covered by this Agreement will be required, as a condition of their Residency, to either a) become members of the UWHA and pay membership dues; or b) pay the applicable fair share fee as determined pursuant to law. Failure to pay either dues or fees is grounds for termination.

2. Notification. The University and UWHA will jointly notify each Resident of the dues requirement within thirty (30) days of the effective date of this Agreement. Thereafter, new Residents will be notified of this requirement when they interview for a position at UW and within thirty (30) days of beginning the Residency program.

3. Listing of Residents. The University shall provide the UWHA with a monthly listing of all Residents with union dues or fair share fee deductions, and a monthly listing of all Residents who terminated their Residency. The University shall provide this information electronically along with their name, PGY, department and start date.

4. Determination of Membership Dues or Fair Share Fees. It shall be the sole responsibility of the UWHA to determine the amount of dues necessary for membership in the UWHA for each academic year and in accordance with the Articles of Incorporation of the UWHA. It is also the sole responsibility of the UWHA to determine the applicable fair share fee for those Residents electing not to become members of the UWHA. The amount of the service fee shall be provided to the University in writing each year to the University. In no event shall the fair share fee be more than the membership dues.

5. Religious Objection. The parties will comply with the requirements of state law (RCW 41.56.122) for any Resident with a bona fide religious objection to paying dues or fees to the UWHA.

6. Dues Deduction. Upon written authorization by an individual Resident, the University shall provide for payroll deductions of UWHA dues and fair share fees which are uniformly applied to all UWHA members. The University will have available for distribution a payroll deduction authorization card for dues/fees. Each Resident may either sign the authorization form or make other arrangements with the UWHA.

7. Remittance of Dues. The University shall electronically transmit to the UWHA within five (5) work days after each payday all dues and fair share fees deducted for that pay period in those bargaining units for which the UWHA is the exclusive bargaining representative.

8. Termination of employment for failure to pay dues or fees. Failure by a Resident to abide by this article shall constitute cause for discharge of such Resident; however, the University has no duty to act until the UWHA makes an appropriate written request for discharge to the Labor Relations Office and verifies (by forwarding a copy of the written notification to the University) that the Resident received written notification from
the UWHA of the delinquency, including the amount owing, method of calculation, if appropriate, and that non-payment will result in discharge by the University. Any such notification must have been provided by the UWHA to the Resident by registered mail, and have allowed the Resident at least thirty (30) days from the date of receipt to pay the delinquent dues or fees. First year residents who are terminated under this statute will be terminated at the end of their first year of residency. All other residents can be terminated at any time after appropriate notification.

9. Indemnification. If the University is found to be at fault in legal proceedings, the UWHA shall indemnify and hold the University harmless against any claims, demands, suits, or any other form of liability that shall arise out of or by reason of action taken or not taken by the University under this Article. In the event that litigation that arises out of this article could reasonably render the UWHA financial insolvent, the UWHA will adhere to the following process: the UWHA will immediately post a bond or provide some other form of security in order to ensure sufficient resources to cover the indemnification for a legal action by a Resident challenging his/her termination for failure to comply with this Article.
Article 6: Fringe Benefits

1. Resident Orientation. Residents attending mandatory orientation will be on paid time.

2. Professional Liability Coverage. Professional liability coverage will be provided by the University of Washington at no cost to the Resident. This insurance will cover the Resident’s good faith performance of his/her assigned duties in the training program, which may also include program-approved volunteer activities and off-site/oversees and global health rotations. The professional liability coverage will not apply to actions, claims or proceedings arising out of acts taken in bad faith.

3. Wellness and Counseling Services. Counseling, therapy and referral services for residents and fellows dealing with specific concerns such as stress, anxiety, depression, burnout, relationship issues, grief/loss, and interpersonal conflicts are available for free, and are kept confidential. Referrals to behavioral health services when necessary are also provided. Residents are also encouraged to discuss problems of either a personal or professional nature with their Chief Resident, Program Director, Program Administrator, Division Chief, Department Chair, or with personnel in the GME Office.

4. Meals. Programs will maintain their meal policies that exist as of the execution of this agreement. The parties will form a Resident Meals Committee to discuss methods of improving the effectiveness and administrative efficiency of meal reimbursement.

5. Shuttles. Residents have access to the UW shuttles (including Health Sciences Express, NightRide, South Lake Union, and SCCA shuttles) as long as UW continues to provide such shuttle services. The schedules, routes, types, and operation of schedules will be determined by UW.

6. Pagers. Residents who are required to have a pager will be provided with one (1) pager by their training program, which must be returned to the program at the completion of training. Replacement costs due to loss are responsibility of the Resident.

7. Uniforms and Laundry. Programs that require their Residents wear a physician lab coat will provide these at the beginning of residency. Replacement of coats may be the responsibility of the Resident. Availability of scrubs and laundry services for uniforms will be provided in accordance with the policies and practices of the Resident’s program and existing hospital assignment.
**Article 7: Grievance Procedure**

1. **Purpose.** The parties recognize that disputes may occasionally arise concerning the terms and conditions of this Agreement and such disputes shall be resolved through this grievance procedure.

2. **Definition.** A grievance is a claim by an employee or group of employees covered by this Agreement or by the UWHA that the University has violated a specific provision of this Agreement. Matters involving the evaluation of academic or clinical performance or professional behavior, a non-reappointment decision, or any other academic matters including but not limited to the failure to attain the educational objectives or requirements of the training program may not be pursued as grievances under this Article. Appeals related to these matters are covered under the UW GME Resident Academics & Professional Conduct Policy & Procedure.

3. **Scope.** This article does not govern complaints made outside the terms of this Agreement. The University will work with the UWHA to inform and educate employees regarding the appropriate forums to raise and address other questions or concerns.

4. **Representation.**
   a. An employee may not file a grievance without the permission of the UWHA. All employees are encouraged to resolve disagreements within their respective programs. Employees may contact the UWHA at any time to begin the grievance procedure, and the UWHA has sole discretion to determine whether the grievance shall be filed, and the extent to which the grievance shall be pursued.
   b. With the permission of the UWHA, an aggrieved party may be accompanied and/or represented by another resident, employee, or legal counsel.

5. **Time Limits.** Employees must contact the UWHA within sixty (60) calendar days from the occurrence of the events giving rise to the grievance, or from the time at which the aggrieved individual or UWHA should reasonably have become aware of the facts. Members are encouraged to bring potential grievances to the UWHA’s attention as soon as possible. The UWHA is responsible for officially submitting the grievance, if it decides to file a grievance. A notification of the intent to file a grievance by the UWHA to the Office of Graduate Medical Education Office (“GME Office”) satisfies the sixty (60) day time limit requirement and an official grievance must be submitted within the next thirty (30) days. Under no circumstances will the University tolerate retaliation against a Resident for filing or otherwise exercising the rights of this article. Any Resident who believes that retaliation has occurred against him/her by any member of the University should notify the GME Office immediately. Failure to notify, file, or appeal a grievance within the specified time periods will constitute a waiver of the grievance and the matter will be deemed resolved. Similarly, failure of the University to respond within the time limits permits the grievance to automatically proceed to the next step of the grievance procedure. By mutual written agreement, parties may extend any and all time limits, and reasonable requests for specific time extensions should be honored.
6. **Grievance Process.** The following procedure represents the exclusive means for deciding grievances. Both parties agree to undertake the process in good faith and to confer with one another throughout the process.

**A. Step One.** A grievance must be filed in writing (or electronically) by the UWHA on behalf of the aggrieved party or parties to the Program Director, the GME Office, and the Director of Labor Relations. The grievance will state the pertinent facts of the case with reasonable particularity, including the section(s) of the Agreement allegedly violated and the remedy or desired outcome that is sought. The date of filing is the date the grievance is received by the Program Director.

The Program Director (and/or designee) will meet with the grievant and a representative chosen by the UWHA within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the grievance. Both parties will make a good faith effort to schedule the meeting in a timely fashion. The grievant will have the opportunity to present its case at this meeting. The Program Director (or designee) will issue a written response to the grievance within fourteen (14) calendar days of the meeting. The response will cite the specific article(s) of this Agreement that is under question and include an explanation of the decision, including why the case did or did not amount to a violation of this Agreement.

Resolutions at Step One, although final, will not be precedential. While discussion at the program level are encouraged, the UWHA has the right to waive Step One and proceed directly to Step Two, so long as the filing is completed within the time limits contained in Section 5 above.

**B. Step Two.** If the grievance is not resolved at Step One, the UWHA may appeal in writing to the GME Office within fourteen (14) calendar days after receipt of the Step One decision. The GME Office may designate other appropriate University personnel to act as the University’s representative for the purposes of Step Two.

Representatives from the GME Office and Labor Relations, as well as the Program Director (and/or designee) will meet with the grievant and representatives from the UWHA within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the grievance, unless there is a mutually agreed upon time extension as previously outlined. The grievant will have the opportunity to present its case at this meeting. The GME Office or Labor Relations will issue a written response to the grievance within fourteen (14) calendar days of the meeting. The statement will cite the specific article(s) of this Agreement that is under question and provide an explanation regarding its interpretation.

No resolution that is inconsistent with the terms of this Agreement will be permitted.

**C. Step Three.** If the grievance is not resolved at Step Two, the UWHA may appeal in writing within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the Step Two decision. The Step Two appeal must be filed with the GME Office and the Director of Labor Relations. The GME Office will forward the grievance to the Chair of the Graduate Medical Education Committee (GMEC). The Chair of GMEC and UWHA will appoint a committee to hear
the grievance as outlined below. The committee will convene within thirty (30) calendar
days of the GME Office receipt of the appeal on a mutually agreed upon date.

a. Composition: The committee will be composed of current sitting members of the
UW GMEC and will include two (2) physician representatives chosen by the Chair of
the GMEC and 2 resident members chosen by the UWHA. Faculty and residents of
the program(s) involved in the dispute may not be appointed. An additional
representative will be designated by the Director of Labor Relations. The Committee
will be chaired by the Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education or his/her
designee.

b. Attendance: The aggrieved party(ies) and any other individuals with germane
knowledge of the events or specific terms of the Agreement under consideration will
be permitted to attend the meeting. However, only the aforementioned Committee
members are permitted to be in attendance during any pre-proceeding meetings
(i.e., organizational meetings) and the deliberations.

c. Execution: Both parties will have an opportunity to present their interpretation of the
case to the Committee. Members of the Committee may ask clarifying questions to
either party at any time. The Committee as well as both parties will have an
opportunity to ask questions of third parties who appear as subject matter experts or
witnesses.

d. Decision-Making: The Committee shall issue a written consensus statement of its
findings and render a recommended course of action within fourteen (14) calendar
days that will be transmitted to all parties to the grievance. Any Committee member
may write a dissenting statement in addition to the consensus statement that is
allowed. The UWHA and the University shall each have fourteen (14) calendar days
to accept or reject the Committee decision. If either party rejects the decision, the
matter may be moved to Step Four.

In lieu of the Step Three Committee, the UWHA may opt to request mediation with the
Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC). If the UWHA opts for mediation
rather than the Step Three Committee and both parties mutually agree to participate in
mediation, UWHA will file a request with PERC in accordance with WAC 391-55-020.
UWHA will send a copy to the Labor Relations Office within thirty (30) days of receipt of
the Step Two decision. In addition to all other filing requirements, the request must
include a copy of the grievance and all previous responses. The University will inform
the UWHA, in writing, and PERC within thirty (30) days of receipt of Mediation request if
they are not in agreement. Participation in mediation will be on a voluntary basis.
Proposals made in mediation will not have any precedential value or relevance at
arbitration unless otherwise agreed by the parties. At any point, either party can choose
to proceed to Step Four.

The UWHA may choose either the Step Three Committee or mediation, but not both. If
the UWHA selects mediation, the University may still opt to forego mediation and

In lieu of the Step Three Committee, the UWHA may opt to request mediation with the
Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC). If the UWHA opts for mediation
rather than the Step Three Committee and both parties mutually agree to participate in
mediation, UWHA will file a request with PERC in accordance with WAC 391-55-020.
UWHA will send a copy to the Labor Relations Office within thirty (30) days of receipt of
the Step Two decision. In addition to all other filing requirements, the request must
include a copy of the grievance and all previous responses. The University will inform
the UWHA, in writing, and PERC within thirty (30) days of receipt of Mediation request if
they are not in agreement. Participation in mediation will be on a voluntary basis.
Proposals made in mediation will not have any precedential value or relevance at
arbitration unless otherwise agreed by the parties. At any point, either party can choose
to proceed to Step Four.

The UWHA may choose either the Step Three Committee or mediation, but not both. If
the UWHA selects mediation, the University may still opt to forego mediation and
instead choose to proceed with the Step Three Committee procedure. The UWHA may 
not opt to proceed directly from Step Two to Step Four without utilizing the Step Three 
Committee or mediation.

D. Step Four. If the grievance is not resolved at Step Two or at Step Three, the UWHA 
may appeal the grievance to an impartial arbitrator within thirty (30) calendar days after 
the receipt of the Step Three decision or the conclusion of the Step Three mediation. 
The submission of the matter to arbitration will be provided to the GME Office and the 
Director of Labor Relations and will state the issue to be arbitrated and the remedy that 
is sought.

a. The party moving the grievance to arbitration will request a panel of seven (7) 
qualified arbitrators from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS).

b. No fewer than thirty (30) days after the receipt of the arbitration request, the parties 
will select an arbitrator from the provided panel by alternately striking names. A coin flip 
will determine which party strikes the first name. Arbitration hearings will be scheduled 
within sixty (60) days of selection of an arbitrator unless there is a mutually agreed upon 
extension or extraordinary circumstances.

c. The arbitrator will conduct a hearing in accordance with the rules of the American 
Arbitration UWHA. The arbitrator will strive to render a decision on the grievance within 
30 days of the close of the hearing, or as otherwise agreed between the parties.

d. The decision of the arbitrator will be binding on all parties.

e. The expenses and fees of the arbitrator will be shared equally by the UWHA and the 
University.

f. The parties agree that the arbitrator shall not have the power or jurisdiction to render 
a decision that adds to, subtracts from, alters, amends or modifies in any way the terms 
and conditions of Agreement. The arbitrator will have no jurisdiction or authority to 
substitute his/her judgment for any academic or clinical judgment made by the 
University.

g. Each party shall bear its own fees and expenses in presenting its case, including the 
costs of legal representation.
Article 8: Health and Safety

1. Policies. The University will ensure a healthy and safe learning and working environment that provides for security and safety measures appropriate to the participating site. The University shall comply with applicable Federal and State health and safety legislation and regulations and has designated the University’s Environmental Health and Safety Department to advise and monitor compliance with such standards. The University will provide notice and an opportunity to bargain the impacts of any policy changes that have a material impact on Resident safety.

2. Working Conditions. All work shall be performed in conformity with applicable safety standards. Residents are encouraged to immediately report any unsafe working conditions to their Program Director. No resident shall be disciplined for reporting any condition nor be required to work or to operate equipment when he/she has reasonable grounds to believe such action would result in immediate danger to life or safety. On request, the Environmental Health and Safety Department shall review the concern and issue a decision.

3. Committee. Health and safety issues shall be an appropriate agenda item for the Housestaff Advisory Committee on an ongoing basis.
Article 9: Housestaff Advisory Committee

1. Purpose. Representatives of the University and the UWHA will meet periodically to provide a forum for communications between the parties to deal with matters of general concern.

2. Composition. The Housestaff Advisory Committee will be composed of three (3) members of the UWHA collective bargaining unit and three (3) representatives from the University.

3. Meetings. Committee meetings may be requested by an authorized representative of either party at any time. Requests for a quarterly meeting will be honored, but the parties may agree to meet more or less frequently. At least one (1) weeks' notice will be given to Committee members of the meeting time and agenda.

4. Committee Scope. The Committee’s function will be limited to an advisory capacity and will not include any decision-making or collective bargaining authority, but the parties may recommend topics or language for discussion by the bargaining teams at subsequent collective bargaining sessions. Committee meeting topics will be limited to subjects of group rather than individual concern, and the Committee will not discuss grievances as defined in this Agreement. It is not intended that this Article obligate either party to negotiate on personnel matters covered in this Agreement or to alter, limit, restrict, or reduce prerogatives of either party otherwise provided in this Agreement.
Article 10: Leave - Bereavement

Bereavement Leave. In the event of the death of a Resident’s family member¹, a Resident shall be granted leave with pay. The amount of paid leave shall be only that which is required to attend the funeral and/or make arrangements necessitated by the death, but in no event shall it exceed three (3) days, with one (1) additional day if significant travel is required. In the event that overseas travel is required, a total of two (2) additional days for travel may be granted. If additional time off is needed, the Resident may request the use of available vacation or sick leave. The Resident must inform the Program Director as soon as possible of the need for bereavement leave.

¹ Family member means the employee’s spouse or same or opposite sex domestic partner; child; parent; grandparent; grandchild; sister; or brother. Family member also includes individuals in the following relationships with the employee’s spouse or domestic partner: child, parent, or grandparent. It also includes those persons in a “step” or “half” relationship.
Article 11: Leave - Extended

1. Extended Leave. Residents may be eligible for paid extended leave if the Resident has used all of the Resident’s eligible vacation and sick leave, and would otherwise need to take leave without pay or separate from the UW GME training program because of a “qualifying condition” (as defined in the UW Shared Leave policy). The Resident must have a “qualifying condition” and must further meet the corresponding eligibility and process requirements as described in the UW Shared Leave policy. Qualifying conditions generally may be expected to include a severe, extraordinary, or life-threatening illness or injury, such as suicidal ideation or substance abuse disorder, requiring extended inpatient treatment under the direction of the Washington Physicians Health Program. Eligible Residents may receive and use a maximum of 12 weeks of paid extended leave during their appointment as a Resident to the University. Paid extended leave will not be approved in excess of what is authorized by the Resident’s healthcare provider. All requests for paid extended leave are subject to approval by the Program Director and the GME Office. Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) leave, if available, runs concurrently with Paid Extended Leave.

1

1 Nothing in this agreement should be construed to alter the University’s definition of “Qualifying Condition” under the Shared Leave Policy. Examples of qualifying conditions are provided for illustrative purposes only. All submitted conditions are evaluated on a case-by-case basis in order to determine the appropriateness under this article.
Article 12: Leave - Holidays

1. Holidays. Residents may join in the observance of all official holidays recognized by the training site at which they are assigned at the time of the holiday. Clinical responsibilities and educational requirements may necessitate that a resident report for duty on a holiday. Program Directors will make every effort to fairly distribute required clinical responsibilities that fall on a holiday amongst Residents over the course of the training program.

For the purposes of this Article, Seattle Children’s will observe the same holidays as the University of Washington for Resident work assignments.

2. Unpaid Personal Holiday. In accordance with RCW 1.16.050, Residents will have the option to take up to two (2) unpaid holidays per calendar year for a reason of faith or conscience, or for an organized activity conducted under the auspices of a religious denomination, church, or religious organization.

To take unpaid time off under the statute, Residents must consult with their Program Director and use their Program’s procedure for making advance leave requests. The Resident will need to inform their Program Director that the requested unpaid day(s) is for a reason of faith or conscience or for an organized activity conducted under the auspices of a religious denomination, church, or religious organization.

The Program Director can only deny a Resident’s requested day(s) off if the Program Director determines that the requested time off would impose an undue hardship on the training site, or the Resident’s presence is necessary to maintain public safety. Undue hardship is defined in Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 82-56-020. Residents may be asked to provide verification for their unpaid leave request.

3. Paid Personal Holiday. Residents are entitled to one (1) paid holiday per calendar year. Each Resident may select the day on which the employee desires to take the additional holiday provided for in this section after consultation with their Program Director pursuant to applicable state law.
Article 13: Leave - Miscellaneous

1. Parental Leave. Up to four (4) months of parental leave may be granted to a Resident with a natural newborn, adoptive, or foster child. The Resident may use a combination of vacation, up to ten days of sick leave, personal holiday, and/or leave without pay while on parental leave.

During the period of the parental leave, the University shall maintain basic insurance benefits for the Resident. The Resident will be responsible for maintaining any optional insurance coverage, other payroll deductions, and insurance co-payments.

If, during the duration of this agreement, the University adopts a policy that grants paid parental leave to any other bargaining unit (that is not part of shared leave program), the UWHA will receive notice of the change and opportunity to bargain.

2. Pregnancy Accommodation. For a Resident who is the birth mother, during the Resident’s last month of pregnancy and for two (2) months post-partum, consideration of the Resident’s wellbeing and ability to work overnight shifts or participate in overnight in-house call will be made. Pregnant Residents are encouraged to seek needed accommodations to their schedules and work responsibilities. The University will provide training/guidance to Program Directors regarding accommodation for pregnant Residents.

A pregnant Resident may request an accommodation— including relief from overnight call or 24-hour shifts— from her Program Director. If the accommodation is feasible and easily implementable, the Program Director will make a good faith effort to adopt it in an expedient fashion. If the Program Director determines that the requested accommodation is not feasible and easily implementable, the Resident will be required to submit the necessary medical documentation that supports the request to the University’s Disability Services Office (“DSO”). The Resident will engage in an interactive dialogue with DSO in an effort to seek a reasonable accommodation given her medical condition.

In the event that the Resident is restricted from overnight call responsibilities prior to and/or after birth by her health care provider due to her medical condition, the Resident may be required to make up these overnight call responsibilities. Every attempt should be made by the Resident to communicate with the Program Director and other Residents about her time away so as to organize call schedules and mitigate any misunderstandings about call and coverage schedules. Other health care needs that may arise during the course of pregnancy will be addressed in accordance with applicable state and federal laws.

The parties will discuss the effectiveness of this section as an ongoing topic at the Housestaff Advisory Committee.
3. Family and Medical Leave. Residents may be eligible for family medical leave under the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) or state Family Leave Act (RCW 49.78). To be eligible, the Resident must have a record of twelve (12) months cumulative State service and have been on duty 1250 hours during the twelve (12) months immediately preceding the family medical leave. A maximum of twelve (12) weeks leave of absence without pay shall be granted in accordance with the reasons designated in the Family and Medical Leave Act (Title 29 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) Eligible Residents may request a family medical leave of absence without pay not to exceed twelve (12) weeks in a twelve (12) month period. The twelve (12) month period the University uses to count FMLA leave is measured using the rolling twelve (12) month period as established in the FMLA. The leave for childcare must be taken within the first twelve (12) months of birth, adoption or placement. When medically necessary, family medical leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule. Requests for such leave shall, when practical, be made to the Program Director at least thirty (30) days before the leave is to begin.

These leaves will be unpaid unless the Resident elects to use paid leave to the extent the circumstances meet the requirements for such leave. During this period of leave, the University shall maintain basic insurance benefits for the Resident. The Resident will be responsible for maintaining any optional insurance coverage, other payroll deductions, and insurance co-payments. If the Resident's leave extends beyond the FMLA-covered period, paid leave may be utilized to retain UW-paid benefits eligibility if approved by the GME Office, or the Resident may use a variety of self-pay options outlined on the UW Benefits Office website. FMLA runs concurrently with other leaves that may be either paid or unpaid.

4. Civil Leave. Civil duty leave, or civil leave, is paid leave granted to Residents who are called to serve on jury duty, as trial witnesses, to exercise other subpoenaed civil duties, or to testify in any other proceeding. In addition to regular pay, Residents may retain any compensation received while on approved civil duty leave. At the Resident's request, the Program will provide a letter requesting deferral of jury duty. Residents are not entitled to civil leave for civil legal actions that they initiate or when named as a defendant or respondent in a private legal action that is not directly related to their University appointment.

5. Military Leave. Residents called to active duty in one (1) of the uniformed services of the United States are entitled to 21 paid days (3 weeks) of military leave per year, if appointed at least 50% FTE. In addition, during a period of military conflict, Residents with spouses who are members of United States armed forces, National Guard or reserves are entitled to a total of 15 days of unpaid leave per deployment after the service member has been notified of an impending call to active duty and before deployment, or when the service member is on leave from deployment. A Resident may elect to substitute paid vacation leave for any part of the otherwise unpaid spousal military leave.
6. Other Unpaid Leave  At his/her request, a Resident may be granted a leave of absence without pay at the discretion of his/her Program Director.

7. Effects of Leave on Board Eligibility. Every Member Board of the American Board of Medical Specialties, Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery, and Pediatric Dentistry has leave restrictions that differ from those of the University of Washington, and Residents are subject to both sets of policies. Leaves of absence, for any reason, may affect a Resident’s eligibility for board certification. Program Directors will inform Residents of their Program’s policy on this topic, which specifies the effects of leaves of absence on eligibility for certification by the relevant Member Board. Residents must complete all program requirements related to clinical training, didactics, scholarly activities, and other program curricula. Residents may not accumulate leave time or vacation time to shorten the overall length of training. Should any approved leaves compromise the necessary training time for certification, the Resident will receive additional training sufficient to meet certification requirements. During such additional training, the Resident will continue to receive salary/stipends and benefits at the level of the year of training the Resident is completing. The completion date on the Resident’s graduation certificate will reflect the additional training time.
Article 14: Leave - Professional

Professional Leave. Residents may receive up to five (5) days of paid Professional Leave to present scholarly work at, or to attend, a professional or scientific meeting, to sit for exams (e.g., USMLE, board certification), to participate in other educational activities outside of their training program, to serve on committees of professional organizations (e.g., AMA, ACGME, CODA), or to participate in professional interviews (including residency, fellowship and job interviews). Additional Professional Leave in excess of five (5) days may be granted at the discretion of the Program Director.

Senior Residents will be given priority in requests for professional leave and programs will make every effort to grant professional leave for fellowship or job interviews. Requests for Professional Leave are subject to prior approval by the Program Director.
Article 15: Leave - Sick

1. Introduction. When a Resident is unable to work due to illness or injury and certain criteria are met, certain paid sick leave shall be available. It is in the parties’ mutual interest that Residents are both encouraged and supported by their programs and colleagues to not work when acutely ill. The parties acknowledge that there is a shared responsibility of both Faculty and Residents to assure coverage during such absences. Excessive absenteeism may result in corrective action.

2. Sick and Health Maintenance Leave. Residents will receive seventeen (17) days (12 weekdays and 5 weekend days) of paid sick and health maintenance leave at the start of each one (1) year appointment period. Sick and health maintenance leave is accrued and rolled over to subsequent training years while the Resident is appointed to a UW GME training program or if appointed within two (2) years of the end of a previous UW GME appointment. Accumulated sick leave credit that is not transferable is not compensable at the completion or expiration of the appointment to the Program. Residents appointed less than full time but greater than or equal to 50% FTE shall receive sick and health maintenance leave credit on a pro rata basis. Residents appointed less than 50% FTE are not eligible to receive and/or use sick leave. Sick leave may be used for the following:

- Personal illness, disability or injury (including illness or disability due to pregnancy), childbirth or to recover from childbirth.
- Personal medical, dental, or optical appointments.
  - Given that many appointments do not require an entire duty period be taken off, Programs will make every effort to allow Residents to attend appointments during scheduled duties, with the Resident performing his/her normal duties before and/or after the appointment. The Resident must provide advance notice to their Program Director of any such appointments, and otherwise comply with any applicable Program policy. The goal is to minimize the disruption to patient care and Resident training, while encouraging Residents to avail themselves of appropriate personal health care. The Resident will thus not be absent for the entire duty period during a given twenty four (24) hour period, and in turn, should not be charged a full sick day. Residents who take less than four (4) hours during a given twenty four (24) hour period will be charged a half sick day. Programs may apply their discretion to not charge sick leave for appointments at the very beginning or very end of the their working day. Residents who have appointments during a scheduled break need not use their sick and health maintenance leave.
- To care for a child of the resident who has a health condition that requires treatment or supervision.
  - For this purpose "child" means a biological, adopted or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis who
is under 18, or 18 or older and is incapable of self-care because of mental
or physical disability.

- To care for the Resident’s seriously ill family member or partner.
- Absence necessitated by the death of a resident’s family member.
- To accompany a family member or partner to medical, dental, or optical
  appointments where the Resident’s presence is required. The Resident must
  make advance arrangements with the Program for such absences.
- Condolence or bereavement – see bereavement leave for details.
- Child care emergency – see child care emergency leave for details.
- Parental leave – see parental leave for details.
Article 16: Leave – Vacation

1. Vacation Leave. Residents will receive a minimum of twenty-one (21) days (15 weekdays and 6 weekend days) of paid vacation at the start of each one (1) year appointment period. Any individual Program may increase the number of days of paid vacation for their program or particular postgraduate year(s) of their program, at their discretion. Residents appointed less than full time but greater than or equal to 50% FTE will receive vacation leave credit on a pro rata basis. Residents appointed less than 50% FTE are not eligible to receive and/or use vacation leave. Unused vacation leave shall lapse at the expiration of each appointment period.

2. Vacation Scheduling. All vacation requests must be submitted to the program according to program policy and approved by the Program Director prior to commencement. Additional approval may be required by the head of the clinical service upon which the Resident is rotating, if applicable. Programs will make every effort to honor vacation requests that are made in a timely manner.
Article 17: Management Rights

Section 1. Management of the University is vested exclusively in the University, including educational programs and the authority to make all decisions related to managing its programs. Except as expressly provided otherwise in this Agreement, the management rights of the University include, but are not limited to, the right to establish and control the University’s programs, resources and priorities; to establish, revise and administer procedures, reasonable rules and regulations; to alter or discontinue existing equipment, facilities, and location of operations; to determine or modify the number, qualifications, scheduling, responsibilities and assignment of Residents; to evaluate and determine the processes and criteria by which the performance of Residents are evaluated; to establish, maintain, modify or enforce standards of performance, conduct, order and safety; to impose corrective action including to terminate a Resident from a training program; to determine the eligibility and selection criteria of Residents; to determine and assign the training assignments of Residents; to determine Resident schedules and hours within ACGME duty hour limits; to assign work locations; and to take whatever actions are necessary in the event of an emergency.

Section 2. The University has the sole and exclusive authority to make all decisions involving patient care, including the procedures, facilities, and equipment to be used, as well as to determine, establish and change staffing levels and the coverage for each service, shift, and department. All such matters, as well as matters relating to clinical judgment, shall be made at the sole discretion of the University.

Section 3. Except as expressly provided otherwise in this agreement, the University has the sole and exclusive authority to make all decisions involving educational policy; to establish the standards and qualifications for selection and advancement through the Residency program; and to determine the training methods and curricula to be utilized in the Residency programs.

Section 4. The determination of whether duties will be assigned to Residents or other individuals, or reassigned from Residents to other individuals, will be made by the University.

Section 5. For Resident training facilities over which the University does not have sole operational authority, the language in this Agreement will not supersede facility-specific practices. Policies or practices at non-University controlled facilities will be an appropriate topic for discussion with the Housestaff Advisory Committee. The University will work with the operators of these non-University facilities to encourage adoption of practices consistent with this Agreement and recommendations of the Housestaff Advisory Committee.
**Article 18: Moonlighting**

1. Definitions. Internal moonlighting refers to patient care services performed outside the scope of the Approved Training Program but at a UW Medicine or UW Medicine-Affiliated Site. External moonlighting refers to patient care services performed outside the scope of the Approved Training Program at a non-UW Medicine Site, non-UW Medicine Affiliated Site, or site that does not participate in the Resident's Approved Training Program. Note: a “site” may include other facilities owned or operated by the organization. When a Training Program includes one (1) facility in a health system, all facilities and clinics within the health system may be considered part of the “site”.

2. Provisions. On occasion, UW Medicine or UW Medicine-Affiliated Sites may identify a need for additional clinical coverage in order to ensure patient safety, access and quality of care. The identification of a need for additional clinical coverage that may be appropriate for internal moonlighting and offered as an opportunity to residents is within the sole discretion of UW Medicine. Where such a need is identified and offered as internal moonlighting, or when there is an opportunity to moonlight externally, Residents are permitted to moonlight provided that such practice meets the requirements listed in this article, does not interfere with the responsibilities, duties and assignments of their training program, their availability for duty, or their program performance at the University of Washington. Residents should refer to the GME Resident/Fellow Moonlighting Policy which addresses additional considerations for moonlighting including professional liability coverage. The provisions of this article are designed to (a) protect patient safety, and (b) ensure that the training of Residents within their training program is not compromised. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the University may at its discretion deny approval of any proposed moonlighting activity that in its view may not meet compliance requirements under Medicare program laws and regulations.

3. Requirements. Before a Resident may engage in moonlighting, s/he must submit an application to his/her Program Director (or the Program Director’s designee). A Resident is eligible to engage in moonlighting if s/he meets the criteria below. As part of the review and approval of the application, the Program Director has responsibility to determine whether the criteria have been met:

   a. Training Year: Per ACGME requirements, the Resident must have completed his/her PGY-1 year of training.

   b. Program Performance: The Resident must be performing at or above average in his/her program as assessed according to the aggregate of the

---

1 At the time of this Agreement, UW Medicine Sites consist of Harborview Medical Center, Northwest Hospital & Medical Center, Valley Medical Center, University of Washington Medical Center, UW Neighborhood Clinics, and Airlift Northwest. At the time of this Agreement, UW Medicine Affiliated sites include Seattle Children’s Hospital, VA Puget Sound Healthcare System, Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and Bloodworks Northwest. UW Medicine and UW Medicine Affiliated sites are subject to change over the course of the Agreement.
most recent 6 months of Milestones assessments or equivalent assessment results (in programs that do not use the ACGME milestones as a metric), and not be subject to remediation or other disciplinary action (e.g., not be on Focus of Concern or Probation, or subject to other actions including Program Refusal to Certify Board Application, Training Site Actions, modified Clinical Supervision Requirements, Removal from Patient Care Activities, Removal from payroll due to failure to maintain proper immigration status for legal employment as a resident at the University of Washington, Paid precautionary suspension pending investigation, Actions by Non-GME Components of the University, Other violations of the Residency/Fellowship Position Appointment (RFPA), Non-Reappointment, Non-Promotion, Suspension, or Termination for Cause).

c. **Licensure**: The Resident must have obtained all required licensure for moonlighting prior to approval, including the appropriate medical or dental license and a paid DEA license, if applicable.

d. **Duty Hours**: All residents participating in moonlighting activities must be in compliance with ACGME duty hours limits and the UW GME Institutional Duty Hours Policy. It is impermissible for a Resident to reduce duty hours in his/her training program in order to stay under the limit to then be eligible to engage in moonlighting. Where a rotation regularly requires duty hours up to or close to the limit of 80 hours per week on average, moonlighting during that specific rotation may not be feasible, even if the Resident has otherwise been approved to moonlight within that academic year. Upon request, Program Directors will provide historical work hours data for these rotations. Residents, on a case-by-case basis, may request permission to moonlight on these rotations if work hours are lower than anticipated. Any Resident found to be misrepresenting or underreporting program or any moonlighting hours will not be eligible to participate in any further moonlighting activities and may be subject to additional disciplinary action.

e. **Medicare Compliance**: Residents who choose to engage in external moonlighting must perform such activities in compliance with government healthcare program laws and regulations, including regulations regarding payment for physician services under the Medicare program. The University of Washington is not responsible for ensuring that Residents who choose to externally moonlight are in compliance with these laws and regulations despite the fact that an external moonlighting activity may have been approved by the Program Director.

f. **Billing restriction for Clinical Services to Patients**: Residents who are permitted to engage in internal moonlighting are generally not authorized to
bill or be billed under their own name and billing number. Instead, subject to compliance with the Medicare program teaching physician rules, supervising physicians generally may bill as teaching physicians for clinical care to patients when the internally moonlighting Resident participates in that clinical care. While billing for moonlighting is strictly prohibited at Harborview Medical Center and University of Washington Medical Center, exceptions for particular circumstances involving internal moonlighting at other entities may be permitted by the GME Office on a case-by-case basis. Both internal and external moonlighting are governed by Medicare compliance regulations as noted in this article.

g. **Grant Restrictions:** For AY16-17, if a Resident is funded by any grant mechanism that prohibits clinical activity as a requirement of funding, that Resident will be prohibited from moonlighting during the time s/he is funded by that mechanism. The University will endeavor to inform Residents of any such grant restrictions. Departments will not include language in grant proposals or request language in grant agreements indicating that Residents will be prohibited from moonlighting during the time they are funded by the grant. Beginning AY18, no Resident may be excluded from moonlighting, except by reason of a grant funding restriction that is a requirement of the sponsor. The UWHA or GME may request through the applicable Office of Sponsored Programs (“OSP”) to the sponsor, that grant language prohibiting moonlighting be removed, with such request subject to sponsor approval.

h. **Patient Care:** The site at which external moonlighting is to take place must assess the resident’s competency to perform any clinical services that he/she will be credentialed to perform at that site. Any external moonlighting activity that requires the Resident to assume continuing responsibility for patients is not permitted, as it may interfere with his/her responsibilities at UW Medicine and/or its affiliated hospitals.

i. **Professional Liability Coverage (Malpractice):** The University of Washington provides its Residents with professional liability coverage for work performed at the request of the University at the following UW Medicine and UW Medicine Affiliated sites: Harborview Medical Center, Northwest Hospital & Medical Center, University of Washington Medical Center, UW Neighborhood Clinics, Airlift Northwest, Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, and Bloodworks Northwest. The University’s professional liability coverage does not apply to moonlighting activities at any other site, including all external
moonlighting, and it is the Resident’s responsibility to obtain professional
liability coverage.¹

j. **Visa Restrictions:** External moonlighting by J-1 visa holders is not permitted
under any circumstances. External moonlighting by H-1B visa holders is
permitted only if the University representing the site of the proposed
moonlighting activities has properly filed a concurrent H-1B petition.

4. **Decision.** After a Resident submits a GME Moonlighting Request Form, the Program
Director (or appropriate designee) shall review the request. If approved, the GME Office
will respond with an acceptance or denial as quickly as possible, but not later than
within 30 days. If the Program Director determines that a particular Resident does not
meet the eligibility criteria described above and should thus not be permitted to
moonlight, s/he will provide specific reasons related to the factors listed in this article as
to why that Resident should not do so, as well as objective criteria by which the
Resident can improve his/her standing in the program, as applicable. Program Directors
will not automatically deny moonlighting requests and will evaluate each request based
on the individual circumstances and eligibility criteria as defined in Section 3.

5. **Review.** The decision to deny a moonlighting request under this article may be
challenged by the Resident under the grievance procedure of this Agreement. However,
the appeal may not be escalated beyond Step 2 of the grievance procedure.

---

¹ At the time of this Agreement, Seattle Children’s Hospital and the VA Puget Sound Health Care System maintain
their own liability coverage programs and in general provide liability coverage for approved moonlighting activities
at their respective locations.
**Article 19: No Strikes, No Lockouts**

1. The University and the UWHA acknowledge that this Agreement provides, through the grievance procedure and through other administrative remedies, for an orderly settlement of grievances or disputes which may arise between the parties. Accordingly, the parties agree that the public interest requires the uninterrupted performance of all University and medical services and to this end pledge to prevent or eliminate any conduct contrary to that objective. Therefore, the University shall not lock out any of the employees as a result of a labor dispute or grievance or disputes on personnel matters; nor shall the UWHA in any way authorize, assist, condone, participate in, or lend support to any work stoppage, work slowdown or any other curtailment of work in the bargaining unit, and employees shall not engage in any such activity.

2. Should the UWHA or any Resident engage in any unauthorized concerted action, then once the employees have returned to work and continue working, a Housestaff Advisory Committee shall immediately meet in a good faith effort to resolve the dispute. This section shall not restrict the ability of the University to discipline employees for engaging in prohibited conduct.

3. Any action of the University in closing its facilities during a general strike, riot, or civil disturbance for the protection of the institution, its property, or its employees shall not be deemed a lockout.

4. Nothing herein constitutes a waiver of the University's right to seek appropriate legal relief in the event of a violation of this Article.
Article 20: Non-Discrimination

1. Non-Discrimination. Neither the University nor the UWHA shall discriminate against any employee on the basis of any classification (including but not limited to sexual harassment) protected by the UW’s Executive Order No. 31. Bona fide occupational qualifications are not to be considered a violation of this section.

2. Complaints. A discrimination complaint may be filed with the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office. Employees may also file discrimination complaints with appropriate federal or state agencies. The parties agree to encourage the filing of discrimination complaints through the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office.
Article 21: Professional Development and Licensing

1. Development. Each Resident is allocated a professional development fund of $350 per year. All programs are encouraged (but not required) to continue providing their Residents with funding that addresses specialty specific needs (e.g. loops, specialty specific memberships, etc.) and that enhance specialty specific Resident development and program reputation (e.g. research grants, specialty specific meetings, etc). Residents may roll over unused Professional Development funds to successive training years up to a total of $1000.

This fund is intended to be used for uncovered expenses related to the Resident’s professional development during the course of his/her training at the University and may include, but is not limited to, travel, lodging and registration fees to attend non-program supported professional meetings or board preparation courses (in person or online); to purchase study materials (e.g., for USMLE or specialty boards), hard copy or electronic professional reference materials (e.g. textbooks or journals), and medical equipment etc. Residents are encouraged to check the University of Washington Health Sciences Library for the availability of any given book prior to purchasing a digital book.

2. Purchase. The Resident must verify with their Program Director that the activity or item that they wish to purchase is reimbursable under the terms of this Article before they incur the expense. During the Resident’s last year of training, all expenses must be submitted at least six (6) months prior to the Resident’s completion of the program.

3. Reimbursement. The Resident will submit receipts for approved expenses to their Program Administrator within 30 days of expenditure. The Program will reimburse the Resident within 90 (ninety) days of submission of the receipts.

4. License Fees. Residents require medical licenses in order to perform their jobs. Residents will be completely reimbursed for Washington State Medical license fees, and any other required certifications not provided by the residency program (such as USMLE Step III, ACLS, PALS, etc). For each of these mandatory expenses, residents will submit a request to the GME Office and will be reimbursed in full. Residents who moonlight must pay for DEA licensure.
Article 22: Progression by Training Year

Training Year: The appointment level of a Resident varies by training year and may vary by training history of an individual Resident. As indicated in the Compensation Article, Residents will be paid according to the training year in which they are participating in the UW training program, and Residents will not necessarily receive credit for prior training in a specialty that is not required for entry into the current program. Residents will receive credit for pay level progression for ACGME-required research training years, and for non-ACGME required research years in General Surgery, Otolaryngology and Urology. However, in some circumstances, Graduate-Year Level or PGY may vary from appointment level. Examples of acceptable variations to these rules are provided below.

General Surgery residency with required research years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General Surgery Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>General Surgery Clinical Year 2</th>
<th>General Surgery Clinical Year 3</th>
<th>General Surgery Research Year 1</th>
<th>General Surgery Research Year 2</th>
<th>General Surgery Clinical Year 4</th>
<th>General Surgery Clinical Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>PGY4</td>
<td>PGY5</td>
<td>PGY6</td>
<td>PGY7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Otolaryngology residency with required research years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Clinical Year 2</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Research Year 1</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Research Year 2</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Clinical Year 3</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Clinical Year 4</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Clinical Year 5</th>
<th>Otolaryngology Clinical Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>PGY4</td>
<td>PGY5</td>
<td>PGY6</td>
<td>PGY7</td>
<td>PGY8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Urology residency with required research year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Urology Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>Urology Clinical Year 2</th>
<th>Urology Clinical Year 3</th>
<th>Urology Clinical Year 4</th>
<th>Urology Research Year 1</th>
<th>Urology Clinical Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>PGY4</td>
<td>PGY5</td>
<td>PGY6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery residency with integrated medical school years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Oral &amp; Maxillofacial Surgery</th>
<th>Medical School Year 3</th>
<th>Medical School Year 4</th>
<th>General Surgery Clinical</th>
<th>Oral &amp; Maxillofacial Surgery</th>
<th>Oral &amp; Maxillofacial Surgery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partial residency in General Surgery followed by switch to Anesthesiology residency:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>General Surgery Year 1</th>
<th>General Surgery Year 2</th>
<th>General Surgery Year 3</th>
<th>Anesthesiology Year 2</th>
<th>Anesthesiology Year 3</th>
<th>Anesthesiology Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>PGY4</td>
<td>PGY5</td>
<td>PGY6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>R4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal Medicine residency followed by Cardiology fellowship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Internal Medicine Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>Internal Medicine Clinical Year 2</th>
<th>Internal Medicine Clinical Year 3</th>
<th>Cardiology Research Year 1</th>
<th>Cardiology Research Year 2</th>
<th>Cardiology Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>Cardiology Clinical Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td>PGY4</td>
<td>PGY5</td>
<td>PGY6</td>
<td>PGY7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Determined by department

Medicine residency followed by Gap Years followed by fellowship:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Internal Medicine Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>Internal Medicine Clinical Year 2</th>
<th>Internal Medicine Clinical Year 3</th>
<th>Gap Year</th>
<th>Gap Year</th>
<th>Nephrology Clinical Year 1</th>
<th>Nephrology Clinical Year 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG Year</td>
<td>PGY1</td>
<td>PGY2</td>
<td>PGY3</td>
<td></td>
<td>PGY4</td>
<td>PGY5</td>
<td>PGY6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Year</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Level</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
<td>R4</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Article 23: Salary/Stipend

Section 1. Salary/Stipend
Residents will be paid according to the training year in which they are participating in the UW training program, and Residents will not necessarily receive credit for prior training in a specialty that is not required for entry into the current program. Residents in any given level of training will be reimbursed at the same rate regardless of funding source, and there will be no differentials among the various specialty fields.

Residents will receive a step increase upon successful completion of the training year and promotion to the next training level. Residents who are required to complete (a) non-accredited research year(s) during the course of their accredited training will receive a step increase for each year of research and upon reentry into the accredited training program.

Section 1.1 Housestaff Salary/Stipend
Effective in the first pay period after contract ratification, the UW GME Stipend Schedule will be recalibrated with a 3% increase as shown below. Residents will receive a 3% across-the-board increase effective 7/1/17 and 7/1/18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R3</th>
<th>R4</th>
<th>R5</th>
<th>R6</th>
<th>R7</th>
<th>R8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AY17</td>
<td>$54,873</td>
<td>$57,013</td>
<td>$59,350</td>
<td>$61,902</td>
<td>$64,564</td>
<td>$67,598</td>
<td>$71,114</td>
<td>$75,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY18</td>
<td>$56,519</td>
<td>$58,723</td>
<td>$61,131</td>
<td>$63,759</td>
<td>$66,501</td>
<td>$69,626</td>
<td>$73,247</td>
<td>$77,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AY19</td>
<td>$58,215</td>
<td>$60,485</td>
<td>$62,965</td>
<td>$65,672</td>
<td>$68,496</td>
<td>$71,715</td>
<td>$75,445</td>
<td>$79,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1.2 Chief Resident Supplement
A Resident who is appointed a Chief Resident may receive additional salary/stipend supplement during the appointment period in the amount of $150 per month.

Section 1.3 Home Call Stipend
The parties recognize that Residents who train in certain programs must take call from home and report to these sites within times as short as 20 minutes. Other Residents have Risk or Jeopardy that require reporting to a site on short notice. Over the course of their training program, all Residents must report on short notice at some point. All Residents will receive a stipend annually in recognition of this training obligation. Home call stipend is effective as of academic year 2017. It will be paid as a lump sum in the first month of each academic year, except the first year of this agreement, in which it will be paid in the first pay period following ratification. The amounts of the stipend will be as follows:

AY17 - $900

1 Starting training levels may vary for programs with alternative training pathways such as Pain Medicine, Clinical Informatics, Dermatology, Occupational Medicine, Critical Care Medicine, Sleep Medicine, Nuclear Medicine, Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, and Radiology fellowships.

2 Residents who have previously completed clinical training experiences deemed relevant to the current training program may be eligible to receive a one-step stipend increase.
AY18 - $1150

AY19 - $1150

Nothing in this section will preclude individual programs from offering a higher home call stipend.

Section 2. Grant-Funded Stipends
For part of their training period, Residents may be appointed to a position that is funded by a training grant or other source. During this period, Residents will receive a salary/stipend commensurate with the salary/stipend rate established for their training year according to the UW GME Stipend Schedule. For salary/stipend received under certain grants, no income taxes may be withheld. The implications on taxation and benefits may vary as described in the UW GME Stipend & Additional Compensation Policy.

Section 3. Federal/State Grants & Contracts
Nothing in this Agreement may violate any provisions of any federal or state grants or contracts.
Article 24: Subordination of Agreement and Authority

1. Severability. Should any part hereof or any provision herein contained be rendered or declared invalid by reason of any existing or subsequently enacted legislation or by any decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, such invalidation of such part or provision of this Agreement shall not invalidate the remaining portions hereof; provided, however, upon such invalidation the parties agree immediately to meet and negotiate such parts or provisions affected. The remaining parts or provisions shall remain in full force and effect.

2. Authority. This Agreement is intended to supersede and replace the Residency and Fellowship Position Appointment ("RFPA") agreement on any subjects on which the Agreement and the RFPA conflict. The RFPA will remain in effect as an appointment agreement on subjects not covered by this Agreement. Nothing in this article should be construed to alter the parties’ bargaining obligations with respect to changes to mandatory or permissive subjects of bargaining.

3. Adherence. Nothing in this Agreement will be construed to modify or replace any state or national requirements for Resident training or board certification. The parties agree that such state or national requirements are not an appropriate subject for bargaining.
Article 25: Transportation

1. Parking During Normal Business Hours: Residents will have access to parking at University of Washington Medical Center (UWMC), Harborview Medical Center (HMC), Seattle Children's Hospital (SCH), the VA Puget Sound Health Care System (VA), and other training sites. Parking at certain training sites will be provided at no charge; otherwise generally applicable rates will apply.

2. Changes to Parking Rates. Changes to daily parking rates cannot occur without notice and opportunity for impact bargaining. If the University makes a change to parking rates or policy that would require Residents to pay a higher rate than other classified staff at the University, the UWHA will be given notice and an opportunity to bargain the decision.

3. Parking During Nights and Weekends: Residents will have access to parking at no charge during nights and weekends at UWMC, HMC, SCH and the VA.

4. On-Call Parking: Residents will have access to parking at no charge when called into the hospital while on home-call. Details of these provisions may be found in the UW GME Parking Policy.

5. Second-Site Parking: Residents who are required to travel to a second training site in the same day in order to attend conferences, education and administrative meetings, or clinic, will be provided with pre-paid parking or will be reimbursed by their program by submitting a receipt for parking at the second site, if parking fees are in effect at both sites.

6. Travel Allowance: Residents typically have no designated primary workplace, travel at irregular hours (when alternative sources of transportation may not be readily available), and may have assigned duties at several sites during the same rotation, thereby incurring related travel costs not incurred by others. In lieu of itemized reimbursement of travel costs, each Resident will receive a $750 per year travel allowance. This amount will also be provided in full (not prorated) in year one of the contract. Circumstances in which residents are on “travel status” as defined by university policy are not addressed by this travel allowance provision and are handled separately under university travel policies and procedures.

7. Shuttles: Residents are encouraged to use alternative transportation methods including UW Shuttles and Fred Hutchinson Center Shuttles. A list of free shuttles available between University and affiliated institutions and shuttle schedule information is available on the GME website.

8. U-PASS: Residents will have the option of participating in the UW U-PASS program, which provides residents with a variety of low-cost transportation options, including full...
fare coverage on Metro Transit and other local and regional buses, full fare coverage on light rail, free rides on the NightRide shuttle service (local UW campus locations only), discount on Zipcar car-sharing program, and discounts and special offers at many local businesses.

9. **Secure Bicycle Storage:** The University will make a good faith effort to provide free, reliable access to secure bike cages at each UW-operated training site to allow safe storage of bicycles at work.

10. **Bicycle Sustainability:** Residents who bike >80% of a quarter shall receive at the end of the quarter $25 to apply towards bike maintenance to promote continued safe, reliable bicycle transportation.

11. **Emergency/Safe Ride Home Program:** If a situation arises where a Resident is unable to safely get home at the end of or during his/her shift due to extreme fatigue, illness or the late hour, the Resident may use the Emergency/Safe Ride Home Program. This program provides transportation to the Resident’s place of residence via Uber, Lyft or taxi from an approved training site. The GME Office will reimburse 100% of the fare (which does not include tip) within a reasonable time after receipt submission.

12. **University Transportation Committee (UTC):** The University and the UWHA Board recognize the unique transportation challenges and limited flexibility of Residents, given the unique duty hours and unpredictability of the Resident schedule. To this end, the University is committed to considering the unique needs of Residents in the context of discussions regarding all modes of transportation used for commuting and University business, and will advocate for solutions that are responsive to those unique needs at the UTC, which is the primary venue for coordination of transportation issues on the Seattle Campus. The UTC will designate one (1) permanent position on the committee to a UWHA-endorsed Resident plus a designated alternate. Their appointment and term will be coordinated by the UWHA.

13. **UW-UWHA Parking Committee:** The University and the UWHA will assure its commitment to this issue with the formation of a committee for Resident parking to include Resident representation and charged to continue to work for solutions to assure affordable and appropriate access to parking.

14. **Alternative Transportation Incentive:** The University and the UWHA will assure its commitment to supporting alternative transportation options with the formation of a joint task force to develop a Bike Program. The University will support the mutually agreed upon Bike Program by making available $50,000 per year. The program will provide free helmets for all Resident bike riders (as defined by the task force), reimbursement for up to $100 per year in bike maintenance costs, and a free annual memberships to Pronto...
Cycle Share. The allocation of funds will be made by the parties. The final details of fund distribution will be provided by UWHA to the University each year.

15. **Notice**: The University agrees to inform the UWHA as soon possible after the University learns of any modifications to parking policies that may affect Residents. At sites operated by the University, the UWHA will have the option to bargain the impacts of any changes to parking policy that will affect Residents.
Appendix I: Ratification Lump Sum

In the first pay period following ratification of the 2016-2019 contract, Residents will receive lump sum payments in the following amounts:

- Residents in R-year R1-R5 will receive $455.
- Residents in R-year R6-R7 will receive $715.
- Residents in R-year R8 or who Progress at least one (1) training year in accordance with the Progression by Training Year section of this agreement will receive $1430.
**MOU: Academic and Professional Conduct Policy**

Memorandum of Understanding

Between

University of Washington

And University of Washington Housestaff Association

Re: Academic and Professional Conduct Policy

1. The UW will conduct a review of the Academic and Professional Conduct Policy during the 2016-2017 academic year. During the review process, the UW will consult with the UWHA to learn of concerns with the existing process and any suggestions for change. The UW Bargaining Team will also forward its recommendation to the UW that the procedures concerning a program’s decision to not Certify a Resident for Board Application be modified to a) require at least four months written notice of the decision, and b) to allow such a decision to be a reviewable action under the GME Academic Action Review Procedure. These recommendations do not constitute a guarantee of any change(s) to the policy.

____________________  ______________________________
For UW                           For UWHA

F–9.1/211-16
11/10/16
Signatories

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Agreement this ______ day of ______________, 2016.

______________________________  _________ ______________________
For the University of Washington   For the UW Housestaff Association

______________________________  _________ ______________________
For the WA Attorney General’s Office  For the UW School of Medicine

F–9.1/211-16
11/10/16
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

Audit Advisory Committee Update

INFORMATION

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

The University of Washington Audit Advisory Committee was established in January 2014 as an advisory committee to the Board of Regents, its appropriate standing committees, and the University President, or his or her designee, on matters relating to the University’s financial practices and standards of conduct. The committee is responsible for reviewing and advising on any external and internal financial audits and internal controls. The committee may, through its Chair or a majority vote of its members, ask management to address specific issues within the responsibilities of the committee.

As noted in the Board of Regents Governance, Standing Orders, Chapter 4, Section 3, the Audit Advisory Committee will consist of no more than eight members to be appointed by the Board. The Audit Advisory Committee is comprised of both Regent and non-Regent members. Members will be asked to make a minimum commitment of three consecutive years, and will serve at the pleasure of the Board.

As approved by the Board at its September 11, 2014 meeting, the Audit Advisory Committee members are:

- Regent Kristianne Blake (Chair) 9/1/14 to 8/31/17
- Robert L. (Bob) Gerth 9/1/14 to 8/31/17
- Richard D. Greaves 9/1/14 to 8/31/17
- Brandon S. Pedersen 9/1/14 to 8/31/17
STANDING COMMITTEES

Finance and Asset Management Committee

UW Medicine Board Report

INFORMATION

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND

In January 2000, the Board of Regents established a board, known as the UW Medicine Board, to advise the Board of Regents, the University President, and the CEO of UW Medicine/Executive Vice President for Medical Affairs/Dean of the School of Medicine regarding the operation and governance of UW Medicine and to govern the patient care aspects of the University of Washington Medical Center.

Per UW Board of Regents standing order chapter 9 and UW Medicine Board bylaws Article 1 Section 1, the board consists of seventeen members, including the UW President and at least one member of the Board of Regents.

This update is a standing item to provide Board of Regents representatives serving on the UW Medicine Board an opportunity to update the Finance and Asset Management committee about current UW Medicine Board activities, discussions and actions.

UW Regents currently serving on the UW Medicine Board:
Kristianne Blake
Rogelio Riojas
Quarterly Safety Report

INFORMATION

This is an oral report for information only.

BACKGROUND

In March 2016, the Board of Regents established the Safety Update as a standing agenda item to highlight leading safety indicators at the University of Washington. The Safety Update item will focus primarily on the areas of employee, student and patient safety.

Beginning September 2016, the format for this standing item changed. In place of the monthly "indicator" report, President Cauce will provide a brief safety update to Board with relevant highlights from the past month. In addition, an in-depth safety report will be provided to the board quarterly in four key areas: student safety, patient safety, environmental health and safety, and Safe Campus.

FEATURED TOPIC

This month is the first quarterly report. Title IX is the featured topic. Title IX is broader than athletic "gender equity," which is the most frequent context in which Title IX has been discussed by the Board.

This report will include an emphasis on student safety, notably in the area of sexual assault and misconduct. The presentation will include:

- Overview of applicable areas
- Current focus on sexual misconduct
- UW governance structure
- Accomplishments
- Action plan
Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee Update

INFORMATION

For information only.

BACKGROUND

The University of Washington Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee was established in January 2014 as an advisory committee to the Board of Regents, its appropriate standing committees, and the University President, or his or her designee, on matters relating to the University's relationship to federal, state, and local governments and agencies.

As noted in the Board of Regents Governance, Standing Orders, Chapter 4, Section C, the Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee shall consist of no more than eight members to be appointed by the Board. The Chair, Vice Chair, and members shall be recommended by the Governance Committee and approved by the Board after consultation with the President of the University and his or her designee(s).

One or two of the appointed members shall be selected from the Board. The remaining appointed members shall be experienced professionals with relevant backgrounds.

There shall be a three-year term limitation for regent and non-regent members, renewable by the Board. Members will be asked to make a minimum commitment of three consecutive years, and shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

As approved by the Board at its meeting on October 9, 2014, the Governmental Affairs Advisory Committee members are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regent Herb Simon (Chair)</td>
<td>10/1/14 to 9/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regent Joanne Harrell</td>
<td>10/1/14 to 9/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Egan</td>
<td>10/1/14 to 9/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Grinstein</td>
<td>10/1/14 to 9/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob McKenna</td>
<td>10/1/14 to 9/30/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Williams</td>
<td>10/1/14 to 9/30/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quarterly Compliance Report – Information Compliance

This report is for information only.

BACKGROUND

In November 2015, Elizabeth Cherry, Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services, presented a report on the University’s new Structural Compliance Program. Over an 18-month cycle, the Board of Regents will receive a quarterly report from each of the six key institution-wide compliance areas:

• Research
• Health & Safety
• Financial
• Information
• Special Areas (e.g. global activities)
• Civil Rights/Employment

Attachments
1) University of Washington Information Compliance
2) UW Information Compliance Priority Item 1: Student Information and Health or Safety Emergencies
3) UW Information Compliance Priority Item 2: Internet of Things (IoT)
University of Washington Information Compliance

Overview

American public universities have long maintained a tradition of intellectual freedom, transparency, and open access to campus facilities. In today’s world, such access includes virtual access: every student and employee carries a computer (often in the form of a smartphone) and demands connectivity to the internet and to multiple university systems and data. Institutions must now monitor both internal systems and the external environment for threats, hacks, phishing scams, and malicious software.

Universities generate, access, acquire, store, and transmit more information than ever before and have become a frequent target for cyber attackers. The consequences of data breaches can be significant, presenting serious financial, reputational and compliance risks. Government regulators demand compliance with a network of intersecting laws and regulations that pertain to security and privacy. These wide-ranging federal and state laws are constantly evolving to keep pace with technological innovation, and cover personally identifiable information (PII), protected health information (PHI), HR data, student and financial aid data, medical and research data, financial information, and public records. Examples include the Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA) and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA).

The administrative realities of complying with these laws and regulations require significant staffing, training, and budgetary commitments for decentralized public research institutions like the University of Washington. The sheer magnitude of the compliance challenges, and associated complexities and costs, has led universities to contract with third parties to manage or hold sensitive information. These relationships introduce still more complexity into an environment where oversight and governance of information is essential to the institution’s sound functioning.

Information compliance affects every member of the UW community – faculty, staff, students, patients, alumni – and many members of the broader public and the media as well. UW units with information compliance functions include: Office of the Chief Information Security Officer (CISO), Office of Research, Office of Public Records and Open Meetings, Records Management Services, Internal Audit, Office of the University Registrar, Enrollment Management, Human Resources, Office of Academic Personnel, and UW Medicine.

Compliance Services facilitates and supports compliance work across the institution by providing a unifying framework for the University’s diverse compliance obligations and subject matter experts. The framework is based on seven elements that characterize effective compliance programs: 1) leadership and oversight, 2) standards of conduct, policies and procedures, 3) education and outreach, 4) monitoring and auditing, 5) receiving reports and investigating, 6) accountability, incentives and corrective action, and 7) response and prevention.
Compliance Services convenes the subject matter experts for facilitated assessments designed to identify strategies or initiatives that advance the maturity of the University’s compliance functions and emphasize continuous improvement.

**Assessment**

In July 2016, assessment sessions were held with Information compliance subject matter experts representing these areas: public records and open meetings, records management, student and financial aid data, alumni and donor data, human resources data, data safety agreements and data custodians, internal audit, employee benefits, and information technology and security, among them. Through those meetings, two priority items were identified for focused attention over the next 18 months: 1) the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act’s health or safety emergency exception, which allows disclosure of personally identifiable information from an education record if, in connection with an emergency, knowledge of the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or other individuals; and, 2) a burgeoning area, known as the “Internet of Things,” that presents new compliance challenges with regard to data security and privacy.

**The Information compliance assessment was led by:**

- Kirk Bailey | Associate Vice President and Chief Information Security Officer, Office of the CISO
- Elizabeth Cherry | Associate Vice Provost, Compliance and Risk Services
- Sue Clausen | Chief Compliance Officer, UW Medicine, and Associate Vice President for Medical Affairs, UW

**Subject matter experts:**

- David M. Anderson | Executive Director, Health Sciences Administration
- Barbara Benson | Director and University Records Officer, Records Management Services
- Chuck Benson | Assistant Director, Facilities Services
- Richard Cordova | Executive Director, Internal Audit
- Elizabeth Coveney | Associate Vice President, HR Administration and Information Systems, Human Resources
- Laura Dorsey | Senior Technology Manager, Engineering and Sciences, CoMotion
- Walt Dryfoos | Associate Vice President, University Advancement
- Katy Dwyer | Executive Director, Benefits, Human Resources
- Cris Ewell | Chief Information Security Officer, UW Medicine
- Helen B. Garrett | University Registrar and Chief Officer of Enrollment Information Services, Office of the University Registrar
- Joe Giffels | Associate Vice Provost for Research Administration and Integrity, Office of Research
- Kay Lewis | Assistant Vice President for Enrollment and Executive Director of Financial Aid and Scholarships
- Jackie Mynarski | Associate Athletic Director, Compliance, Intercollegiate Athletics
- Ann Nagel | Director and Associate CISO, Office of the Chief Information Security Officer
- Lori Oliver | Director of Legal and Business Affairs, UW Medicine and Associate Vice President for Medical Affairs, UW
Summary of Priority Items

Priority Item 1: Student Information and Health or Safety Emergencies
The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) generally prohibits colleges and universities from disclosing personally identifiable information about a student from education records without the student’s consent. However, FERPA does provide a number of exceptions when disclosure may be permitted even without a student’s consent. One example is in connection with a health or safety emergency, e.g. when a student may be a threat to her/himself, or a threat to others. An institution’s failure to provide appropriate warning about a student who poses a danger can have significant legal and, more importantly, safety ramifications.

Student Life and the Office of the University Registrar will lead an effort to establish clear criteria and procedures for releasing student information in connection with a health or safety emergency, and to review existing University policies to determine appropriate alignment with federal and state laws and regulations.

Priority Item 2: Internet of Things (IoT)
Complex industrial control systems (an aspect of the Internet of Things, or IoT) that collect and share data using sensors, software and the internet are found across campus. These systems control building access, power, lights, water, networked printers, heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC), and more. Due to their reliance on connectivity, they introduce vulnerabilities into existing data security and privacy management mechanisms. This can affect the University’s ability to control access to data, protect health and safety, and ensure compliance with information security and privacy laws and regulations.

To better manage IoT, University stakeholders will: recommend that ongoing, institution-wide IoT oversight be established; identify and mitigate vulnerabilities in existing technologies in use across campus; establish a strategic framework to guide operational decision-making for new buildings or renovation projects; and encourage awareness of and compliance with laws and regulations.

Additional Reading

Challenge Statement
The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) generally prohibits colleges and universities from disclosing personally identifiable information about a student – except for designated “directory information,” which includes physical and email address, phone number, dates of attendance, date of birth, and other personal and academic information – without the student’s consent. However, when a student is a threat to her/himself, or a threat to others, an institution may disclose personally identifiable information from an education record of a student without the student’s consent, if the information is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or others. An institution’s failure to provide appropriate warning about a student who poses a danger can have significant legal and, more importantly, safety ramifications.

Context
FERPA is a federal privacy law that protects students’ education records, as well as personally identifiable information contained in such records. An education record is any record, regardless of its format, that is directly related to a student and maintained by the institution or by a party acting on behalf of the institution.

Student information is available and accessible to many faculty and staff across the institution, all of whom must be made aware of FERPA protections regarding education records that contain such information. Training and education on safeguarding student information, and the circumstances under which it can be released (for example, at the request of the student or in response to a subpoena or public records request), is routinely provided to UW departments and schools.

There is less awareness, however, with regard to FERPA’s health or safety emergency exception, which permits disclosures without student consent when necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or others in an emergency. In the case of an articulable and significant threat, a school official may release student information from the education record to appropriate parties in order to protect the welfare of the student or other individuals. This exception to FERPA’s consent requirement is limited to the period of the emergency and only extends to information needed in connection with the emergency. It does not allow for a blanket release of personally identifiable information from a student’s education record.

Mitigation Plan
Working together, Student Life and the Office of the University Registrar will lead an effort to:

- Establish clear criteria and procedures for releasing student information related to a health or safety emergency, including documenting the articulable and significant threat that formed the basis for the disclosure, and the parties to whom the information was disclosed.
- Coordinate with offices that identify and assess students of concern, and those that provide mental or physical safety support services, including SafeCampus, Health & Wellness, Counseling...
Center, Disability Resources for Students (DRS), Youth Programs Development and Support, Housing & Food Services, and others.

- Review existing University policies to determine appropriate alignment with federal and state laws and regulations regarding the disclosure of student information in connection with a health or safety emergency.

Project Leads
Helen B. Garrett | University Registrar and Chief Officer of Enrollment Information Services, Office of the University Registrar
Ellen B. Taylor | Associate Vice President for Student Life

Relevant Laws and Regulations
Federal

State
- Mental Illness (Exemptions from liability): Chapter 71.05.120 RCW
- Medical Records – Healthcare Information Access and Disclosure (Mental health services, confidentiality of records – Permitted disclosures): Chapter 70.02.230 RCW; see also Chapter 70.02.050(1)(c).
Challenge Statement
Complex industrial control systems that collect and share data using sensors, software and the internet are found across campus. These systems control building access, power, lights, water, networked printers, heating/ventilation/air conditioning (HVAC), and more. Due to their reliance on connectivity, these systems may introduce weakness into the institution’s existing data security and privacy management mechanisms. As a result, individuals with bad intent who are able to compromise industrial control systems can gain access to other UW information systems and data. Vulnerabilities in these systems can affect the institution’s ability to control access to data, protect health and safety, and ensure compliance with information security and privacy laws and regulations.

Context
Internet of Things (IoT) refers not only to industrial control systems, but also to vehicles, machines and devices that collect, send and exchange data via the internet. IoT can support efficiency and innovation in public safety, healthcare, research, and teaching and learning. However, if these complex systems are not implemented with caution and careful planning, the return on investments in IoT functions may not be realized, and exposure to cyber-related risk can increase significantly. Technology is advancing at a very fast rate and being integrated into University buildings and operations without a standardized approach or plan for evaluation, selection, implementation, maintenance, and monitoring.

Decisions about use of technology and vendors for industrial control systems are being made independently by administrative and academic units across campus, but impacts to the institution as a whole are significant. For example, a new building with multiple IoT systems has implications that affect Capital Planning and Development, Information Technology (IT), Facilities Services, as well as multiple end-user departments. Each new system that connects to existing University infrastructure, especially those maintained by third-party vendors, potentially creates a new point of vulnerability.

IoT is a major concern, not only for the UW and other universities across the country, but also for private industry. Regulators have taken note. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) released a report in January 2015, titled Internet of Things: Privacy and Security in a Connected World, which identifies potential security and safety risks related to IoT. Numerous regulations that mandate data security and breach notification already exist; additional laws and regulations responding to IoT-related issues may be forthcoming.

Mitigation Plan
There is no single, comprehensive solution to address IoT-related concerns, and avoidance of IoT systems is not practicable. Risks can be mitigated, however, with a coordinated approach to selection, procurement, installation and maintenance of these systems. To that end, key stakeholders will:
• Recommend that ongoing, institution-wide IoT oversight be integrated into an existing governance group like the Privacy Assurance and Systems Security (PASS) Council or the Information Security and Privacy Board (ISPB). The IoT oversight group will:
  o Acquire a clear understanding of technologies currently in use across campus.
  o Develop a plan to mitigate vulnerabilities in existing systems, establish a strategic framework to guide operational decision-making for new buildings or renovation projects, and encourage awareness of and compliance with laws and regulations.
  o Identify ownership of and responsibility for IoT systems throughout their lifecycle, with a particular focus on those that span multiple units and departments, and those managed by third-party vendors.
  o Include representatives from Facilities Services, UW-IT (central and local), Capital Planning and Development, Office of Planning and Management, Procurement Services, end-user groups, and others to be determined.

Project Leads
Kirk Bailey | Associate Vice President and Chief Information Security Officer, Office of the CISO
Chuck Benson | Assistant Director, Facilities Services

Sample of Relevant Laws and Regulations
Federal

State
• Personal Information – Notice of Security Breaches (Public Records Act): Chapter 42.56.590 RCW
BOARD OF REGENTS MEETING

Resolution Regarding Schedule of Regular Board Meetings in 2017

RECOMMENDED ACTION

It is the recommendation of the Chair of the Board of Regents that the Board approve the following resolution regarding its schedule of regular meetings for 2017.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the bylaws of the Board of Regents and WAC 478-04-030 call for regular meetings, and

WHEREAS, the schedule of meetings is to be established yearly by resolution of this Board,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the regular meetings of the Board of Regents will be held on the following days, dates, times, and locations in 2017, subject to change, with notice being provided of such change by the Secretary of the Board in accordance with the bylaws of the Board of Regents and applicable laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>January 11</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>January 12</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Dempsey Hall, Anthony’s Forum, Room 302</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Governance Standing Committee and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>March 8</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>March 9</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>April 12</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>April 13</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>May 10</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Governance Standing Committee and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>May 11</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Husky Union Building Room 334</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>July 12</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Governance Standing Committee and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>July 13</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Allen Center, Room CSE 691</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>August 9 **</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolution Regarding Schedule of Regular Board Meetings in 2017 (continued p. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>August 10**</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>September 13</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>September 14</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>3:00 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Governance Standing Committee, and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>November 8</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>November 9</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>December 13 **</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>UW – Gerberding Hall, Room 142</td>
<td>Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>December 14 **</td>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>UW – Petersen Room, Allen Library</td>
<td>Standing Committees* and Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting time of regular meetings. The Board will meet on the Wednesdays noted above beginning at 3:00 p.m. or 5:30 p.m. and on the Thursdays noted above beginning at 8:30 a.m., or such later time as may be announced on the Board’s webpage (http://www.washington.edu/regents/) and posted at the Board Office in Gerberding Hall. A portion of each day’s meetings will be allocated to meetings of the Board’s standing committees. The detailed schedule of the day’s meetings will be posted in advance on the Board’s webpage and at the Board Office in Gerberding Hall.

Except as otherwise indicated, the meetings listed above are held at the University of Washington Seattle Campus, Seattle, Washington, at the locations noted above, unless a different location is established and public notice given in accordance with Chapter 42.30 RCW. A map of the Seattle campus can be found at: https://www.washington.edu/maps/

*Standing Committees noted here include the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and the Finance and Asset Management Committee.

**The August, and December meetings may be canceled, circumstances permitting.

Requests for disability accommodation. To request disability accommodation, contact the Disability Services Office at: 206.543.6450 (voice), 206.543.6452 (TTY), 206.685.7264 (fax), or email at dso@uw.edu. The University of Washington makes every effort to honor disability accommodation requests. Requests can be responded to most effectively if received as far in advance of the event as possible.
2016 Candidate Survey

UW Impact conducts a non-partisan candidate survey prior to every Washington State legislative election in order to provide alums and UWAA members with information on the candidates who champion the value of public higher education.

Please see below for your candidates’ answers to UW Impact’s 2016 higher education questionnaire. You may search by candidate name, legislative district and sort information within each column by clicking the arrows to the left of the column header. Answers followed by a green plus sign have expanded content. Click the yes or no answer to see the candidate’s full commentary.

If you do not see your candidate(s) listed below, he or she did not fill out a survey.* Want to urge your candidate to do so? Let us know who you’d like to see, and we will contact him or her directly.

*Indicates an incumbent candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Chamber</th>
<th>Legislative District</th>
<th>Would you prioritize increasing funding to the SNG in 2017?...</th>
<th>Is faculty compensation an issue you would prioritize as a state lawmaker?...</th>
<th>Is expanding access &amp; reducing bottlenecks to high-demand fields like STEM, health care and teacher preparation a priority?...</th>
<th>In your opinion, what is the most important issue facing the future of the UW and public higher education in Washington State, and how do you propose to solve it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Valentine</td>
<td>House, Pos. 1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Access to affordable higher education and a lack of adequate access to programs that lead to filling quality jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Langston</td>
<td>House, Pos. 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>No +</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Access to higher education should be available for all who want to attend. The challenge is finding the funding necessary to keep access open. I am open to new revenue in order to fully fund our basic education and higher education system in our State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shar Lichty</td>
<td>House, Pos. 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Chapman</td>
<td>House, Pos. 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Soto Palmer</td>
<td>House, Pos. 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Affordability and access to higher education are important and critical issues. I would begin by discussing obstacles with students, parents and educators seeking balanced solutions with people who are affected by these issues and also determine what other issues may be hindering public higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Sells*</td>
<td>House, Pos. 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Affordability in Higher Education and education across the board. We will have to raise revenue or take it from somewhere else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Zeiger*</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Affordability is the major issue in public higher education. We can address this by maintaining our state's current tuition limitation policy as passed by the legislature in 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Wyss</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Affordable cost of tuition is a large challenge. Would like to look at the model being used by Purdue University under the direction of...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To browse the candidate survey and more, please visit UWImpact.org