1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Robin Angotti. [Exhibit A]

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]
   d. Council Activities Report. [Exhibit E]

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of March 29, 2021.
   a. Approval of the March 29, 2021, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the April 15, 2021, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approval of a Special Committee to Review Membership on the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]
   b. Approve nominations for 2021-2022 Senate Executive Committee positions. [Exhibit G]
   c. Approve 2021-2022 Schedule of Senate Executive Committee and Faculty Senate meetings. [Exhibit H]

8. Announcements.

   a. Class A Legislation – Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting representation – second consideration. [Exhibit I]
      Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
   b. Class A Legislation – New Faculty Council – second consideration. [Exhibit J]
      Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.
      Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
   c. Class A Legislation – Faculty Council Title Change – second consideration. [Exhibit K]
      Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs.
      Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
   d. Class A Legislation – Housekeeping and the Faculty Code – second consideration. [Exhibit L]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
   e. Class B Legislation – Medical Excuse Notes. [Exhibit M]
      Faculty Council on Student Affairs.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   f. Class B Legislation – Satisfactory Progress. [Exhibit N]
Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

g. Class C Resolution – UW Advisory Body for Safety and Policing. [Exhibit O]

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

h. Class C Resolution – Fossil Fuel Divestment. [Exhibit P]

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

i. Class C Resolution – Reproducibility, openness, and Transparency in Research at UW. [Exhibit Q]

Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

10. Discussion Items.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Approved by: Robin Angotti, Chair
Secretary of the Faculty
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, May 20 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.
This is it, the last meeting of the Faculty Senate in what has been a historical and unprecedented year for the University of Washington. Here we are, at the end of an academic year like no other, with the promise and anxiety of the next academic year looming on the horizon. In many ways, going back to in-person instruction will be as difficult as pivoting to remote instruction. We have all been asking if the phrase “largely in person” is describing the modality of the instruction or if it refers to the weight many of us have put on while foraging through our refrigerators while we were locked at home.

Today we will discuss second consideration of several pieces of Class A legislation which will expand the membership on SCPB, add an additional faculty council for Information Technology and Cybersecurity, change the names of FCMA and FCWA, and deal with some housekeeping issues in the faculty code. We also have several pieces of Class B legislation such as medical excuse notes and legislation from FCAS on satisfactory progress to align Chapter 116 with current institutional practice. We also have no shortage of Class C resolutions. In fact, in the Senate office, we have been joking that it has been like naming hurricanes and we have wondered when we would run out of letters and have to use the Greek alphabet! The fact that there is this much legislation in this last meeting of the year speaks to the incredible amount of work that the faculty councils and the senate staff has done over the last year. The Class C resolutions speak to divestment from fossil fuels, policing, and the importance of reproducibility, openness, and transparency in research at UW.

The end of this extraordinary year brings with it the sadness that we have another year of interrupted ceremonies that celebrate the accomplishments of our students. The students this year were more prepared for virtual graduation than they were last year, but it is still a disappointment to them as well as us. We have nurtured them and helped the move through these few years of their university experience. It seems to lack closure when we can’t watch their moment of completion.

University leadership is working through the details of how we will restart in the fall. There are still many questions left unanswered regarding issues such as modes of instruction and we feel the angst of planning for the unknown, knowing we might have to change all those plans on a moment’s notice. This adds to the pressure as many of us are also trying to use our summer to jumpstart stalled research agendas. Because of the extraordinary events of the last year, we all know that life, work, and school have been changed forever. None of us can predict what the future will bring, but we have shown we are resilient and responsive to whatever situation comes before us. We will adapt. However, we all hope for a return to a more familiar way of life.

It has been a privilege serving with you in this very difficult year. You all have been engaged, informed and willing to participate. It is because of your willingness to serve that shared governance is so strong at the University of Washington. It has been one of the greatest honors of my career to have had the opportunity to serve with you.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. Legislative Representative Positions: Jacob Vigdor has been elected by the Faculty Senate as Faculty Legislative Representative for 2021-2022. JoAnn Taricani has been elected by the Faculty Senate as Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative for 2021-2022.

2. Secretary of the Faculty. The Faculty Senate voted to confirm Mike Townsend as the Secretary of the Faculty for a five-year term beginning August 1, 2021.

3. Senate Elections: Senate elections are nearing completion.

4. Committee on Committees: The Committee on Committees is seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees for 2021-2022. Contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) for further information.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Joseph Janes, Associate Professor, Information School

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

Since our last report, SCPB has met several times and discussed the following topics:

- Spring Quarter is when the annual university budgeting process cycle accelerates as we approach the June meeting of the Board of Regents where they approve the coming fiscal year budget; as such, a good deal of our time is taken up with that.
- A series of updates and discussions on the state biennial budgeting process and progress, including potential federal relief funding both direct and via the state, and impacts on UW budgets
- Consultation on proposals from units for fee-based degree program tuition increases and overall tuition rates for FY 22
- A presentation and discussion on the five-year Facilities plan
- A follow-up discussion with Continuum College in response to SCPB questions regarding the planned revision to their financial model for fee-based programs
- An overview and discussion of the first draft FY 22 budget and consultation with the Provost and Office for Planning and Budgeting on principles for informing decisions on compensation and merit for FY 22
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative  
Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance

The 2021 legislative session concluded on Sunday, April 25th. Let’s wrap up the major developments.

**Overall budget outlook**

The legislature has allocated roughly $884 million in operating funds to the University of Washington for the two-year period beginning July 1, 2021. As of this writing, Governor Inslee has yet to sign off on the budget, and with the power of the line-item veto it’s possible that the final tally will be somewhat smaller. If this holds, the funding for the upcoming biennium represents a significant increase over the two-year period we are about to conclude. Adjusting for inflation, state support for UW still falls about 15% below the high water mark established before the Great Recession.

The legislature also chose to fund UW’s priorities in the capital budget. Overall, this has been a good year for the University in Olympia. As I’ve covered in previous reports, this would have come as a surprise even a few short months ago when revenue projections suggested a need for major belt-tightening.

**Compensation**

The legislature’s final budget retains language that was included in both the House and Senate proposals, indicating that funding levels were sufficient to support a 2% raise for employees who had forgone an increase for the 2020/21 academic year.

Last year, at the request of the governor’s office, faculty merit raises for 2020/21 were withheld and a portion of the savings returned to the state. Unionized (also referred to as “represented”) employees had already negotiated salary increases for 2020/21 and received them.

This past fall, represented employees at UW and throughout state government negotiated contracts for 2021/22 that incorporated significant concessions — salary freezes and furloughs. Governor Inslee’s original budget, released in December, extended the freezes and furloughs to all state employees.

By the time the budgeting mantle passed to the legislature, revenue forecasts had improved significantly. Both the House and Senate proposed to “buy back” concessions that unions had accepted just a few months prior. It was in the context of these “buy back” efforts that the legislature elected to include language explicitly calling out the concessions faculty made in the form of forgone raises for 2020/21.

Current conversations involving central administration, the Board of Deans and Chancellors, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, have introduced the possibility of an across-the-board 2% pay raise for all employees – faculty and staff, unionized and non-unionized. While 2% is better than zero, an across-the-board increase would effectively perpetuate the disparity between represented and non-represented employees that opened up when only the former group received raises for 2020/21. The prospect of restoring parity between the two groups by allowing a higher rate of increase for faculty and non-represented staff in 2021/22 will be a subject of continuing consultation.

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

The legislature passed SB 5227, mandating diversity, equity, and inclusion training for faculty staff and students and periodic climate surveys at all public institutions of higher education statewide. This legislation was modified through the session to address concerns raised by diversity officers, and the legislature allocated funding to defray compliance costs. As your representative I testified in favor of this legislation three times.

The legislature also passed SB 5228, mandating health equity content in the med school curriculum and the reporting of student demographic characteristics by the state’s medical schools.

**Progressive revenue**
The legislature passed SB 5096, introducing a capital gains tax. Taxpayers realizing gains in excess of $250,000 in a calendar year would be required to pay a 7% tax on the amount over $250,000. This highly contentious bill passed the Senate by a single vote. Opponents of the bill promised a court battle and potentially a ballot initiative to repeal the law. The courts may be called upon to determine whether such a ballot initiative can go forward given specific language in the bill. One way or another, the fight is far from over.

**Faculty regent**

Rep. Gerry Pollet introduced a bill to add an 11th member to the UW Board of Regents, drawn from the ranks of the faculty. A similar provision would apply to WSU. This bill was voted out of its originating committee in the House but did not pass the chamber. There will be another chance to pick this up where it left off in the 2022 legislative short session.

**Preview of Coming Attractions**

In the 2022 legislative session expect further discussion of the faculty regent bill and attention to the legislature’s budget supplement, which will play into conversations about the prospects for merit increases in the 2022/23 academic year. There may also be possibilities to advance other policy priorities.

At the beginning of the academic year I circulated a survey to determine faculty priorities for the legislative session. Expect a similar survey to head your way in September!

**Concluding Comments**

The last "in person" Faculty Senate meeting occurred on February 27, 2020. I attended as a candidate for Senate Vice Chair alongside Chris Laws, who would go on to win the election “fair and square.” At that meeting President Cauce noted concerns about the coronavirus. Just two days later, reports would emerge of the first COVID-19 death in the United States, right here in the Puget Sound region.

My commitment to serve as your faculty legislative representative began at the very next Senate meeting, the first to be held fully online, on April 30th. My term has coincided with a period of great strain for this University, and for each of us individually.

It has been an honor to bear witness to your dedication. The pandemic has revealed to us that the mission of the University can be upheld without classrooms or even campuses, so long as we have our people. Without buildings, there can still be research. Without chalkboards, there can still be teaching. Without the ability to physically convene, there can still be service. Without people, however, there is nothing.

I am grateful for your decision to extend my period of service in this post. I look forward to bearing further witness to the great work of this University and doing what I can to perpetuate the fiscal support and policies which make that work possible.
Council Activities Report

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

The council approved Class B legislation revising Scholastic Regulations Chapters 102, 110, and 116.

In addition to the normal business of reviewing program changes, the following are major issues that FCAS has undertaken or recently completed:

- Re-organization of FCAS policies, procedures, and guidelines
- Suspended the English Language Proficiency requirement
- Working on the diversity credit requirement taskforce
- Continued discussions of the transfer admissions issue
- Revised the Athlete Admissions policy

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

The FCBR is interested in addressing the following topics/goals for the academic year:

- Continued review of Academic HR and UWHR policies:
  - Faculty housing assistance programs
  - UWRP
  - Medical leave
  - Retirement patterns and trends

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

The council approved Class A legislation amending the Faculty Code Chapter 29, Section 29-31 and commissioned a report from the 2021 Survey of Lecturers.

The FCFA has also addressed or discussed the following topics/goals for the academic year:

- Data review of individual part-time/temporary lecturers 2021 survey
- Developing a survey of colleges/departments on part-time and temporary lecturers
- Voting rights for faculty on sabbatical leave – in consideration

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

The council approved Class A legislation revising Faculty Code Chapter 42, Section 42-31 to change its name and scope of responsibilities and a Class C resolution Regarding an Advisory Body for UW Safety and Policing.

The FCMA has focused on the following topics/goals for the academic year:

- Hosted a Winter quarter webinar on UW Campus Policing (March 1, 2021) with FCSA
- Developing a Spring quarter webinar on Anti-AAPI Racism (May 4, 2021)
- Council subcommittees focusing on:
  - Recruitment and retention of diverse faculty
  - Diversity statements for all faculty
  - Impacts of COVID-19
  - UW Police
Faculty Council on Research

The council approved a Class C resolution concerning the importance of reproducibility, openness, and transparency in research at UW.

In addition to its normal business reviewing and voting on classified research contracts, the following are other topics/goals that the FCR has focused on during the academic year:

- Drafted a letter to the Provost on a campus wide Allies Program
- Continuing to develop a Class C resolution on Community Engaged Scholarship
- Reviewing the OSP publication restrictions – approval authorities list
- Receiving updates from the Vice Provost of Research search committee
- Frequent updates from the Transparency in Animal Research taskforce

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The council approved Class B legislation revising Scholastic Regulations Chapter 112, Section 1 on the requirement of medical excuse notes.

In addition to its normal business reviewing non-academic student affairs policy, the below are continuing topics of interest that the FCSA has considered during the academic year:

- Received informational reports on DRS, FYP, and ASUW
- Collaborating with FCMA on UW Policing webinar

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

The council approved, with FCUFS, a Class A legislation revising the Faculty Code Chapter 42, Section 42-31 to include a new faculty council and a Class C resolution regarding the reconceptualization of merit.

The FCTL has focused on the following topics/goals for the academic year:

- Data review of faculty survey to collect best practices of reasonable accommodation
- Drafted a Class C resolution from the reasonable accommodation faculty survey
- Continued discussions on lecture capture
- Council subcommittees focusing on:
  - Reasonable Accommodation
  - Merit
  - Academic Integrity
- Continued discussions on Faculty Peer Evaluations & Course Evaluations

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

The council approved Class A legislation revising Faculty Code Chapter 22, Section 22-91 and a Class C resolution regarding the tri-campus relationship.

In addition to its normal business of reviewing all policies across UW Seattle, UW Bothell, and UW Tacoma, the following are major issues the FCTCP has recently completed or considered:

- Faculty Code review of “chancellor” and “dean” language
• Reviewed and approved UW Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination proposed changes for NOPS

Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

The council approved, with FCTL, a Class A legislation revising the Faculty Code Chapter 42, Section 42-31 to develop a new faculty council on technology and a Class C resolution Regarding Fossil Fuel Divestment.

In addition to its normal business of reviewing all policies relating to university facilities and services, the FCUFS also recently completed the following:

• Received the annual classroom report – with impacts from COVID-19
• Updates on P3s projects, West Campus master plan, and FY22-26 Capital Budget
• Reviewed the annual transportation report
• Reviewed building updates from UWT and UWB

Faculty Council on University Libraries

In addition to its normal business of reviewing all policies relating to UW libraries, the FCUL has focused on the following topics/goals for the academic year:

• Updates on Sand Point shelving facility/Space Planning, including earthquake and fire safety
• UW Library funding – in consideration
• Updates on Library budgets and subscriptions review
• Receiving updates from the Dean of the Libraries search committee

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The council approved Class A legislation revising Faculty Code Chapter 42, Section 42-31 to change its name and scope of responsibilities.

The FCWA has focused on the following topics/goals for the academic year:

• Defining “publication” of P&T and developing guidelines for departments
• Continuing discussions and updates on Title IX Training & Education
2021-2022 Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
- Ellen Covey, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
- Mary Pat Wenderoth, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
- Xuegang Ban, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.

Faculty Council on Research
- Mike Averkiou, College of Engineering, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Francis Kim, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Sara Kover, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.

Faculty Council on Student Affairs
- Dean Heerwagen, College of Built Environments, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2022.
- Andrea Carroll, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
- Fred Bookstein, College of Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2022.

Faculty Council on University Libraries
- Julie Nicoletta, UW Tacoma School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.

Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
- Cheryl Greengrove, UW Tacoma School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
Nominations for 2021-22 Senate Executive Committee Positions

Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td>Stephanie Wheeler, Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Dahl, Otolaryngology – Head &amp; Neck Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Edelman, Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Sciences – 2 positions</strong></td>
<td>Maya Sonenberg, English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engineering – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Dan Schwartz, Chemical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other health science colleges (^1) – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment and Built Environments – 1 position</strong></td>
<td>Jan Whittington, Built Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Schools(^2) – 1 position</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Public Health, Dentistry, Pharmacy, Nursing, Social Work  
\(^2\) Business, Education, Evans, Information, Law, ROTC
### 2021-2022
Schedule of Senate and Executive Committee Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autumn Quarter 2021</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>September 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>October 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>October 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>November 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>November 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>December 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter Quarter 2022</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>December 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>January 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>January 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>February 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>February 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>February 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Quarter 2022</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>March 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>March 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>April 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Agenda Deadline</td>
<td>April 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>May 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Meeting</td>
<td>May 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senate** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m.

**Executive Committee** meetings will be held at 2:30 p.m.

**Special Meetings** will occur if necessary to conduct unfinished business or special business of the SEC or Senate.
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 22

Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Code: Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Membership

On January 28, 2021, the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the Faculty Senate.

Background and Rationale

The membership of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting is loosely defined in the Faculty Code as maintaining representation from the colleges, schools, and campuses. In practice, this has usually meant that the membership consists entirely of UW Seattle faculty members. This legislation will ensure that there is always at least one faculty member from UW Bothell, UW Tacoma, and the School of Medicine.

The presidents of the Associated Students of the University of Washington and Graduate and Professional Student Senate are also guaranteed membership (without vote) on the committee. This legislation will also add the student body presidents from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

The Proposed Class A Legislation

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Chapter 22 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below
Section 22-91  Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting

A. The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting shall advise the administration and shall inform the Faculty Senate on long-range planning and on preparation of budgets and distribution of funds with particular reference to faculty concerns. The committee shall be guided by the advice of the Executive Committee and/or the Senate on matters of policy.

B. It shall be the responsibility of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting to report committee activities on a regular basis to, and to seek advice from, the Executive Committee and the Senate. The Chair shall be a member of the Senate Executive Committee.

C. The committee membership shall consist of:

1. Twelve faculty members, including:
   a. The immediate past Chair of the Faculty Senate, who also chairs the committee effective August 1 through July 31;
   b. The Senate Chair;
   c. The Faculty Legislative Representative and Deputy Legislative Representative;
   d. Six at-large faculty members, nomination, election, and replacement of whom shall be governed by procedures set forth in Chapter 42, Section 42-32 of the Faculty Code, and who shall serve three-year terms; in nominating such members, the Senate Executive Committee shall maintain representation from the colleges, schools, and campuses, including at least one representative each from the Bothell, Seattle, Tacoma campuses and the School of Medicine;
   e. The Senate Vice Chair;
   f. The Secretary of the Faculty;

2. The Provost, the Vice Provost for Planning and Budgeting, and a representative of the Board of Deans;

3. One student member nominated jointly by the ASUW and GPSS, and who shall serve a one-year term;

4. The Presidents of the ASUW, ASUWB, ASUWT and GPSS, who shall serve ex officio without vote.

D. Terms of members shall begin on September 16, unless otherwise specified at the time of appointment.


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
February 8, 2021

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
February 25, 2021

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
March 29, 2021
Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 15, 2021

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 3, 2021
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 42

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code: New Faculty Council

On March 4, 2021, the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the Faculty Senate.

Background and Rationale

There are currently eleven faculty councils and they cover a wide range of topics that affect the UW. However, none of the faculty councils directly focus on the use of technology that directly affect the day-to-day lives of faculty, staff, and students. Over the years, as technology has grown more ubiquitous in our everyday lives, responsibility for oversight of the use of technology has been given to various faculty councils. Given the overwhelming use of technology which will only continue to grow, this has significantly increased the workload of faculty councils whose focus is on other issues.

The importance of technology in the academic enterprise and in managing work flow at UW was increasing even before the pandemic. Its importance has grown exponentially since we all started working and teaching from home and this increased importance has brought new focus on the need for a faculty council that will solely focus on technological issues.

A new faculty council on information technology, security, and managing innovation would be able to directly address policy issues relating to the use of technology at the university. Faculty need a stronger voice in how these policies are made and implemented and this new council will help make sure that happens.

Proposed Changes

These are the following changes that are made to the Faculty Code:

- Adding a 12th council in Section 42-31A.
- Encouraging the Senate Executive Committee to make every effort to have at least one representative from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma on each faculty council in in Section 42-32D.
- The duties, powers, and responsibilities of the new council are listed in Section 42-50.
Section 42-31 The Faculty Councils

A. As the principal advisory bodies to the Senate there shall be the following faculty councils:

1. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards;
2. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs;
3. The Faculty Council on Research;
4. The Faculty Council on Student Affairs;
5. The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services;
6. The Faculty Council on University Libraries;
7. The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement;
8. The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy;
9. The Faculty Council on Women in Academia;
10. The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs;
11. The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning;
12. The Faculty Council on Information Technology and Cybersecurity

B. Faculty councils may be abolished and created only by amendment to the Faculty Code.

C. Faculty councils are responsible to the Executive Committee of the Senate.


Section 42-32 Appointment of Faculty Councils

A. Because the faculty councils will be concerned with broad problems of policy relating to matters of University government, the basic qualifications of appointees should include a broad familiarity with the problems of University government, an understanding of the particular problems of the faculty within the framework of the University, and a familiarity with the substance of the particular areas of council responsibility.

B. The Executive Committee shall nominate and the Senate shall approve the appointment of the chairs and members of faculty councils.

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy shall consist of two members from the University of Washington, Seattle; two members, designated by the General Faculty Organization, from the University of Washington, Bothell; two members, designated by the Faculty Assembly, from the University of Washington, Tacoma; and as ex officio with vote: the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Vice Chair of the General Faculty Organization, and the Vice Chair of the Faculty Assembly; and as ex officio without vote: the Faculty Legislative Representative and the Deputy Legislative Representative.

C. At the beginning of each academic year the roster of each faculty council shall be published in the Class C Bulletin. Subsequent changes during the academic year shall also be published in the Class C Bulletin.

D. The Executive Committee may determine the size of faculty councils from year to year, provided only that it make every effort to confine the size of each council to the size required for the effective discharge of its responsibilities. The Executive committee will also make every effort to include at least one member representing the University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma on all the councils.

E. Council members shall serve three-year terms and may be appointed to serve a second consecutive term. Appointments become effective at the beginning of the academic year. When an appointment is
made to fill a position vacated during the academic year, the appointment shall be made as specified in Chapter 41, Section 41-33.

F. Faculty council members shall be deemed to have vacated their seats when they have been absent from three council meetings in an academic year. Council members are considered absent only if they fail, prior to a meeting, to inform the chair of the faculty council or the faculty council analyst of their inability to attend.


Section 42-33 Duties, Responsibilities and Powers of Faculty Councils

A. Faculty councils serve as deliberative and advisory bodies for all matters of University policy, and are primary forums for faculty-administrative interaction in determining that policy. Each faculty council within the area of its jurisdiction:

1. Shall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee all legislative proposals pertaining to matters set forth in Chapter 22, Section 22-32, Subsection A;

2. Shall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee any resolution passed at a faculty meeting falling under Chapter 21, Section 21-51, Subsection D;

3. May on its own initiative prepare legislative proposals or resolutions for submission through the Executive Committee to the Senate;

4. Shall submit to the Senate Chair any report, including annual reports, for transmission to the Senate through the Executive Committee;

5. May receive and make appropriate recommendations, within the limits set forth in Chapter 22, Section 22-32, Subsection B, concerning any communication from a member of the faculty;

6. May request such information and assistance as may be required in the effective pursuit of its duties;

7. May appoint, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, such ad hoc committees as may be required for the effective pursuit of its work;

8. Shall be responsible for providing information and for interpreting or obtaining interpretation of policy regarding matters falling under its jurisdiction;

9. Shall receive reports or recommendations or resolutions from administrative or presidential committees in areas for which it is responsible, and, when appropriate, shall be invited to be represented on those committees.

B. The Senate Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee, shall decide which faculty council shall assume jurisdiction when jurisdictional responsibility may be unclear and shall arrange for coordination among councils in the event that a matter may fall within the responsibility of more than one council.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964; S-A 43, November 14, 1972; S-A 67, December 5, 1983: all with Presidential approval.

Section 42-34 Faculty Council on Academic Standards

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for matters of University policy relating to the academic affairs of the University, such as admissions policy, scholastic standards, university graduation requirements, and inter-institutional academic standards.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964; Senate Executive Committee action, November 30, 1964; S-A 50, January 22, 1976; S-A 73, May 24, 1985: all with Presidential approval.
Section 42-36 Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of the faculty, such as appointment, tenure, promotion, professional leave, compensation (including salary and fringe benefits), academic freedom, standards of academic performance, and professional ethics.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964: with Presidential approval.

Section 42-37 Faculty Council on Research

The Faculty Council on Research shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to research and scholarship.


Section 42-38 Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The Faculty Council on Student Affairs shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to non-academic student affairs such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964 with Presidential approval.

Section 42-39 Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to University facilities and services such as building needs, space utilization, supplies and equipment, administrative services, and parking and traffic problems.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964 with Presidential approval.

Section 42-41 Faculty Council on University Libraries

The Faculty Council on University Libraries shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to libraries such as, but not limited to, collection development; services to students, faculty, and others; the system of libraries, including branch libraries; space needs; and budgetary requirements.

S-A 50, January 22, 1976 with Presidential approval.

Section 42-44 Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to faculty retirement, insurance and benefits.

S-A 89, April 8, 1994 with Presidential approval.

Section 42-46 Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy shall be responsible for matters of academic and non-academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington.

S-A 104, April 9, 2001 with Presidential approval.

Section 42-47 Faculty Council on Women in Academia

The Faculty Council on Women in Academia shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of women.
Section 42-48 Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of faculty of color.


Section 42-49 Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy, both academic and non-academic, relating to improvement of teaching and learning in the University; including distance learning, continuing education, and Summer Quarter, and the use of educational technology in instruction.


Section 42-50 Faculty Council on Information Technology and CybersSecurity

The Faculty Council on Information Technology and CybersSecurity shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to Information Technology and CybersSecurity such as technology used for teaching and learning; videoconferencing; technology relating to hiring, merit, and promotion; collection and use of data; and research. This also entails issues of security and intellectual property regarding the use of such technologies.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
March 29, 2021

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 15, 2021

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 3, 2021
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 29

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code: Faculty Council title changes

On March 22, 2021, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) and the Faculty Council on Women in Academia (FCWA) approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the Faculty Senate.

Background and Rationale

To reflect current efforts in equity and justice, the FCMA and FCWA propose changing their names and descriptions in the Faculty Code. The council names should reflect their work.

Over the past several years, the FCMA’s primary work has been in the realms of race, equity, and justice rather than multiculturalism. Its initiatives to address campus policing and safety, faculty recruitment and retention, and the effects of the pandemic have little to do with multiculturalism. In its shared effort with the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to revamp the undergraduate diversity curriculum requirement, one goal is to move away from a multicultural lens towards a more explicit focus on race, equity, and anti-racism.

Similarly, for several years FCWA has addressed issues of gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity. Its scope goes beyond topics pertaining to women. For example, it has put forward proposals on equity and justice related to Covid-19, parental leave, sexual assault, and gender-neutral bathrooms.

Proposed Changes

These are the following changes that will be made to the Faculty Code:

- The FCWA will be known as the Faculty Council on Gender, Equity, and Justice, and its charge will include matters related to gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity.
- The FCMA will be known as the Faculty Council on Race, Equity, and Justice, and its focus will involve issues related to BIPOC faculty.

Please see the specific language beginning on the next page.
Section 42-31 The Faculty Councils

A. As the principal advisory bodies to the Senate there shall be the following faculty councils:

1. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards;
2. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs;
3. The Faculty Council on Research;
4. The Faculty Council on Student Affairs;
5. The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services;
6. The Faculty Council on University Libraries;
7. The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement;
8. The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy;
9. The Faculty Council on Women in Academia; Gender, Equity, and Justice;
10. The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs Race, Equity, and Justice;
11. The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

B. Faculty councils may be abolished and created only by amendment to the Faculty Code.

C. Faculty councils are responsible to the Executive Committee of the Senate.


Section 42-32 Appointment of Faculty Councils

A. Because the faculty councils will be concerned with broad problems of policy relating to matters of University government, the basic qualifications of appointees should include a broad familiarity with the problems of University government, an understanding of the particular problems of the faculty within the framework of the University, and a familiarity with the substance of the particular areas of council responsibility.

B. The Executive Committee shall nominate and the Senate shall approve the appointment of the chairs and members of faculty councils.

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy shall consist of two members from the University of Washington, Seattle; two members, designated by the General Faculty Organization, from the University of Washington, Bothell; two members, designated by the Faculty Assembly, from the University of Washington, Tacoma; and as ex officio with vote: the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Vice Chair of the General Faculty Organization, and the Vice Chair of the Faculty Assembly; and as ex officio without vote: the Faculty Legislative Representative and the Deputy Legislative Representative.

C. At the beginning of each academic year the roster of each faculty council shall be published in the Class C Bulletin. Subsequent changes during the academic year shall also be published in the Class C Bulletin.

D. The Executive Committee may determine the size of faculty councils from year to year, provided only that it make every effort to confine the size of each council to the size required for the effective discharge of its responsibilities.

E. Council members shall serve three-year terms and may be appointed to serve a second consecutive term. Appointments become effective at the beginning of the academic year. When an appointment is made to fill a position vacated during the academic year, the appointment shall be made as specified in Chapter 41, Section 41-33.

F. Faculty council members shall be deemed to have vacated their seats when they have been absent from three council meetings in an academic year. Council members are considered absent only if
they fail, prior to a meeting, to inform the chair of the faculty council or the faculty council analyst of their inability to attend.


### Section 42-33  Duties, Responsibilities and Powers of Faculty Councils

**A.** Faculty councils serve as deliberative and advisory bodies for all matters of University policy, and are primary forums for faculty-administrative interaction in determining that policy. Each faculty council within the area of its jurisdiction:

1. Shall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee all legislative proposals pertaining to matters set forth in Chapter 22, **Section 22-32, Subsection A**;

2. Shall prepare for submission to the Senate through the Executive Committee any resolution passed at a faculty meeting falling under Chapter 21, **Section 21-51, Subsection D**;

3. May on its own initiative prepare legislative proposals or resolutions for submission through the Executive Committee to the Senate;

4. Shall submit to the Senate Chair any report, including annual reports, for transmission to the Senate through the Executive Committee;

5. May receive and make appropriate recommendations, within the limits set forth in Chapter 22, **Section 22-32, Subsection B**, concerning any communication from a member of the faculty;

6. May request such information and assistance as may be required in the effective pursuit of its duties;

7. May appoint, subject to the approval of the Executive Committee, such ad hoc committees as may be required for the effective pursuit of its work;

8. Shall be responsible for providing information and for interpreting or obtaining interpretation of policy regarding matters falling under its jurisdiction;

9. Shall receive reports or recommendations or resolutions from administrative or presidential committees in areas for which it is responsible, and, when appropriate, shall be invited to be represented on those committees.

**B.** The Senate Chair, after consultation with the Executive Committee, shall decide which faculty council shall assume jurisdiction when jurisdictional responsibility may be unclear and shall arrange for coordination among councils in the event that a matter may fall within the responsibility of more than one council.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964; S-A 43, November 14, 1972; S-A 67, December 5, 1983: all with Presidential approval.

### Section 42-34  Faculty Council on Academic Standards

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for matters of University policy relating to the academic affairs of the University, such as admissions policy, scholastic standards, university graduation requirements, and inter-institutional academic standards.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964; Senate Executive Committee action, November 30, 1964; S-A 50, January 22, 1976; S-A 73, May 24, 1985: all with Presidential approval.

### Section 42-36  Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of the faculty, such as appointment, tenure, promotion, professional
leave, compensation (including salary and fringe benefits), academic freedom, standards of academic
performance, and professional ethics.

*S-A 29, June 8, 1964: with Presidential approval.*

Section 42-37 Faculty Council on Research

The Faculty Council on Research shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of
policy relating to research and scholarship.


Section 42-38 Faculty Council on Student Affairs

The Faculty Council on Student Affairs shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of
policy relating to non-academic student affairs such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social
affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare.

*S-A 29, June 8, 1964 with Presidential approval.*

Section 42-39 Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to University facilities and services such as building needs, space utilization, supplies and equipment, administrative services, and parking and traffic problems.

*S-A 29, June 8, 1964 with Presidential approval.*

Section 42-41 Faculty Council on University Libraries

The Faculty Council on University Libraries shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to libraries such as, but not limited to, collection development; services to students, faculty, and others; the system of libraries, including branch libraries; space needs; and budgetary requirements.

*S-A 50, January 22, 1976 with Presidential approval.*

Section 42-44 Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to faculty retirement, insurance and benefits.

*S-A 89, April 8, 1994 with Presidential approval.*

Section 42-46 Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy shall be responsible for matters of academic and non-academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington.

*S-A 104, April 9, 2001 with Presidential approval.*

Section 42-47 Faculty Council on Women in Academia Gender, Equity, and Justice

The Faculty Council on Women in Academia Gender, Equity, and Justice shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of women, gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity.

*S-A 114, June 9, 2005 with Presidential approval; RC, September 23, 2009.*

Section 42-48 Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs Race, Equity, and Justice
The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs—Race, Equity, and Justice shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) faculty of color.


**Section 42-49 Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

The Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy, both academic and non-academic, relating to improvement of teaching and learning in the University; including distance learning, continuing education, and Summer Quarter, and the use of educational technology in instruction.


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
March 29, 2021

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 15, 2021

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 3, 2021
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 29

Housekeeping and Temporary Amendments

On March 9, 2021, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the Faculty Senate.

Background and Rationale

The online version of the Faculty Code contains an “Introduction,” which includes the following language:

> The University Policy & Rules Office publishes simple housekeeping amendments to the Faculty Code and Governance that correct typographical errors; make address, name, or contact information changes; or clarify language without changing its effect. All housekeeping amendments to the Faculty Code and Governance are first reviewed and approved by the Secretary of the Faculty.

This language is not part of the Faculty Code, and has never been formally approved by the Faculty Senate or the faculty as a whole; but it has been used to justify a number of permanent changes to the Faculty Code without going through the Senate’s usual Class A legislative process. Most of these changes have been merely clerical, but some such changes were more substantive and did not really deserve to be called “housekeeping.” In at least one such case, significant and consequential changes were made to the code with no faculty oversight other than the consent of the Secretary of the Faculty, and an adjudication later ruled that the changes had been inappropriate and must be reversed.

The purpose of the present legislation is to remedy this situation and prevent such occurrences in the future.

What We Propose to Do

This proposed amendment to the faculty code will make the following additions to Chapter 29, which describes the process for amending the Faculty Code:

1. Establish two classes of faculty code changes that can be enacted with an expedited process: "housekeeping changes" and "temporary amendments," with strict limits on what qualifies for either type of treatment. Both classes of changes require approval by the SEC, at least.
2. "Housekeeping changes" are permanent changes, proposed by the secretary of the faculty and approved by the SEC, for the limited purposes of correcting inaccurately transcribed text of the Faculty Code or updating names of officials or addresses.
3. "Temporary amendments" are more substantive changes that need to be enacted quickly, only for the limited purposes of meeting a deadline to comply with laws or regulations, or addressing a state of emergency declared by the governor. They can be enacted by the SEC in order to respond quickly to emergent needs, but then they are strictly time-limited, and require a vote of the full senate in order to continue in effect or to be extended. The senate may not extend a temporary amendment for more than 6 months in any one action, but further extensions are allowed in order to respond to unforeseen changes in the legal situation.
4. Anything that does not fall into one of these two categories must go through the usual Class A process for amending the code.

In addition, there are a few small clarifications to the existing code language, explained in the comment boxes below.

There was an additional category of changes described as “housekeeping” in the Faculty Code Introduction, namely to “clarify language without changing its effect.” In FCFA’s judgment, any such
change is likely to engender controversy over whether the new language changes the effect of the code or not, and thus should go through the usual Class A legislative process. In any case, the SEC is already empowered to interpret sections of the Faculty Code that are not currently the subject of an adjudication. Changes meant to clarify language will no longer be allowed as “housekeeping changes.”

The Proposed Class A Legislation

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Chapter 29 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below. (The paragraphs appearing in boxes are just clarifying comments, and are not part of the proposed amendments.)
Chapter 29: Amendment of the Faculty Code

Section 29-31  Provisions Subject to Amendment

A. Provisions of the Faculty Code may be amended as provided in this chapter.

The change from “21 through 28” to “21 through 29” below is just a correction of a transcription error. Research into the Senate archives has revealed that when this section of the code was enacted, it actually read “21 through 29,” but somehow when it was transferred to the web-based version, it was incorrectly transcribed. Clearly Section 29 (this section) needs to be amendable also.

The change from “-31 through -99” to “-31 and higher” reflects the fact that as the code has become more complex, it has become necessary to add section numbers higher than 99 in some chapters.

B. Subsection A of this section applies to all regularly enacted sections in Chapters 21 through 29 of this edition of the Faculty Code. Such sections are those properly numbered -31 and higher through -99, as specified in the Introduction to the Faculty Code and Governance.

Section 29-34  Executive Committee and Senate Consideration of Amendments

A. After a proposal for amendment of the Faculty Code has been referred to it by the Senate, the Executive Committee at its next meeting:

1. Shall consider any statement of the President concerning the proposal;
2. Shall consider suggestions of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations;
3. May make such changes in the form and substance of the proposal as it deems necessary:
   a. To make the proposal conform with the organization and style of the Faculty Code, and
   b. To avoid conflict with statutes, resolutions of the Regents, and executive orders, or with other provisions of the Faculty Code, and
   c. To avoid disapproval of the proposal by the President.

B. The Executive Committee may submit to the Senate either:

1. The proposal for amendment in the form in which the committee received it, or
2. Both:
   a. The proposal in the form in which the committee received it, and
   b. An alternate proposal embodying changes authorized by Subsection A.3 of this section.

C. The Executive Committee shall place the proposal or proposals for amendment on the agenda either of a special Senate meeting or of the next regular Senate meeting.

The change in the next paragraph is meant to clarify the code’s intent and make it consistent with current practice: if the SEC’s alternate proposal is rejected, then the senate’s only option is an up-or-
down vote on the original proposal. This should make it clear that "considering" the original proposal does not include amending it.

D. If the Executive Committee submits an alternate proposal under the provisions of Subsection B.2 of this section, the first question before the Senate shall be whether it approves or disapproves submission to the faculty of the alternate proposal. If the Senate rejects the alternate proposal, it shall then consider approve or disapprove the proposal originally referred by it to the Executive Committee.

Section 29-39 Housekeeping Changes to the Faculty Code

A. A housekeeping change is a permanent modification of the Faculty Code for one of the following purposes:
   1. To correct inaccurately transcribed text of the Faculty Code, including amendments, or
   2. To update names of officials or addresses.

B. Housekeeping changes may be proposed by the Secretary of the Faculty, and are subject to approval by a majority vote of the Senate Executive Committee. They become effective immediately upon such approval.

Section 29-40 Temporary Amendments to the Faculty Code

A. A temporary amendment is a time-limited modification of the Faculty Code for one of the following purposes:
   1. To meet a deadline to comply with federal, state, or local laws or regulations, or
   2. To address a state of emergency declared by the governor.

B. Temporary amendments may be proposed by the Chair of the Senate or by the President, and are subject to approval by a majority vote of the Senate Executive Committee. They become effective immediately upon such approval.

C. Every temporary amendment must have an explicit expiration date. Ordinarily, the expiration date will be 60 days after the second senate meeting following the Executive Committee’s action. When a temporary amendment is enacted, the Executive Committee may set an earlier expiration date.

D. At the first Senate meeting following the Executive Committee’s approval of a temporary amendment, the Senate must take one of the following actions on the amendment by majority vote:
   1. Affirm the temporary amendment with the original expiration date;
   2. Repeal the temporary amendment; or
   3. Modify the expiration date to a date no more than 180 days after the meeting.

E. At any subsequent meeting of the Senate while the temporary amendment is still in effect, the Senate may, by majority vote, repeal the temporary amendment or further modify its expiration date to a time no more than 180 days after the meeting.
To enact any other modification of a temporary amendment, move the expiration date beyond the limits specified in Subsections D and E above, or convert a temporary amendment to a permanent amendment, the procedures outlined in sections 29-32 through 29-38 must be followed.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
March 29, 2021

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 15, 2021

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 3, 2021
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 112, General Requirements

Background and Rationale

In practice, many UW instructors may currently require that students provide “medical excuse notes” following a short-term absence. These are documents from a medical provider attesting to the severity of the illness and the necessity that the student be absent from class. These notes are required with good intentions: to discourage students from missing class for frivolous reasons and to protect against fraudulent claims of illness. However, this strategy of routinely requiring students to obtain medical excuse notes does little to meet these goals and has unintended, adverse consequences for the student, the medical providers, and the University.

Faculty Senate and ASUW leadership (Board Bill 5.03), in conjunction with colleagues at Hall Health, have identified several key areas of concern:

• Student Safety and Autonomy — Requiring a medical excuse note removes students’ autonomy to responsibly assess and practice self-care for minor ailments and health concerns. Students who see a provider to get a note have a specific objective: to get the note. There is pressure to make sure that the symptoms are presented in such a way that the provider will generate a note. This may result in students not taking care of their symptoms in a timely manner at home or they may exaggerate their symptoms, leading to testing or treatments that incur risk. In either case, and patients may be harmed -physically or financially- as a result. The risk/benefit ratio in these cases is significant. Hall Health promotes responsible self-care and self-reliance among students, including making one’s own determination about when to see a doctor and when to practice self-care for minor ailments and health concerns.

• Financial Burdens and Inequities – Students who are uninsured/underinsured, including low income students, DACA students, and minority students are at a financial disadvantage when seeking medical care. Policies that require a student to seek care for an administrative reason place a financial burden on these students and affect students in unequal ways. Further, there are many online sources to purchase a fraudulent medical note - resulting in dishonest behavior by students who can afford this route, which also highlights financial inequities among students.

• Respecting the identities and safety needs of students — Requiring students to provide a doctor’s note implicitly or explicitly asks students to engage with Western medicine. For students who utilize healthcare traditions that align with other cultural backgrounds, this setting may not be supportive of their identities and practices. Further, Western medical settings in the U.S. have not always been safe spaces for BIPOC, trans, fat, and disabled people, and this precedent continues in many modern medical settings. Requiring students to see a doctor is a gatekeeping mechanism that forces students into a space that may be emotionally perilous and potentially threatening. Removing this requirement eliminates the need for students to enter into a system that may feel unsafe for them.

• Protecting the provider-patient relationship — Lacking omniscience, a provider must rely on the patient’s description of the symptoms. Sometimes this is after the illness has already resolved and the student is only seeking a note. Providers are trained to be advocates for their patients and so a note will be provided almost 100 percent of the time. Thus, a medical excuse note provides no actual confirmation of the veracity, intensity, or duration of a student’s illness, and thus is of no value as a check on student behavior.

• Hall Health Access and Resources — Hall Health is often filled to capacity. Students who don’t really need to be a patient limit access for those who do have a medical need for care. The generation of excuse notes is a wasteful use of expensive and limited health care staff time and resources. Estimates from Hall Health suggest as much as $250,000 annually is spent attending to some 2,500 note requests, and that visits for such requests represent approximately 5 percent of total student visits.
• Education and personal responsibility — The relationship between instructors and students should be focused on classroom behavior and academic performance. Medical information is private, and is no more a part of this relationship than it would be in any other professional context. As students develop intellectually and prepare for their careers beyond college, they should experience an environment that requires personal responsibility and accountability, reflecting the professional realities that they will experience after graduation. An important educational component of college life is developing personal responsibility, self-reliance, and resilience, in addition to professional conduct and communication skills.

Given these serious concerns, the Faculty Senate and ASUW leadership propose the following change to prohibit requests for medical excuse notes by instructors. Of note: limiting routine medical excuse notes would not have any bearing on documentation needed for disability, hardship, or other significant circumstances (including medical conditions) requiring longer term absences from the University; nor would such limitations prevent instructors from requiring students to justify the unavoidable nature of an absence, or require that instructors develop new accommodations. This change is intended to protect students from having to disclose private information to faculty, engage in potentially risky behaviors, or face undue financial and emotional burdens, to conserve resources at Hall Health, and encourage personal responsibility and professional conduct among students.

Nevertheless, changing faculty use of medical excuse notes will have meaningful impacts on many courses across all three campuses. This change will encourage consideration of the rationale behind using medical excuse notes and how to replicate or improve upon the pedagogical role of such documentation. Ideally, this may lead to collegial and department-level conversations on classroom management strategies that will benefit faculty and students. Eliminating medical excuse notes will also change student-faculty communication and facilitate development of more realistic expectations and conduct necessary in the professional, post-college world.

Many faculty members have already abandoned the practice of requiring medical excuse notes for short-term absence. Drawing on their experience, as well as the expertise of the Center for Teaching and Learning and the University of Washington Office of the University Registrar, a set of best practice guidelines that protect students, support evidence-based pedagogy, and maintain instructors’ rights and authority have been developed. These guidelines offer templates for syllabus language and student requests for adjustments, organizational and pedagogical strategies, and an FAQ section addressing concerns about this change. This supportive framework, along with more information about this new policy, related scholastic regulations, examples of unavoidable absences, references to provisions for dropping classes, changing grade status to S/NS, the leave of absence provision for long-term illness, and a complaint procedure for students who may be denied a request for a reasonable adjustment, is available to students, as well as current and future instructors on the University of Washington Office of the University Registrar’s website.

---

Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 112

1. General Requirements

B. A student absent from any examination or class activity through sickness or other cause judged by the instructor to be unavoidable shall be given an opportunity to take a rescheduled examination or perform work judged by the instructor to be the equivalent. If the instructor determines that neither alternative is feasible during the current quarter, the instructor may exempt the student from the requirement. Examples of unavoidable cause include death or serious illness in the immediate family, illness of the student, and provided previous notification is given, observance of regularly scheduled religious obligations and might possibly include attendance at academic conferences or field trips, or participation in University-sponsored activities such as debating contests or athletic competition. Instructors may require written communication from students in making these determinations, but instructors are
prohibited from requiring, and students should not provide, medical documentation as proof of short-term
illness to justify an absence. The regulations for Incompletes in Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 110,
Subsection 1.A.3 shall apply.

S-B 110, May 26, 1970; S-B 112, October 27, 1970; S-B 140, December 1982; S-B 155, June 18, 1993:
24 all with Presidential approval.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
May 3, 2021
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 116, Satisfactory Progress

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 116 (Satisfactory Progress) based on the following findings:

- In 2012, FCAS approved a policy on Satisfactory Progress designed to allow fair access to as many eligible applicants as possible each year while enabling students, who so choose, to have a four-year college experience beyond high school.
- This policy has been working well since implementation.
- The proposed updates to this chapter would align it with current institutional practice.

Student Governance and Policies

Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 116

Satisfactory Progress

Students admitted to the University to pursue baccalaureate degrees are expected to make satisfactory progress toward the attainment of that degree, and are expected to enter a major and graduate after a reasonable number of credits and academic satisfactory progress quarters have been completed.

1. The term academic satisfactory progress quarter is defined as a quarter that occurs during the academic year, specifically Autumn, Winter, and Spring quarters. A student admitted using the freshman application is considered to have completed zero academic satisfactory progress quarters. A student admitted using a transfer application who has completed less than a year of college coursework is considered to have completed zero academic satisfactory progress quarters. A student admitted using a transfer application who has completed one year of college coursework is considered to have completed three academic satisfactory progress quarters. A student admitted using a transfer application who has completed two or more years of college coursework is considered to have completed six academic satisfactory progress quarters.

2. By the time undergraduate students have completed 105 credits and five academic satisfactory progress quarters, they either must be accepted in their major or have a hold placed against their registration or have their pre-major status extended temporarily by an adviser.

3. By the time undergraduate students have completed 165 credits and 11 academic satisfactory progress quarters, they either must file an application for Baccalaureate Degree or a hold will be placed against their registration, unless a graduation plan extension has been approved by their degree granting unit. Completing a minor, completing requirements for graduate or professional programs, or enrolling in an additional major or degree program is not grounds for an exception.

4. Students shall graduate with their first baccalaureate by the time they have completed 30 credits beyond the credits required for the first degree or concurrent degrees and 12 academic satisfactory progress quarters. Departmental advisers may grant extensions beyond the 30-credit limit. Students who exceed this limit will have their registration blocked for all future quarter except summer unless the degree granting unit has approved an extension.

5. Postbaccalaureate students are expected to be preparing for admission into a degree program, seeking an additional bachelor’s degree, or working toward a certificate. Students admitted as
“postbaccalaureate-undeclared” must declare a major by the time they have earned 30 credits beyond their last degree, and once a degree objective has been declared, must make progress toward that degree as evidenced by the courses they have completed satisfactorily. **Degree granting units** College **advisers** may grant extensions beyond the 30-credit limit.

4. Students who do not declare a major by the time they have earned 105 credits, or who have exceeded the graduation credit limits, or who have not been accepted in a major as fifth-year or postbaccalaureate students, will have a “hold” placed against registration, beginning the following quarter.

5. The Committee on Admissions and Academic Standards may terminate a student's enrollment if the student demonstrates lack of academic progress as evidenced by repeated course(s) or University withdrawals and cancellations. The student may be reinstated with the approval of the student's college and the committee. EOP students may be reinstated in consultation with the Office of Minority Affairs.

*S-B 147, January 20, 1987 with Presidential approval.*

*Approved by:*

*Senate Executive Committee*

*May 3, 2021*
Class C Resolution Regarding an Advisory Body for UW Safety and Policing

WHEREAS, the recent and past police killings of Black, Indigenous, and people of color (BIPOC) in the United States have created an environment of anxiety, mistrust, and outrage for the BIPOC community and its allies; and

WHEREAS, the frequency of police violence directed against Black Americans has caused feelings of fear, despair, and vulnerability that come with experiencing continuous, historical racialized trauma; and

WHEREAS, living in neighborhoods with high levels of invasive policing is associated with physiological effects and physical illness in BIPOC community members; and

WHEREAS, the national Movement for Black Lives has invited the UW community to uphold the values of justice, equity, and anti-racism; and

WHEREAS, racial inequities persist within every level of UW’s tri-campus learning environment, and such inequities interfere with the academic mission of the University and its ability to disseminate knowledge; and

WHEREAS, the university’s safety and policing organizations include the UW Police Department (UWPD) and SafeCampus in Seattle; UW Tacoma Campus Safety & Security; and the UW Bothell Campus Safety Department; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in June 2020 passed a Class C Resolution calling on the university to divest from local law enforcement agencies, disarm the UWPD, and reimagine a safe campus; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) held a summer 2020 tri-campus panel discussion on eliminating the role of law enforcement officers in the day-to-day experiences of students, faculty, and staff; and

WHEREAS, the FCMA and the Faculty Council on Student Affairs jointly hosted a spring 2021 tri-campus forum to explore the UW’s progress in reimagining a safe campus and to consider next steps; and

WHEREAS, the university has taken positive and meaningful action to advance campus safety and security, and the Faculty Senate believes that further steps are needed to advance safety and to hear the voices of the community; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate calls on the university to create a campus safety and policing advisory body composed of faculty, students, staff, and members of the community at large. The advisory body, on behalf of the UW community and its neighbors, shall meet on a regular basis and provide meaningful input to the president and leaders of campus safety and policing organizations regarding:

1. The accountability of the campus safety and policing organizations, including the review of actions taken in cases of alleged misconduct.
2. Cooperation or coordination of the campus safety and policing organizations with the FBI and other law enforcement agencies.
3. The regularly scheduled union contract negotiation process.
4. Hiring the leaders of the campus safety and policing organizations.
5. The jurisdiction of the campus safety and policing organizations.
6. The reduction of armed police in the UWPD and redirection of funds to health and wellness.
7. The increased responsibility of SafeCampus for wellness checks, victims’ advocates, and other aspects of campus safety, including the response to sexual assaults.

8. Creative ways of improving campus safety.

9. Transparency and streamlined communication with all stakeholders, including the timely release of information legitimately requested by members of the public.

10. Any other issues that pertain to the role of the campus safety and policing organizations in the wellness of the community.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate will continue to address issues of racial injustice during the 2021-2022 academic year.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
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Class C Resolution Regarding Fossil Fuel Divestment

WHEREAS, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reported in 2018 that "... human-induced warming reached 1°C above pre-industrial levels around 2017 and, if this pace of warming continues, would reach 1.5°C around 2040" (1); and

WHEREAS, the estimated economic damages of such a rise in atmospheric temperatures would be $54 trillion (1); and

WHEREAS, the damages from climate change, which will accrue principally in communities with low historical greenhouse gas emissions, represent the "largest health inequity of our time" (2); and

WHEREAS the University of Washington Board of Regents Statement of Ethical Principles states "...it is our responsibility to hold ourselves and one another to the highest ethical standards, guiding our quests for the discovery and dissemination of knowledge and the conduct of other University affairs with a deep respect for the rules and societal standards that define the right way to conduct our work" (3); and

WHEREAS the Statement of Ethical Principles later reads “As stewards of University resources, we each have a responsibility to ensure that all assets under our control are used prudently, ethically, and for their designated purposes…”(3); and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington has recognized its part in confronting climate change by signing the American College & University Presidents’ Climate Commitment (4), the Washington Business Climate Declaration (5), and the “We Are Still In” letter (6); and

WHEREAS, The University of Washington divested from only thermal coal in 2014, and have yet to take public actions towards further divestment from fossil fuels (7), (defined to include, but not limited to: coal, natural gas, and/or any other petroleum-based fuel, as well as extraction, refinement, distribution, use, or digital support for those processes); and

WHEREAS, many of the University of Washington’s peer institutions have pledged to or have already fully divested from fossil fuels; these institutions include the University of Hawaii, Oregon State University, University of Oregon, University of British Columbia, and the University of California system (8); and

WHEREAS, divestment from all fossil fuels is currently not a part of the University of Washington’s Climate Action or Sustainability plans; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington student body has called for divestment for all fossil fuels through resolutions passed by the Associated Students of the University of Washington and the University of Washington Graduate and Professional Student Senate; and

WHEREAS, the University of California’s chief investment officer stated that the University of California divested from fossil fuels because maintaining the investments posed a significant financial risk (9); and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington’s continued investment in fossil fuels not only promotes the continued emission of fossil fuels and hinders necessary changes to renewable energy sources but puts in jeopardy the University’s pension and endowment funds; and
WHEREAS, the University of Washington Regents have requested input from the University of Washington faculty regarding its position regarding fossil fuel divestment; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of the University of Washington calls on the University of Washington Board of Regents to publicly announce that climate change is an ethical and population health crisis and therefore to commit to using all available means at its disposal to respond to the threat by decarbonizing the university’s investments, operations, procurement contracts, and supply chain.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate supports the University of Washington no longer investing in the fossil fuel industry (defined to include, but not limited to: coal, natural gas, and/or any other petroleum-based fuel, as well as extraction, refinement, distribution, use, or digital support for those processes) in its endowment, whether in the form of Bonds, Stocks, Mutual Funds, Hedge Funds, Private Equity or Venture Capital that supports the fossil fuel industry or Assets and Real Estate related to the fossil fuel industry; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate calls on the University of Washington to divest all current holdings and investments in the fossil fuel industry from its endowment, pensions or otherwise, before or no later than fiscal year 2025; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate supports the University of Washington allocating at least 2.5% of the financial investments held in its endowment towards sustainable solutions, through 1) mutual funds screened to assure no involvement in the fossil fuel industry, 2) reinvesting in renewable energy projects, 3) investments in climate change mitigation technologies, 4) capital projects, 5) real assets, or 6) revolving loan funds for sustainable and climate smart development on or off campus.

Approved by:
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Class C Resolution Regarding the Importance of Reproducibility, Openness, and Transparency in Research at UW

WHEREAS, the primary mission of the University of Washington is the advancement, dissemination and preservation of knowledge; and

WHEREAS, there is growing evidence that nearly every field is affected by the problem of studies that are difficult or impossible to replicate or reproduce. This slows progress in research and diminishes public trust in science.

WHEREAS, many institutions and research communities are recommending or requiring practices that improve the reproducibility, transparency and openness of research that:

- Ensures the reliability of knowledge and facilitates the reproducibility of results
- Improves the efficiency and creativity of knowledge creation
- Expands access to knowledge and to the research enterprise

WHEREAS, the reports by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 'Reproducibility and Replicability in Science' (2019) and 'Open Science by Design' (2018) recommend:

- To help ensure the reproducibility of computational results, researchers should convey clear, specific, and complete information about any computational methods and data products that support their published results in order to enable other researchers to repeat the analysis, unless such information is restricted by nonpublic data policies.
- Educational institutions should educate and train students and faculty about computational methods and tools to improve the quality of data and code and to produce reproducible research, and create a culture that actively supports open science by design.

WHEREAS, many public and private funders have introduced mandates to ensure that the data and methods underlying articles are available

WHEREAS, the University of Washington Libraries has established an online, freely accessible and searchable data repository, ResearchWorks at the University of Washington (ResearchWorks), for the dissemination and preservation of scholarly works published by members of the University community; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate requests that:

1. UW researchers include brief statements in their published work that attest to the reproducibility, transparency and openness of their research whenever possible, and in a manner consistent with the best practices of their research community.
2. UW instructors draw on best practices in their communities to teach students integrity in empirical research by informing students of the principles, methods, and tools that will enhance the reproducibility, transparency and openness of work produced by future generations of researchers. Instructors are recommended to consult with the UW Center for Teaching and Learning for guidance on specific challenges in teaching concepts and skills of reproducible, transparent and open research.
3. UW researchers and instructors consult the UW Libraries’ resource page on reproducibility to learn more about improving the computational reproducibility of their research, and consult with Data Scientists at the UW eScience Institute for guidance on specific challenges in making their computational work reproducible.
47  4. The Provost's Office provides resources to the University of Washington Libraries to improve the UW's institutional data repository to support the reproducibility, transparency and openness of UW research, according to their previous assessments.
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FAQ

Q: What is the evidence that nearly every field is affected by studies that are difficult or impossible to replicate or reproduce?

A:

- **Economics**: Reinhart and Rogoff, two respected Harvard economists, reported in a 2010 paper that growth slows when a country's debt rises to more than 90% of GDP. Austerity backers in the UK and elsewhere invoked this many times. A postgrad failed to replicate the result, and Reinhart and Rogoff sent him their Excel file. They had unwittingly failed to select the entire list of countries as input to one of their formulas. Fixing this diminished the reported effect, and using a variant of the original method yielded the opposite result than that used to justify billions of dollars' worth of national budget decisions. A systematic study of economics found that only about 55% of studies could be reproduced, and that's only counting studies for which the raw data were available (Vilhuber, 2018)

- **Cancer biology**: The Reproducibility Project: Cancer Biology found that for 0% of 51 papers could a full replication protocol be designed with no input from the authors (Errington, 2019). Not sharing data or analysis code is common. Ioannidis and colleagues (2009) could only reproduce about 2 out of 18 microarray-based gene-expression studies, mostly due to lack of complete data sharing.

- **Artificial intelligence**: (machine learning) A survey of reinforcement learning papers found only about 50% included code, and in a study of publications associated with neural net recommender systems, only 40% were found to be reproducible (Barber, 2019).

- **Wet-lab biology**: Researchers at Amgen reported shock when they were only able to replicate 11% of 53 landmark studies in oncology and hematology (Begley and Ellis, 2012). A Bayer team reported that ~25% of published preclinical studies could be validated to the point at which projects could continue (Prinz et al., 2011). Due to poor computational reproducibility and methods sharing, the most careful effort so far (Errington, 2013), of 50 high-impact cancer biology studies, decided only 18 could be fully attempted, and has finished only 14, of which 9 are partial or full successes.

- **Social sciences**: 62% of 21 social science experiments published in Science and Nature between 2010 and 2015 replicated, using samples on average five times bigger than the original studies to increase statistical power (Camerer et al., 2018). 61% of 18 laboratory economics experiments successfully replicated (Camerer et al., 2016). 39% of 100 experimental and correlational psychology studies replicated (Nosek et al., 2015). 53% of 51 other psychology studies (Klein et al., 2018; Ebersole et al., 2016; Klein et al. 2014)

- **Medicine Trials**: Data for >50% never made available, ~50% of outcomes not reported, author-held data lost at ~7%/year (Devito et al., 2020)

Q: What are examples of practices that many institutions and research communities are recommending or requiring to improve the reproducibility of research?

A:

- Over 1,100 scholarly journals have implemented the ‘Transparency and Openness Promotion Guidelines’ of the Center for Open Science: [https://www.cos.io/top](https://www.cos.io/top). These allow a journal to clearly communicate its standards for transparency, openness, and reproducibility.
- UK Research and Innovation requires funded researchers to include a statement in their journal articles which provides information on how third parties can access any underpinning research data.

- The UK Reproducibility Network is ten universities working to align their staff with open-science initiatives — reproducibility sections in grant applications and reporting checklists in article submissions, for example. They are also cooperating to consider larger changes, from training to hiring and promotion practices. [https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03750-7](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-03750-7)

- The University of Sheffield [statement on Open Research](https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/our-research/solutions/principles/open-access) which has the following expectations of researchers:
  - Open access for outputs. Strive to make all scholarly outputs freely available, e.g. for scholarly articles via preprint platforms, at the time point of journal publication if not before; for other outputs via appropriate repositories at the earliest possible point.
  - Open data. Data underlying publications to be made openly available and FAIR where legally, ethically, and technically possible, as well as referenced via a data access statement in the publication.
  - Licensed. Adopt copyright licenses which support sharing and reuse for research outputs including data, code and publications, where possible
  - Transparent research methods. Share process and methods used in obtaining and evaluating research results, as appropriate to particular projects and disciplines (e.g. by publishing research software using best practice techniques for reproducibility, by preregistering protocols and analyses in advance of data collection when appropriate).

- The University College London Office of the Vice-Provost (Research) has a [UCL Statement on Transparency in Research](https://www.ucl.ac.uk/research/transparency-in-research) that recommends their researchers:
  - make their research methods, software, outputs and data open, and available at the earliest possible point, according to statements such as the Berlin Declaration
  - describe their data according to FAIR Data Principles, ensuring that it is Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable
  - deposit their publication, data and software outputs in open access repositories

- The University of Bristol has a [Research data management and open data policy](https://zenodo.org/record/4049968) that encouraging researchers to publish data in an appropriate digital format (i.e. non-proprietary) wherever possible, in order to facilitate data re-use

- [https://zenodo.org/record/4049968#X3DITGIlCNw](https://zenodo.org/record/4049968#X3DITGIlCNw)

- The high-energy physics community have adopted policies and practices to facilitate data sharing at large scales to enable reproducible research: [https://www.nature.com/articles/s41567-018-0342-2](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41567-018-0342-2)

- The [American Journal of Political Science](https://www.ajps.org) (AJPS) has a Replication & Verification Policy that requires scholars to incorporate reproducibility and data-sharing into the academic publication process. Acceptance of a manuscript for publication in the AJPS is contingent on successful replication of any empirical analyses reported in the article: [https://ajps.org/ajps-verification-policy/](https://ajps.org/ajps-verification-policy/)

- [Nature Communications](https://www.nature.com/articles) requires authors to supply for publication the source data underlying any graphs and charts, and uncropped, unprocessed scans of any blots or gels: [https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-06012-8](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-06012-8)

Q: What are some examples of public and private funders that have introduced mandates to ensure that the data and methods underlying articles are available
A: The Sherpa Juliet database indicates that 12 public and private funding agencies in the US mandate data archiving as a condition of receiving funds:
https://v2.sherpa.ac.uk/view/funder_by_data_req/requires.country.html

The White House's Office of Science and Technology Policy issued a memo in 2013 directing all federal agencies that provide $100 million or more in research funding to come up with plans requiring grant recipients to share the results of their research with the public. Sixteen federal agencies the give research grants have adopted policies such as Data must be openly available at the time of acceptance of research manuscript' https://guides.library.unr.edu/openaccess/mandates

Q: What does reproducibility, openness, and transparency mean, and how do they relate to similar concepts?

A: Is important to be aware that the definitions of some of these terms vary from one research community to another. For example, the definition of ‘reproducibility’ and ‘replicability’ have opposite meanings in some disciplines, see chapter six of the NASEM report for more discussion of this: https://www.nap.edu/read/25303/chapter/6

Transparency: Research is transparent if the methods, analysis and data are reported and disseminated openly, clearly and comprehensively.

Reproducibility: The findings of a research study are reproducible if they can be obtained in an independent study using the same methods and data as those used in the original study. cf. https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.03311

Openness: The sharing of resources and ideas, with emphasis on making these publicly and freely available for future use. cf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5066505/

Integrity: Research has integrity if it has been conducted, analysed, reported and disseminated honestly and to a high standard, ensuring that the research and its findings can be trusted.

Replicability: A research study is replicable if its results can be obtained in an independent study using the same methods as those in the original study, but using different data or a new context.

Robustness: Research findings are robust if they can be consistently produced a) across a range of tests within a research study, and/or b) across different research studies that involve variations in assumptions, variables or procedures.

Computational reproducibility: the ability to take the raw data from a study and re-analyze it using only a computer to reproduce the final results, including the statistics. cf. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aah6168

Empirical reproducibility: when detailed information is provided about non-computational empirical scientific experiments and observations. In practise this is enabled by making data freely available, as well as details of how the data was collected and analysed, such as laboratory protocols, reagents, organisms, etc.

Q. What are some data repositories that are currently used by researchers that we can use right now?

A: Here is a spreadsheet listing data repositories (currently 108) that are recommended by the journal Scientific Data (Springer Nature) as being suitable for hosting data associated with peer-reviewed articles in any journal: http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.1434640.

The Registry of Research Data Repositories is a global registry of research data repositories funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). It covers research data repositories from different academic
It presents repositories for the permanent storage and access of data sets to researchers, funding bodies, publishers and scholarly institutions, and can be searched here: http://service.re3data.org/search

Here are links to lists of data repositories recommended by Scientific Data, organised by research area:

- **Biological sciences**: Nucleic acid sequence; Protein sequence; Molecular & supramolecular structure; Neuroscience; Omics; Taxonomy & species diversity; Mathematical & modelling resources; Cytometry and Immunology; Imaging; Organism-focused resources
- **Health sciences**
- **Chemistry and Chemical biology**
- **Earth, Environmental and Space sciences**: Broad scope Earth & environmental sciences; Astronomy & planetary sciences; Biogeochmesty and Geochemistry; Climate sciences; Ecology; Geomagnetism & Palaeomagnetism; Ocean sciences; Solid Earth sciences
- **Physics**
- **Materials science**
- **Social sciences**
- **Generalist repositories**
- **Other repositories**

Q. How do these recommendations compare to current requirements from NIH and NSF?

The current NIH policy on research data sharing is that “Data should be made as widely and freely available as possible while safeguarding the privacy of participants, and protecting confidential and proprietary data. To facilitate data sharing, investigators submitting a research application requesting $500,000 or more of direct costs in any single year to NIH on or after October 1, 2003 are expected to include a plan for sharing final research data for research purposes, or state why data sharing is not possible.”

This resolution goes beyond the NIH data sharing requirements by asking researchers to:
- Share data from projects requesting less than $500,000 from the NIH
- Share data via a trustworthy research repository, not ‘under the auspices of the PI’ or ‘available from the corresponding author on reasonable request’. Exceptions include restricted datasets, which should be shared according to best practices in the field.
- Include in publications a statement about data sharing that includes a DOI to the data discussed in the paper or a note about restrictions to data access.

The current NIH policy on reproducibility is that grant applications are expected to show 1) the scientific premise forming the basis of the proposed research, 2) rigorous experimental design for robust and unbiased results, 3) consideration of relevant biological variables, and 4) authentication of key biological and/or chemical resources. In brief, the policy is aimed specifically at rigor and transparency, and focused on good experimental design and reporting. It emphasises empirical reproducibility and has only limited guidance on statistical and computational reproducibility.

This resolution goes beyond the NIH reproducibility requirements by asking researchers to make a statement in NIH-funded publications about how the statistical and computational parts of their data analysis and visualisations can be inspected and reproduced by others. One example of how this may be accomplished is to include in the text of the article a DOI linking to a trustworthy repository that contains the Python or R code used to produce the results reported in the paper.
The NSF data sharing policy that states “Investigators are expected to share with other researchers, at no more than incremental cost and within a reasonable time, the primary data, samples, physical collections and other supporting materials created or gathered in the course of work under NSF grants. Grantees are expected to encourage and facilitate such sharing. … Proposals must include a supplementary document of no more than two pages labeled “Data Management Plan”. Individual directorates and divisions provide more detailed guidance on preparation of data management plans.

This resolution goes beyond the NSF data sharing requirements by asking researchers to:

- Share digital data files via a trustworthy research repository, not ‘under the auspices of the PI’ or ‘available from the corresponding author on reasonable request’. Exceptions include restricted datasets, which should be shared according to best practices in the field.
- Include in publications a statement about data sharing that includes a DOI to the data discussed in the paper or a note about restrictions to data access.

The NSF has not yet introduced standards and guidance directly aimed at enhancing reproducibility, openness, and transparency in its application process, as NIH has. Several of NSF’s directorates have also issued “dear colleague letters” in recent years that encourage submission of proposals addressing certain aspects of reproducibility and replicability, including the Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences, the Directorate for Computer and Information Science and Engineering, and the Geosciences Directorate.