Minutes (Video Recording)
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, April 15, 2021, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda. (Video Time Stamp 00:00:00 -- 00:00:23)

The meeting was called to order at 2:31 P.M.

Without objection, the agenda was approved.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Robin Angotti. (00:00:23—00:01:24) [Exhibit A]

Angotti referred members to her prepared video presentation, and she emphasized her trip to the Tacoma campus.

3. Reports and Opportunity for Questions. (00:01:25 – 00:09:59)
   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. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative – Alexes Harris, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences. [Exhibit E]

Alexes Harris, Faculty Athletic Representative, Department of Sociology, presented a report, summarizing her role and referring members to the material in the Exhibit as well as a prepared video.

In response to questions, several points were made. Harris pointed out that the changing legal landscape is leading to an increased professionalization of college athletics. For example, recent court decisions recognize student-athlete rights to commercially exploit their name, image, and likeness (“NIL”). States and colleges are working on policies implementing these rulings. Many schools are hoping and waiting for national guidance from Congress and/or the NCAA on the issue. In addition, the US Supreme Court is hearing a separate case relating to increased financial support that can be given by schools to student athletes. Harris noted that there has been some student-athlete grade fall off during the COVID crisis. Harris noted the effect of recent societal events on student-athletes, and she asked that all faculty be aware of the issue for all students. President Cauce echoed these sentiments.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce. (00:10:00 – 00:33:05)

President Cauce acknowledged the hard work put in by all members of the community during the COVID crisis. She said that transitioning back will be difficult. The Autumn course schedule will be forthcoming, and the expectation is that all but the largest classes will be in person. She said that this expectation is predicated on widespread vaccinations and no COVD spikes. She added that the University will be ready to pivot back if necessary. Every effort will be made to accommodate faculty members for whom in-person work is problematic and attention will have to be paid to faculty who have fallen behind the normal career trajectory because of COVID-related hurdles. She hoped that faculty will accommodate student accessibility requests, including things like lecture capture. Masks will be required, and the University will be making a final decision on requiring vaccines, but the expectation will be that students, in the absence of a religious or medical reason, will vaccinate. Polls show that students want to be vaccinated. Because enforcement of any requirement would be very difficult, there will be a focus on providing incentives for vaccination and making vaccination easy. Some of those difficulties include the lack of a national vaccination registry, deciding which vaccines would suffice, the ability to self-attest to a religious or medical exemption, the question of whether boosters would be required, and the practical problem of stopping non-vaccinated students from entering the classroom. She asked faculty to continue to be aware of the effect of societal issues on students. She closed by saying that the state budget picture is better than had been expected.

During questions, several points were made. Cauce distinguished the measles vaccination requirement by saying that COVID vaccines are not fully FDA approved and verification of vaccination is more difficult.
Cauce repeated that the University needs to start moving back to in-person, but that a pivot back will take place if necessary. She also repeated that efforts will be made to accommodate faculty with COVID-related issues. She said that a number of incentives for vaccination are being considered. She added that faculty will not be expected to enforce protective measures such as distancing, masks, and vaccination. Cauce said that the economic outlook does put a merit raise into the realm of possibility.

At this point Jacob Vigdor, Faculty Legislative Representative, gave an oral report, emphasizing the possibility that the state will provide its part of the funding necessary to make up for the raise not given last year. Even if the state so provides, the question would remain whether the University has the resources to make up its part of the required overall funding. Provost Richards added that the improved state outlook is based largely on the projected March revenues.

5. Requests for Information. (00:33:06 – 00:33:14)
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of March 29, 2021.
   a. Approval of the February 8, 2021, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the February 25, 2021, Faculty Senate minutes.

Without objection, Angotti announced that, in the interests of time, requests would be postponed to the good of the order.

6. Memorial Resolution. (00:33:15 – 00:35:02)

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate, presented the resolution.

BE IT RESOLVED that the minutes of this meeting record the sorrow of the entire faculty upon its loss by death of these friends and colleagues:

Professor Emeritus Austin Ross of Public Health, who passed away on October 3, 2020, after having served the University since 1999.

Professor Emeritus Richard Bogan of Engineering who passed away December 8, 2020, after having served the University since 1954.

Professor Emeritus Loring Rowell of Medicine who passed away on December 19, 2020, after having served the University since 1962.

Teaching Professor Kathleen Corcoran of Law who passed away on February 14, 2021, after having served the University since 2004.

Professor Emeritus Joseph Rothberg of Arts & Sciences who passed away on March 4, 2021, after having served the University since 1969.

Affiliate Professor Ann Staton of Arts & Sciences who passed away on March 7, 2021, after having served the University since 1977.

The resolution was approved by a moment of silence.

7. Consent Agenda. (00:35:03 – 00:35:12)
   a. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]
   b. Approve nominations for 2020-21 Senate Executive Committee positions. [Exhibit G]
   c. Confirm Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, as 2021-2022 Faculty Legislative Representative.

The consent agenda was approved.

8. Announcements. (00:35:13 – 00:35:32)
   a. Confirmation of the Secretary of the Faculty
Angotti announced that the Senate Executive Committee had elected Mike Townsend to serve a term as Secretary of the Faculty. Pursuant to Section 22-56:B, a catalyst vote will be held to confirm the election.

   a. Nomination of Candidates for 2021-2022 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative. (00:35:34 – 00:36:24)
      Jonathan Medverd, Associate Professor, School of Medicine.
      JoAnn Taricani, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences.

      Without objection and pursuant to Section 44-31:A, the Senate chose to appoint a Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative for the 2021-2022 year.

      On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate, nominated Jonathan Medverd, Associate Professor, School of Medicine, and JoAnn Taricani, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences as candidates for the Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative for the 2021-2022 year.

      There being no further nominations from the floor, the nominations were closed.

      b. 2021-2022 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative Candidate Presentations. (00:36:25 – 00:48:20)

      The candidates gave their presentations.

      c. Class A Legislation – Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting representation – second consideration. (00:48:21 -- 01:07:10) [Exhibit H]
         Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.
         Action: Approve for faculty vote.

         On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate, moved that the legislation be submitted to the faculty.

         On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that line 10 be changed to increase the number to fifteen and line 15 be changed to increase the number to nine.

         During discussion on the amendment, several arguments were made. Some members argued that the increase would make up for the loss of at-large representation created by the designation of a seat for the School of Medicine and also that the increase would not affect the council’s effectiveness. Other members argued that that representation was more a matter of who is on the council rather than how many are on the council and that further increasing the size of the council would affect its effectiveness.

         There was no more discussion.

         The motion to amend was approved.

         There was no further discussion on the legislation as amended.

         Pursuant to Section 29-33:B.3 and on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that the legislation be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

         There was no discussion.

         The motion to refer was approved.

         d. Class A Legislation – New Faculty Council – first consideration. (01:07:11 –01:14:44) [Exhibit I]
            Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.
            Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate moved that the legislation be submitted to the faculty.

Tom Halverson, Chair of the Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit, and emphasizing how technologies like Proctorio, Panopto, and Interfolio raise issues best dealt with by a separate council. He added that the new council would serve to consolidate issues surrounding technology on all three campuses, work with existing councils to fill in gaps on policies, and help the University be proactive about issues related to technology and security.

In response to questions, Halverson said that the council would help coordinate issues surrounding intellectual property.

Pursuant to Section 29-33:B.3 and on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that the legislation be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion to refer was approved.

e. Class A Legislation – Faculty Council Title Change – first consideration. (01:14:45 – 01:24:22) [Exhibit J]
   Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs.
   Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
   Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate moved that the legislation be submitted to the faculty.

Gautham Reddy, Chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, and Margo Bergman, Chair of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit.

During discussion, several questions were raised and points made. Some members thought that the identical use of “equity and justice” would cause confusion about the councils’ individual missions, notwithstanding the additional distinguishing modifiers of race and gender. In response to questions about whether the name change meant that multiculturalism would no longer be addressed, it was stated that the name change reflects the focus of the committee’s work and that the word “multiculturalism” might be considered somewhat obsolete.

Pursuant to Section 29-33:B.3 and on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that the legislation be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion to refer was approved.

   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate moved that the legislation be submitted to the faculty.

Jack Lee, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit.

During discussion, several points were made. General support was expressed for the amendment. It was suggested that it be made clear that the so-called Introduction to the Faculty Code and Governance is not
something formally approved by the faculty, but rather is created by the Rules Coordination Office.

Pursuant to Section 29-33:B.3 and on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Laws moved that the legislation be referred back to the Senate Executive Committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion to refer was approved.

g. Class B Legislation – Registrar Drop. (01:33:39 – 01:38:30) [Exhibit L]  
   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.  
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate moved that the legislation be submitted to the faculty.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Helen Garrett, University Registrar, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit.

During discussion, it was made clear that the changes applicable to the general university involve the elimination of language relating to the no-longer existing hardship withdrawal.

There was no further discussion.

The motion to submit the legislation to the faculty was approved.

   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.  
   **Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.

On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate moved that the legislation be submitted to the faculty.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Helen Garrett, University Registrar, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit and emphasizing that the schools involved have approved the relevant policies and the intent of the legislation is to make grading policies available in one location.

There was no discussion.

The motion to submit the legislation to the faculty was approved.

10. Discussion Items. (01:41:44 – 02:10:07)  
   a. UW Investment Management Company – Environmental, Social, and Corporate Governance.  
      (01:41:44 – 02:10:07) [Exhibit N]  
      Scott Davies, Chief Operating Officer, UWINCO  
      Allison Bromley, Investment Officer, UWINCO  
      Sam Smith, Investment Officer, UWINCO

Scott Davies, Chief Operating Officer, UWINCO, and Allison Bromley, Investment Officer, UWINCO, summarized the material in the Exhibit, emphasizing that all decisions and policies regarding investment are not within UWINCO’s purview, but are the responsibility of the Board of Regents.

During discussion, several questions were raised and several points were made. Given that the returns outlook for conventional oil and gas is less favorable than in the past, the University has lowered its overall exposure over the past few years from 8% of total to less than 3% of total. In addition, there and have made no new investments since 2014. Clean-tech investments have increased from nil to over 1% in that same time frame. The University joined the Carbon Disclosure Project because of the Project’s effectiveness in influencing corporate decision-making. The University makes every effort to avoid “greenwashing.” Credit
rating is starting to have an impact on corporate decisions, especially with respect to the long-term prospects of conventional energy. The University is engaging in a general shift from divestment per se to the use of ESG scoring and direct investor influence.

11. Good of the Order. (02:10:08 -- 02:10:53 )

There was nothing offered.

12. Adjournment. (02:10:53 – end)

The meeting adjourned at 4:42 P.M.

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, April 22 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.
Spring has arrived, both a new season and a new quarter. For most of us, this is the busiest time of the year, and covid has not made it any easier. Faculty and administration are all running on fumes right now and, in our own exhaustion, it is far too easy to forget about what our colleagues are going through. I implore you to reach down deep and muster up all the patience you can and listen carefully to what people are saying and take a moment to care for each other.

This is the second to last Senate meeting before the end of the academic year. Thus, this is the last meeting where Class A legislation (legislation that amends the faculty code) can be introduced for first consideration.

Serving in the Senate, although I understood the differences between types of legislation, I do not think I really understood how legislation came into being until I was a council chair and I definitely did not understand the timeline for legislation to make it from a successful vote in a faculty council to the SEC and ultimately to the floor of the Senate. I also had no concept of how many people had worked on that piece of legislation before it got to a debate on the senate floor. From an idea in a faculty’s members mind to written legislation being presented at the Senate, the work, effort, negotiation, debate, and collaboration it takes to move legislation forward is a time-consuming, intense struggle. And the coordination of all the different pieces of legislation which are simultaneously being hammered out in and across councils is mind boggling. Each individual piece of legislation may go through many iterations before being voted out of council to move further along to SEC and then the Senate. And that doesn’t even count the other issues that councils are working on that don’t involve legislation! All those issues, the majority of the councils’ work, is never introduced in any kind of formal legislation.

Whether a piece of legislation comes from a council or from a Senator on the floor, there are people working behind the scenes to get that legislation in the right format to be successful. It is a dance of coordination which falls first to Senate staffers who manage the coordination across councils as well as making the appropriate formatting changes. Legislation is also a result of collaboration between Senate councils and Faculty Senate leadership. All this is to say that each piece of legislation in the materials has been crafted, discussed, revised, debated, amended, voted for, and supported by dozens of faculty members before it ever arrives at the senate floor. Legislation that makes it to this stage has been vetted by dozens of people from multiple units across the entire university. To the faculty who proposed it and the councils who worked on it, the legislation in the materials today is important and relevant and many people gave it their time and attention believing that it will strengthen the Faculty Code and the way the university operates the academic enterprise. At the first reading, Class A legislation gets debated and voted on by both the SEC and the Senate, ultimately coming back to SEC after being vetted by the code cops and the president. Literally hundreds of people have had eyes on any one piece of legislation. To the people willing to take on this kind of time commitment and responsibility, I thank you. It is because of you that this process works as the code intended.

Now the culmination of all this work arrives on the senate floor where this body gets to put eyes on it and debate it. You bring a different perspective and one no less vital than that of all the people who worked on the legislation before you. It is critical that you read, understand, question, and consider the ramifications of each piece of legislation on the faculty we serve and the good of the university as a whole. At the beginning of this academic year, in my remarks at the first meeting, I told the Senators of my hope to have a Senate that discusses and debates, rather than just listens and agrees. To be strong, we need diversity of voices willing to speak. I have been pleasantly surprised by the willingness of this Senate to be vocal, engaged, and involved in ways I could never have imagined. Someone reminded me that, if all the legislation put forward easily passes with unanimous agreement, then we aren’t really doing our job. The debate in the Senate is one part of the legislative process. This debate is vital to fully vetting the legislation that comes before us. Debate and disagreement can be good, but we need to make sure that we treat our colleagues with respect – even when we fundamentally disagree with their position. We are all involved in shared governance to make UW a better place and we have to remember that our fellow Senators and Faculty Council members are making good faith efforts to accomplish that goal.
SEC and Senate meetings are open meetings. The process of faculty governance is transparent and available to anyone who wants to take the time to be involved. Links to the meetings of the SEC and Senate are published on the Senate website. In my remarks throughout the year, I have also encouraged Senators to get involved in faculty councils where they might have a particular interest. That same advice holds true for any faculty, Senator or otherwise, who may want a greater understanding of how faculty governance works as well as how their voice might contribute during the earliest phases of debate and crafting legislation which are the best places to create change.

It has been a great year and you have been a phenomenal senate and I look forward to what you will accomplish in these last two meetings of the academic year.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. Vice-Chair Position: Professor Gautham Reddy, School of Medicine Seattle, has been elected to be the 2021-2022 Vice-Chair.

2. Secretary of the Faculty Position: The Senate Executive Committee is forwarding its electee to the Senate for confirmation.

3. Legislative Representative Positions: The Senate Executive Committee is forwarding its nominees to the Senate for consideration.

4. Senate Elections: Senate elections are currently ongoing.

5. 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.

6. Annual Faculty Lecture: The nominating committee has finished deliberations and forwarded its recommendation to the President.
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:

- A briefing and discussion on current and future advancement strategies, the overall university endowment process and performance, and decision-making around distribution
- A presentation and discussion on the university’s updated Enterprise Risk Management Program and 5-year risk review
- A quarterly review and tracking of unit deficits
- A briefing and discussion with CoMotion leadership on status, new initiatives, including an equity and inclusion in entrepreneurship
- An update on the finance transformation project: current status, areas under discussion, new organizational structure, upcoming decision points
- Consideration of a limited RCEP request from the Bothell School of STEM to eliminate the Minor in Consciousness
- FY22 Annual Review Status Update: planning assumptions, projected operating results from core academic and self-sustaining units, next steps for spring quarter
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance

There’s big news to report on the question of compensation and some updates on a few other bills. Let’s get right down to business!

Compensation update for 2021/22: The legislature giveth...

At the onset of the COVID pandemic last year, the Governor’s office instructed the University to take a number of precautionary financial measures. Academic units were advised to brace themselves for significant cuts to state funding in academic year 2020/21 as well as 2021/22. In addition to these prospective cutbacks, the University faced other forms of financial uncertainty. The cancellation of sporting events, or restrictions on attendance, reduced athletic revenue. UW Medicine faced significant costs of providing care to patients without insurance, and the cancellation of non-urgent procedures led to lost reimbursements. The reduced on-campus student population decimated housing and food service revenues. And if students reacted to the move to online or hybrid learning by declining to enroll, we’d have faced reductions in tuition revenue.

It was in this dire context that virtually all state employees were asked or required to make concessions in their terms of employment. Thousands of UW staff, from the hospitals to the dining halls, faced layoffs and furloughs. Unionized employees throughout state government accepted concessions in contract negotiations. For UW faculty, budgeted merit increases for the 2020/21 academic year were canceled. Importantly, our raises were held back even while many unionized employees received contractually guaranteed cost-of-living increases.

As recently as December, the possibility existed that things would get worse before they got better. The Governor’s initial budget proposal for the two-year period between July 2021 and 2023 called for salary freezes and mandatory furloughs for all state employees, including faculty.

In hindsight, we braced ourselves for a financial storm that dissipated, causing far less damage than we anticipated. Enrollments and tuition revenue held steady. Federal stimulus money helped make the hospitals whole for the care they provided, and filled in some of the budget gaps in the University’s non-academic enterprises. At the state level, the revenue forecast has steadily improved since the nadir of mid-2020 (see below). The House and Senate budget proposals released in late March not only take faculty furloughs off the table, they go so far as to restore the state’s share of the faculty salary increases that were withheld last year. To quote directly from the proposed state Senate budget bill (SB 5092), section 948:

Appropriations in this act for state agencies, including Institutions of Higher Education, are sufficient to provide a three percent or two percent general wage increase, effective July 1, 2021, for employees who were scheduled to receive a general wage increase of either of those amounts on July 1, 2020, that was forgone due to COVID-19 emergency.

This language appears in the context of budget bills that reverse the concessions state employees made in contract negotiations last year, prior to the legislative session. Some state employees, including the unionized faculty at Western Washington, Central Washington, Eastern Washington, and Evergreen State, have gone from a contract with mandatory furloughs to a contract incorporating salary increases for the upcoming year.

Compared to what we had been expecting, this is a great statement to see, but there should be an asterisk by it.

The state’s appropriations are intended to cover the state-funded portion of our salaries, but for most of us the majority of our salary is derived from other sources: grants, contracts, tuition, endowments, patient care. While the legislature’s proposed budget indicates that university funding allocations are sufficient to implement the 2020/21 merit increases a year behind schedule, there is no requirement that the University actually do so. And while the University finds itself in a better budget position than we might
have anticipated a year ago, concerns about lingering impacts of the COVID pandemic persist into the next academic year.

The question of whether to restore our forgone merit increases thus becomes a matter of shared governance. Can the University afford to match the state’s funding allocation and carry out the legislature’s intent? Could the University in fact afford to fund merit increases in excess of the legislative authorization, as it did in 2016/17 and earlier years? These questions will be answered in a series of conversations involving the central administration, deans and chancellors, this body, and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget. Ultimately, any case for funding merit increases must be made to the Regents.

As faculty, we have a vested interest in this deliberation. In the survey I distributed at the beginning of the academic year, many of you voiced concerns about salaries that had kept pace neither with rising work expectations nor our peer institutions. I encourage you to restate these concerns in the context of our current deliberations.

At the same time, by the principles of shared governance we must act as stewards of the institution, trusting that our partners in leadership will inform us frankly of the risks and constraints we face. This may well be a difficult conversation, but it is one in which we must all consider what serves the long-term best interest of this University. As will the Regents when they decide whether to approve any plan to restore forgone salary increases.

Before concluding, I’ll point out that the legislature’s budget incorporates funding sufficient to implement the state’s share of our forgone 2020 merit increases, but not for successive cycles of increases going forward. Should the state’s revenue outlook continue to improve, the possibility exists that next year’s legislative session will see supplemental budget proposals that allow a new round of merit increases to take effect in 2022/23. Provided, of course, that the University’s resource outlook continues on a positive trajectory.

**More Detail on State Revenue Projections**

In the early months of the pandemic, fears mounted that the public health crisis and the economic crisis it precipitated would in turn create a fiscal crisis for state and local government. Here in Washington, forecasts released in June projected 9% drops in revenue collection both for the current fiscal biennium, which ends June 30th, and for the next biennium extending to mid-2023. State agencies including UW were instructed to brace themselves for budget cuts. The merit increases that had been budgeted for the 2020/21 academic year were withheld. Our colleagues at other state universities faced furloughs on top of salary freezes. Unionized state employees accepted concessions in newly negotiated contracts.
With the release of the latest state revenue projections on March 17th, this episode of recent history now resembles a bad dream from which we have collectively awakened. What we thought might be a 9% drop in the current biennium is now projected to be an 0.8% drop. Revenue projections for the 2021-23 biennium are actually running ahead of where they were before the pandemic began. Put the two biennia together and the net revenue impact of the pandemic amounts to 0.05% -- one-twentieth of a percentage point. Rounding error.

Diversity Training & Climate Bills Move Forward

Senator Emily Randall introduced a bill this session that would require all public institutions of higher education to engage in diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism training and conduct periodic climate surveys. The original version of this bill (SB 5227) occasioned some hesitation from universities as it would have required surveys and trainings in excess of what campus diversity officers consider optimal. Mandatory annual trainings and surveys would have posed a significant cost to the University.

Amendments to this bill in committee and on the Senate floor resulted in Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill (E2SSB) 5227, which codifies regulations that are much closer to current practice and thus earned the unqualified support of most stakeholders in higher education. Mandatory trainings were to be reserved for new students and new faculty/staff hires, with continuing training encouraged but not mandated and climate surveys conducted once every five years. This bill passed the Senate on a bipartisan 35-14 vote. While cumulative amendments reduced the projected cost of compliance, UW’s good-faith estimate of cost amounts to nearly $2 million over the next six years.

Upon being forwarded to the House, the Committee on College & Workforce Development introduced yet more amendments to the bill. One amendment in particular requires that 35% of tenured faculty and 35% of administrators at each institution participate in training every two years. With these amendments, the bill cleared committee on a 7-6 party line vote. The bill has also received a positive vote from the House Appropriations Committee.

Senator Randall also sponsored a bill (SB 5228) requiring health equity training in the MD curriculum. The binding provisions of this bill are redundant with accreditation requirements already in place for schools of medicine nationwide. The bill passed the Senate on a 31-17 vote and the House on a 56-42 vote.

Faculty Regent Bill Stalls
The bill to add an 11th member to the UW Board of Regents reserved for a member of the faculty (HB 1051) was voted out of committee with bipartisan support. Unfortunately, it did not receive a vote on the House floor in advance of a key March 9th deadline. The bill will therefore not move further forward this year. The House retains the option of taking up the bill in next year’s session.

A grand total of 20 bills that had passed House committees failed to clear this hurdle, including a measure to declare an official state dinosaur (HB 1067). With luck, the faculty regent bill will be able to outrun the dinosaur bill next year.

**Capital Gains Tax Squeaks By**

In the priorities survey I distributed at the beginning of the academic year, the need to adopt progressive revenue instruments emerged as a common theme. Governor Inslee’s proposed capital gains tax, after being amended in committee and on the Senate floor, passed that chamber by a razor-thin 25-24 margin, with four Democrats joining Republicans in opposition to the bill. As of this writing it sits before the House Committee on Finance. Relative to the Senate, the Democratic majority is ever-so-slightly narrower in the House. So while ESSB 5096 has some momentum, it is not out of the woods yet.
Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative
Alexes Harris, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences

Outline

Alexes Harris, FAR, Professor Department of Sociology

> FAR Role (Compliance, Academics, Student health and wellness)
> Collegiate Athletics in a Pandemic
  – Guiding Principles, Protocols
> Student Athlete Experience
  – Grades
  – Social Justice
> Moving Forward
  – NIL/Alston, Budget
College Athletics in the Pandemic

Guiding Principles
- Maintain sport sponsorship and operations for all 22 teams
- Student-athlete support services fully funded
  - Medical health and wellness / mental health services
  - Sports performance / nutrition
  - Academic services / student development
  - Financial aid / compliance
  - Diversity, equity and inclusion programming and education
- Prioritize investments recommended by medical team and COVID-19 committee
- Proactive mitigation strategies to financially recover as quickly as possible

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

ICA COVID Expenses and Budget Cuts

- Expenses
  - Over $1.6 million in COVID related expenses
  - $750K additional scholarship for “super seniors”
- Loss in Revenue
  - Loss in ticket sales and conference
  - Loss in Media $$ from Pac12
- Adjustments
  - 10% cut in salaries & benefits through two rounds of staffing reductions

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON

College Athletics in the Pandemic

COVID Protocols

- Layers of governing: State, County, UW, Pac12, NCAA

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
Student Athlete Experience: Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Spring 2020 # Athletes (%)</th>
<th>Fall 2020# Athletes (%)</th>
<th>Winter 2021 # Athletes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>45 (9%)</td>
<td>36 (6%)</td>
<td>26 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50-3.99</td>
<td>273 (54%)</td>
<td>280 (48%)</td>
<td>239 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00-3.49</td>
<td>120 (24%)</td>
<td>160 (28%)</td>
<td>154 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00-2.99</td>
<td>56 (11%)</td>
<td>82 (14%)</td>
<td>106 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00-1.99</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>21 (4%)</td>
<td>40 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>503 (100%)</td>
<td>579 (100%)</td>
<td>575 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Athlete Experience

Social Justice

> Voting
- Pac 12 initiative – Day Off
- Partnership with WSU – informational discussion
  > 100% eligible student athletes registered to vote
- Separate information sessions re: accessing out of state ballots, larger context of voting (civics discussion)
Student Athlete Experience

Social Justice

> Discussions
  – Immediately following the public video of killing of George Floyd
  – Held team zooms to help students process killing, themes of structural racism, and the criminal legal system
  – Zoomed with Coaches – motivational & criminal legal system

Student Athlete Experience

Mental Health

> Indication of broader context of our students
> ICA committed to providing all care needed

Moving Forward: Key Issues

> Changing legal landscape
  – Alston – Sup Ct Case, March 31
    > Question whether NCAA eligibility rules regarding compensation of student-athletes violate federal antitrust law. $0,000 additional academic support
  – NIL
    > FL+ State legislation – July 1 will go into effect
    > Federal Legislation - hopeful for national guidance and standards

http://www.nationalcollegiateathleteassociation.com
Moving Forward: Key Issues

> Budget Concerns
  - UWICA one of few Pac 12 schools 100% financially independent
  - Uncertain ticket sales
  - On-going COVID expenses – PCE, testing, cleaning

> Continue to center student athletes’
  - Education, career development, citizen roles
  - Defining what “success” means for our students
    - Personal, academic and athletic

Alexes Harris, Dept. of Sociology

Contact

> wharris@uw.edu
2020-2021 Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees

Student Reviewing Officers

- Mary Hotchkiss, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Sara Lopez, College of Education, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Kari Lerum, UW Bothell School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Ann Culligan, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Angel Fettig, College of Education, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Caley Cook, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Jane Distad, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
- Dan Cabrera, School of Medicine, as a member for a term beginning September 16, 2021, and ending September 15, 2024.
Nominations for 2020-21 Senate Executive Committee Positions

Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering – 1 position</td>
<td>Dan Schwartz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Fifteen 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 Nine 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
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 Security

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.

S-A 29, June 8, 1964; S-A 35, June 17, 1970; S-A 50, January 22, 1976; S-A 104, April 9, 2001: all with
Presidential approval; RC, April 22, 2010; S-A 144, March 1, 2019 with Presidential approval.

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 Security

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


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
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:
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Class B Legislation  
Student Governance and Policies  
Scholastic Regulations  
Chapter 102, Registration  

Background and Rationale  

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 102 (Registration) based on the following findings:

- Changes made to Scholastic Regulations Chapter 110 related to the new Registrar Drop (RD) withdrawal code and the inception of the Current Quarter Drop and Former Quarter Drop require amendments to this chapter.

Student Governance and Policies  
Scholastic Regulations  
Chapter 102  

Registration  

5. Change of Registration  

A. Online Academic Calendar  

Information on dates and procedures for registration changes is published in the online Academic Calendar.

B. Registration Change Fee  

No registration charge fees are assessed for changes in registration during periods 1, 2, and 3. A registration change fee will be assessed for changes in registration after period 3.

C. Withdrawals  

No registration change fees are assessed for a complete withdrawal from the University. However, after the end of period 3, students are charged tuition forfeiture for a complete withdrawal.

D. Courses Dropped Before the First 14 Days  

Courses dropped through the first 14 calendar days of the quarter will not be recorded on the University transcript. If all courses are dropped during this time and not re-registered, a statement of WITHDRAWN with the date of withdrawal will be recorded on the University transcript.

E. Courses Dropped After the First 14 Days  

Courses dropped after the 14th calendar day through the seventh week of the quarter will be recorded with a grade of W RD for Registrar Drop, to be followed by a number representing the week of the quarter in which the drop occurred.

F. Hardship Withdrawals Former Quarter Drop  

No courses may be dropped after the seventh week of the quarter unless approved as hardship withdrawal exceptions by the Registrar’s Office. (See Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 113, Section 3.) Courses that have been approved for a Former Quarter Drop will be annotated with
an RD for Registrar Drop and the GPA points and grade awarded for the course will be removed from the transcript. (See Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 113, Section 3.)

G. Instructor or Departmental Approval

Courses added after registration period 3 through the third week of the quarter require instructor or departmental approval as determined by departmental policy. After the third week of the quarter the student must have the permission of both the department chair and the instructor. Approval is granted only in very unusual circumstances.

H. Dropped Courses

A course is officially dropped only when transacted through the University’s online system or when accepted by a representative of the Registrar’s Office campus registration team. An academic department can request a student to drop a course if the student does not meet publicized departmental participation requirements.

I. Tuition and Fees for Dropped or Added Courses

Students dropping courses may receive some refund of tuition and fees depending upon the number of credits dropped and the time of the quarter. Students adding courses may be required to pay additional tuition and fees as determined by the fee schedule.

J. Summer Quarter

Proportional schedules will be publicized in the Academic Calendar for Summer Quarter a, b, and full terms.


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
March 29, 2021
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 110, Grades, Honors, and Scholarship

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 110 (Grades, Honors, and Scholarship) based on the following findings:

- When reviewing this chapter for possible revisions it became apparent that many sections had not been updated for many years. This was especially apparent with the Graduate School and professional school sections for the School of Law, School of Medicine, and the School of Dentistry.
- In the spirit of honoring gender inclusivity, prior references to “his and her” are being changed to the corresponding noun.

Student Governance and Policies

Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 110

A. System of Grades

The following shall be the system of grades, subject to the exceptions noted in Subsections B, C, D, and E of this section.

5) The Grade RD

e) For DL courses that do not follow the quarter schedule, the grade RD shall be assigned to any course dropped after the 14th calendar day after the start of the course and no later than two weeks before the end of the maximum term for completion of the course, as specified at the time of registration. The date of withdrawal shall be noted on the transcript. The provisions of Subsections 1.A.5.c and 1.A.5.d. shall also apply.

B. Grading Practices for Graduate Students

To provide for consistency in reporting of grades for graduate students, the system of numeric and letter grades listed in Subsection 1.A shall be used subject to the following special provisions:

1) Minimum Grade Level

Grades below 1.7 will be recorded as 0.0 by the Registrar and will not count toward total credit count or grade and credit requirements. A minimum of 2.7 shall be required in each graded course which counts toward satisfying graduate degree requirements. A minimum cumulative grade-point average of 3.0 is required for graduation.

2) The Grade I
a) An Incomplete may be given as indicated in Subsection 1. A.3.a, with the exception that an incomplete received by the graduate student does not automatically convert to a grade of 0.0 but the "I" will remain as a permanent part of the student's record.

b) In order to obtain credit for the course, a student must convert an Incomplete into a passing grade by the last day of the next quarter in residence. This rule may be waived by the dean of the college in which the course is offered. In no case may an Incomplete be converted into a passing grade after a lapse of two years without the approval of the Graduate School.

3) The Grade N

The grade N is used only for hyphenated courses and courses numbered 600 (Independent Study and Research), 700 (Thesis), 800 (Dissertation), and 801 (Practice Doctorate Project/Capstone). An N grade indicates that satisfactory progress is being made, but evaluation depends on completion of the research, thesis, dissertation, or project/capstone, at which time the instructor or supervisory committee chair should change the N grade or grades to one more appropriate to the final evaluation (normally CR/NC).

4) The Grade W RD

Grading for Withdrawals from the University and for Drops from Courses are specified in Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 113. The special provisions pertaining to graduate students are that:

a) Except for Subsections 1.A.4, 1.C, and 1.D, the provisions of Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 113, Section 3, "Dropping a Course," do not apply to graduate students.

b) Official withdrawal from a course during the first 10 class days of a quarter will not be entered on the permanent academic record. After the first two weeks and through the seventh week of the course, a graduate student may withdraw from a course by filing a form with the Registrar’s Office. A grade of W RD will be recorded. No official withdrawal will be permitted after the seventh week of the quarter except under the conditions described in Scholastic Regulations, Chapter 113, 3.A.4.

5) The Grade S/NS

A graduate student, with the approval of the graduate program advisor or supervisory committee chair, may elect to be graded S/NS in any numerically-graded courses for which he or she is eligible. If a student does not so elect, then he or she will be graded on a numerical basis. If approval is granted, the student must elect the S/NS option when registering or no later than the end of the seventh week of the quarter. Numeric grades will not subsequently be converted to S/NS grades (or vice versa). The instructor shall submit a numeric grade to the Registrar, who shall convert grades of 2.7 and above to S and grades lower than 2.7 to NS for graduate students in graduate or

6) The Grade CR/NC

With the approval of the faculty in the academic unit, any course may be designated for grading on the CR/NC basis by notice in the appropriate Time Schedule. For such courses, the instructor shall submit a grade of CR or NC to be recorded by the Registrar for each student in the class at the end of the quarter.
7) **Numerical Grade Requirement**

Of the minimum credits required for a graduate degree, a graduate student must show numerical grades in at least 18 quarter hours of course work taken at the University of Washington. These numerical grades may be earned in 400- and 500-level courses.

8) **Grade-Point Average**

A graduate student's grade-point average shall be calculated entirely on the basis of numeric grades in 400- and 500-level courses. The grades of S, NS, CR, NC, and N shall be excluded, as shall all grades in courses numbered 600, 700, 800, and 801, and in 100-, 200-, and 300-level courses.

9) **Petition for Modification of Grading Practice**

The student may petition the Dean of the Graduate School to make an exception to the policies described above. The petition shall be accompanied by comments and recommendations from the graduate program adviser or supervisory committee chair.

C. **Grading Practice for the School of Medicine**

The system of grades for the School of Medicine shall be Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory/Honors. All required courses in the medical school curriculum must be completed with a Satisfactory grade, and the determination of Honors grades shall remain the prerogative of the faculty instructing the courses. An Incomplete shall be converted to a passing grade by the next quarter in residence except that this time limit may be extended up to one year with the approval of the dean's office. Incompletes not so converted shall be replaced by a Not Satisfactory grade.

Withdrawals are unusual, as in illness situations, and are processed upon approval of the dean's office.

In the Foundations Phase, the grading system for required courses is Pass and Fail only. In the Patient Care and Explore & Focus Phases, the grading system is Honors, High Pass, Pass, and Fail. The Honors and High Pass designations are available in clinical clerkships greater than or equal to four weeks in length. Two-week clinical electives and international clinical electives are graded on Pass/Fail only.

An Incomplete shall be converted to a passing grade by the next quarter in residence except that this time limit may be extended up to one year with the approval of the dean's office. Incompletes not so converted shall be replaced by a Fail grade.

Registrar Drops are unusual, as in illness situations, and are processed upon approval of the dean's office.

D. **Grading Practice for the School of Law**

Applicable to first-year J.D. students who matriculate in Autumn 1998 and thereafter, grades to be assigned to all courses for credit toward the J.D. degree, except courses taken on a Credit/No Credit (CR/NC) or Satisfactory/Non-Satisfactory (S/NS) basis, shall consist of the following: A, A-, B+, B, C, D, and E.

1) **Grade Significance**

The significance of each grade is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Equivalent</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Percentage of Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Less than or equal to 10% (may be 0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Less than or equal to 30% (minus % given A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>More than 50% (minus % given A and A-) and less than or equal to 60% (minus % given A or A-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>% discretionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>% discretionary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>This grade indicates that the level of performance is below that which on average is required for the award of the degree.</td>
<td>% discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No credit. This grade indicates unsatisfactory performance and no credit is given for the course.</td>
<td>% discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But this significance is subject to the following conditions:

a) The percentage for the grade of B+ is mandatory for all required first-year courses.

b) The percentage ranges for grades of A and A- in all three years, and of B+ in the second and third-year classes, are guidelines and are strongly recommended. These guidelines should not be thought of as applicable to specialized and individualized courses such as seminars, clinical, experiential, and "practice" offerings, independent study, and workshops, nor to summer-quarter courses, courses heavily directed to non-law students, and courses in which most of the enrolled students are candidates for post-J.D. graduate degrees. They would also not have significance for classes of ten students or less.

c) A faculty member who submits grades that deviate from the suggested percentages shall submit a written explanation to the associate dean before the grades are recorded.

d) A numerical class rank, based on the numerical equivalencies shown above, shall be computed for the sole purpose of awarding academic honors, including graduation awards, prizes, or membership in scholarly societies, including Order of the Coif, legal journals and reviews. Class rank shall not be disclosed on a student's transcript or otherwise disclosed except for the purpose of computing eligibility for academic honors.

2) Academic Difficulty and Disqualification Rules

a) A student will be in Academic Difficulty if he or she receives, during any three consecutive quarters, a grade of E or two grades of D. A student will regain good
academic standing upon completion of two consecutive quarters with no grade of D or E. A student in Academic Difficulty shall be counseled by a dean concerning ways to improve his or her performance.

b) A student will be disqualified as a candidate for the J.D. degree and will not be allowed to re-enroll in the Law School if he or she receives:

- During any academic year, grades of E for nine credit hours or grades of E or D for 17 credit hours;
- During the first and second years, grades of E for 14 credit hours or grades of E or D for 25 credit hours;
- During three years, grades of E for 21 credit hours or grades of E or D for 37 credit hours.

A student who has been disqualified as a J.D. candidate for unsatisfactory grades may petition the faculty for readmission.

3) Grade System Start Date

This grading system shall apply to all incoming first-year students in the Autumn of 1998, and to all incoming first-year students thereafter.

1) Anonymous Grading

Anonymous grading shall apply to all examinations and papers. If a professor chooses to use class performance as a component of the overall grade, he or she shall irrevocably report that component for all students to Student Services for factoring in the overall grade before release to the instructor of the examination grades.

The anonymous grading rule is inapplicable to papers written in courses in which students are writing multiple drafts and/or meeting with the instructor to discuss individual paper topics.

2) Class Rank

Class rank shall be computed at the end of students’ 1L year and at the end of each academic year thereafter. Transfer students will receive a UW ranking after completing one academic year (a minimum of three academic quarters) at UW Law.

The ranking is only for the following purposes:

a) To award academic honors, including graduation awards, prizes, or membership in scholarly societies, including Order of the Coif, legal journals and reviews; or

b) To define percentile bands of 5% and 10% at the conclusion of the first year; and

c) To define percentile bands of 5%, 10%, 20%, and 33 1/3% at the conclusion of the second and third years (after the submission and calculation of Spring quarter grades).

Only students who fall within a percentile band will be notified of the percentile band in which they placed. Students who are ranked first through fifth in their class will be notified of an individual rank. Students below the percentile cut-off will not be ranked. Neither students’ individual class rank nor the grade point average (GPA) cut-offs for the percentile bands described above will appear on students’ transcript.
Under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), release of an individual student's placement within the defined GPA percentile bands by the law school requires the written permission of the student. To further preserve student privacy, additional ranking information, including the GPA percentile bands, will not be disclosed by the law school.

Class of 2020

In view of the evolving public health crisis, the Order of the Coif has suspended its restrictions on Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory credit through the end of the 2019-20 academic year for the Class of 2020. Students who elect Satisfactory/Not Satisfactory will still be considered for Order of the Coif if they meet the other eligibility requirements.

3) Computation of Grade Point Average

Grades assigned in Law 600, Independent Research, shall not be included in the calculation of a student's grade point average after this academic year.

4) Law School Grading System

Grades to be assigned to all courses for credit toward the J.D. degree, except courses taken on a Credit/No Credit basis, shall consist of the following: A, A-, B+, B, B-, C, D, and E.

a) The significance of each grade is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage of Class</th>
<th>Numerical equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>At least 5% and less than or equal to 15%.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>At least 20% minus (% given A) and less than or equal to 40% minus (% given A).</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>At least 50% minus (% given A or A-) and less than or equal to 75% minus (% given A or A-).</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>% Discretionary.*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>% Discretionary.*</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>% Discretionary. C or D grades are capped at a total of 5% for first-year courses.*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grade Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>% Discretionary</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>% Discretionary. This grade indicates that the level of performance is below that which on average is required for the award of the degree. C or D grades are capped at a total of 5% for first-year courses.*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>% Discretionary. No credit. This grade indicates unsatisfactory performance and no credit is given for the course.*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*At least 25% (but no more than 50%) B and below, combined.

---

**b) The significance of each grade is further subject to the following conditions:**

- **These percentage ranges are mandatory for all J.D. courses, subject to the exceptions in (b) or (c) below. There is no discretion outside of these ranges.** A faculty member who submits grades for a course subject to the mandatory distribution that fails to comply with the mandatory distribution will have the grades returned to her or him by the Dean, with instructions to re-submit the grades in accordance with the distribution. If the faculty member fails to do so, the faculty member will submit exam scores to the Dean or his designee, and the latter would assign grades at the midpoint of each range (i.e., 10 percent A's, 20 percent A's, 32.5% B+'s, 37.5% B and lower).

- **The mandatory distribution is not applicable to specialized and individualized courses such as seminars, clinical, experiential, and ‘practice’ offerings, independent study, and workshops, nor to summer quarter courses, courses heavily directed to non-law students, and courses in which most of the enrolled students are candidates for non-J.D. graduate degrees. They would also not have significance for classes of fifteen students or less.**

- **The mandatory distribution is not applicable to designated "mastery" courses. A faculty member may have her or his course designated as a mastery course by submitting the course syllabus and evaluative elements to the Curriculum Committee, and ultimately the faculty, for approval, subject to the following conditions: (a) the course must require significant, periodic written work and feedback during the course, with stated performance standards for achieving specific grades; (b) first-year courses cannot be designated as mastery courses unless all sections of that course are offered on a mastery basis; and (c) mastery courses will be designated as such, in the catalog and course description.**

- **A numerical class rank, based on the numerical equivalencies shown above, shall be computed for the sole purpose of awarding academic honors, including graduation awards, prizes, or membership in scholarly societies, including Order of the Coif, legal journals and reviews. Class**
rank shall not be disclosed on a student's transcript or otherwise disclosed except for the purpose of computing eligibility for academic honors.


Effective Spring Quarter 2007, transcripts for law students who began in Autumn Quarter 2005 or later will include a full calculated grade point average, with the following numerical conversions: A(4.0), A-(3.7), B+(3.4), B(3.0), B-(2.7), C(2.0), D(1.0), E(0.0). Students who began earlier than Autumn 2005, will have a transcript that only shows their grade point average in classes taken since Autumn 2005.

5) COVID-19 grading changes

Spring Quarter 2020

In recognition of the impact these extraordinary times are having on students, UW Law faculty voted to shift grading for all spring quarter courses to credit/no credit.

Winter Quarter 2020 limited grading change

In view of the evolving public health crisis, UW Law faculty voted to:

- Reopen the period by which 2L, 3L, and graduate students can elect to receive Satisfactory/Not satisfactory credit for elective courses only.
- Waive the eight credit-limit for Satisfactory/Not satisfactory credit for winter quarter 2020 only. Satisfactory/Not satisfactory elections for electives will not count against the eight-credit cap.

6) Incompletes

The Committee's memo to the faculty of May 28, 1975 also reported that as a part of the same University study which led to the change in the withdrawal policy, the University policy on the use of Incompletes was studied. The existing policy permits the grade of I to remain on a transcript indefinitely. The growth of the number of I grades (tripled since 1966) was regarded by the Faculty Council as a further erosion of the reliability of the University's GPA's. The Incomplete was also used as a withdrawal technique after the final date of the quarter. Hence, correction of the withdrawal policy required a change in the policy on Incompletes.

The recently adopted University policy does not change the grounds for giving an Incomplete. (They remain essentially that the student establish to his instructor's satisfaction that illness or other circumstances beyond the student's control prevent the student's completion of the course.) What is changed is that the grade of I is automatically converted to a failing grade if it is not made up (i.e., the course requirements completed) by the end of the following quarter. The student may petition the Registrar for additional time (up to three quarters) and the Registrar will grant the extension if approved by the Instructor.

It was moved and seconded, that (1) the law school follow the University's newly-adopted policy on Incompletes, with the Associate Dean performing the function assigned the Registrar in the University scheme; (2) the failing grade' assigned in case an Incomplete is not made up be recorded as a [1.9]; (3) Incompletes given to Spring Quarter need not be made up until the end of the following Fall Quarter, irrespective of whether the student is enrolled in the intervening Summer Quarter.
7) Information Faculty Must Provide to Students on Grading

Each professor should announce during the first week of any course the nature of the grading practice to be followed, including any components of the course grade other than a final examination grade. Such components may include one or more papers, preliminary examinations, class participation. If a final or end-quarter examination is not "closed book," the announcement should so state and should in such case include a statement of what materials may be consulted by students during an examination. If coursebooks are to be permitted, but student notes are not, students should be advised in the announcement that coursebooks should not be annotated with a student's notes.

Precise allocation of course grade to components need not be announced in advance. However, such allocation to the extent possible should be indicated, and each student should have available on request the allocation among all components of any course grade after grading has been completed.

All final and end-quarter examinations should be graded anonymously, with papers identified by student numbers which shall not be released to a professor until grades on examinations have been turned into the Office of Student Services. If any exception is necessary in a professor's judgment, an examination number will be released, but the student whose number is released will be informed of the circumstances as soon as conveniently possible.

After the professor has turned in final and end-quarter examination grades, the names of students and grades will be available to the professor, but not the student numbers unless those numbers are not to be used again in any course by the same students in a subsequent quarter. Course grades should be calculated by the professor after examination grades have been turned in. Course grades and final examination grades will be made available to students by the Office of Student Services. A student's request to the professor for components of the student's grade should be necessary only if the professor uses multiple components of course grades other than final or end-quarter examinations.

8) Satisfactory Academic Progress

To be eligible for financial aid at the University of Washington students must maintain Satisfactory Academic Progress. The requirements for Satisfactory Academic Progress are that full-time J.D. students enroll in a minimum of 12 credits per quarter, and

a) Complete a minimum of 6 credits each quarter.

b) Complete 36 credits for full-time aid received in the autumn through spring quarters.

c) Finish the J.D. program no earlier than 24 months and no later than 72 months after commencing study at the law school or a law school from which the school has accepted transfer credit.

d) Must not be in Academic Difficulty or Disqualified for Low Scholarship.

J.D. students who do not meet these requirements must file an appeal with the Office of Student Financial Aid for reconsideration of continued financial aid.

9) Academic Difficulty and Disqualification Rules

A J.D. student will be in Academic Difficulty if he or she receives, during any two consecutive quarters, a grade of E or two grades of D or three grades of C.

A J.D. student in Academic Difficulty must meet with the Dean for Students or the Director of Academic Support for counseling each quarter until the student regains good academic
standing. Good academic standing requires two consecutive quarters with no grades of C or below.

A J.D. student will be Disqualified for Low Scholarship and will not be allowed to re-enroll if he or she receives:

a) During the first and second years, grades of E or No Credit for 12 credit hours or a combination of grades of C, D, E, or No Credit for 20 credit hours;

b) During any three academic years, grades of E or No Credit for 15 credit hours or grades of C, D, E, or No Credit for 24 credit hours.

10) Readmission After Disqualification for Academic Failure

A student who has been disqualified as a J.D. candidate for academic failure may seek readmission by petitioning the faculty. ABA Standard 505 permits readmission "upon an affirmative showing that the student possesses the requisite ability and that the prior disqualification does not indicate a lack of capacity to complete the course of study at the admitting school." Upon receipt of a petition, the Dean will appoint a panel of faculty and administrators to evaluate the candidate’s ability to successfully complete the study of law if readmitted. Factors which may be considered include:

a) The existence, while the student was enrolled, of extraordinary circumstances beyond the student's control (serious illness, unusual hardship or qualitatively similar circumstances) that adversely affected the student's performance or otherwise contributed to the student's failure.

b) The extent of the student's understanding of the reasons for the student’s failure.

c) The extent to which the reasons for failure have been alleviated.

d) The nature and extent of the student's experiences since disqualification.

e) Any other factors that positively indicate a substantial likelihood that the student will successfully complete the prescribed study of law.

11) Mastery Courses

Certain courses have been approved by the faculty as mastery courses. The mandatory distribution is not applicable to designated "mastery" courses. A faculty member may have her or his course designated as a mastery course by submitting the course syllabus and evaluative elements to the Curriculum Committee, and ultimately the faculty, for approval, subject to the following conditions:

a) the course must require significant, periodic written work and feedback during the course, with stated performance standards for achieving specific grades;

b) first-year courses cannot be designated as mastery courses unless all sections of that course are offered on a mastery basis;

c) and mastery courses will be designated as such, in the catalog and course description.

Even though a course has been approved as a mastery course, an instructor has discretion to teach it in a non-mastery format.

12) Repeating Courses
a) A student in the School of Law in good standing who has failed a required course must repeat the course or take, with the approval of the Dean, a second examination without registration at the time a regular examination for the course is offered. If a passing grade is received upon re-examination, the student receives the same credit for the course that it carried at the time the student was first examined. The failing grade remains on the record, but only the passing grade is computed in the student's grade point average.

b) A student may also be required to repeat a course or courses as a condition of readmission, at the discretion of the Dean. (See Faculty Policy on Academic Probation and Readmission.)

c) In no other circumstances will a grade earned in a course which the student has previously audited or taken for credit be computed in the student's grade point average.

13) Deadline for Faculty to Turn in Grades

The deadlines for faculty to turn in grades to Academic Services are as follows:

- Autumn Quarter: 7th calendar day from the start of Winter Quarter
- Winter Quarter: 7th calendar day from the start of Spring Quarter
- Spring Quarter (upper-level classes): 14th calendar day after the end of the upper-level exam period
- Spring Quarter (1L classes): 14th calendar day after the end of the 1L exam period
- Summer Quarter: 14th calendar day after the end of the exam period

These deadlines are subject to the following exceptions:

a) Professors who teach both a compressed course and a non-compressed course in Spring Quarter are not required to submit grades for either course until the 14th day after the non-compressed exam period.

b) The Registrar has the authority to waive the grade deadline in any quarter for good cause shown. Faculty teaching 2 large classes in a single quarter should contact the Registrar. If such a waiver is granted, students will be notified of the fact that a waiver has been granted.

This policy shall be enforced through the following steps:

- At the last faculty meeting of each quarter, the Dean reminds the faculty of the grading deadlines, of the importance of grading and of the desirability of leaving word about how the faculty member can be contacted by Academic Services;
- On the day after the applicable grade deadline, Academic Services will announce the classes for which grades are not received, and, when available, the expected posting date;
- The Associate Dean for Academic Administration confers with faculty members who are late in turning in grades to bring them into compliance;
- If the Associate Dean for Academic Administration cannot arrive at a satisfactory resolution, he or she informs the Dean of the problem.

14) Change of Grade
Except in case of error, no instructor may change a grade that he or she has turned in to the Registrar. Grades cannot be changed after a degree has been granted.


E. Grading Practice for the School of Dentistry

The School of Dentistry uses the following University grade-point system: A=4, B=3, C=2, and E=0. The grade-point average is calculated by multiplying the grade points received in a course by the number of credits earned in the course, totaling these values, and dividing by the total number of credits earned.

The progress of professional dental students is reviewed at least quarterly. Students experiencing academic or clinical difficulties are identified and referred to student progress committees which make determinations regarding academic progress. If the work in a course is incomplete or inadequate, a grade of I may be given. This Incomplete must be removed before September 15 if the student is to advance into the next year's class. If academic or clinical achievement is unsatisfactory the student may be dismissed from the school.

Student work shall be evaluated and awarded a range of grades from 4.0 to 2.8 in 0.1 increments, and the grade 0.0. Grades in the range 2.7 to 0.1 may not be assigned.

1) Numerical grades having significance are:

4.0: Highest grade attainable, assigned for extraordinary high performance.

2.8: Cumulative average necessary for good academic standing in the School of Dentistry and for graduation. Failure to achieve a 2.8 cumulative GPA at the end of each academic year shall usually lead to dismissal.

2.8: Lowest grade providing unconditional course credit toward graduation.

0.0: Total failure of performance, or other than official withdrawal. Requires submission of "Student Deficiency Report" to Academic Affairs by the Course Director.

2) Grading Information

a) Grades 4.0 - 2.8

All grades awarded in this range denote satisfactory completion of coursework and provide unconditional course credit toward graduation.

b) Credit/No Credit Grades

With the approval of the Curriculum Committee, certain School courses may be graded on a Credit/No Credit basis. All students registered in such courses are assigned Credit or No Credit grades. Credit/No Credit Grades do not enter into computation of cumulative grade-point-averages. However, No Credit (NC) grades shall be considered the equivalent of a failing (0.0) grade in Student Progress Committee decisions.
c) Incomplete Grades

Incomplete (I) grades may be awarded when all the following circumstances are in evidence:

- The student does not complete all course requirements by the final day of the course;
- The student’s performance has been satisfactory to within two (2) weeks of the end of the quarter; OR extenuating circumstances prevent the student from successfully completing or fully participating in the course; AND
- The student presents proof satisfactory to the Course Director that circumstances beyond the student’s control prevented completion of course requirements. Such proof must be received by the Course Director no later than the time grades are due at the Registrar’s Office according to the University calendar.

If the above conditions are not in evidence, a 0.0 grade shall be awarded.

At the time grades are due, the Course Director shall submit a Student Deficiency Report to Academic Affairs describing reasons for the I grade, listing the requirements the student must fulfill to remove the I, and stating the deadline for fulfillment of course requirements.

The student's opportunity to proceed with additional work to remove an I grade and the time by which such work must be completed are contingent upon decisions of the Course Director, the Student Progress Committee, and the Dean during quarterly review of student progress.

I grades shall be converted to "0.0" grades by the Course Director if deadlines for removal specified by the Course Director are not met.

If an I in a preclinical course is not removed by the deadline, the student shall be prohibited from proceeding to clinical activity.

3) N Grades

N grades are limited to hyphenated courses and indicate satisfactory progress at the end of a quarter other than the terminal quarter of a hyphenated series.

At the end of the last quarter of a hyphenated series, a numerical grade or an I must be recorded. This terminal grade shall be the grade for each preceding quarter of the hyphenated sequence and shall replace N grades previously recorded on the University transcript.

A 0.0 grade may be submitted at the end of any quarter in a hyphenated sequence.

i. N grades shall not be submitted when student performance is unsatisfactory.

ii. N grades shall not be submitted at the end of a course if the course director has not yet assigned a grade for a particular course that has been completed.

4) X Grades

An X (No Grade Now) appears on a student’s transcript when the instructor has not yet assigned a grade for a particular course. This remains on a student’s record until a grade is submitted. The X option only signifies that the instructor has not completed evaluating a student's performance and is not yet prepared to assign a final grade.
X grades do not affect the GPA, but they do affect student status and eligibility for some types of financial aid. As a result, instructors must make every effort to submit grades in a timely manner.

5) Withdrawal Grades

Withdrawal (W) grades are unusual in UWSOD because of the prerequisites and sequence in the dental curriculum. Therefore, withdrawal from a course requires the approval of the Course Director and the Dean or the Dean’s delegates. Withdrawal without such approval shall result in a 0.0 grade.

6) Proceeding to Clinical Care

If a 0.0, NC, or I grade in a preclinical course is not removed by the deadline set by the Course Director and approved by the Student Progress Committee and the Dean, the student may be prohibited from proceeding to clinical activity.

If a 0.0, NC, or I grade in a clinical course is not removed by the deadline set by the Course Director and approved by the Student Progress Committee and the Dean, the student may be prohibited from continuing with further clinical activity.

7) COVID-19 Grading Changes for UW School of Dentistry

Spring Quarter 2020

In response to appeals from our students, the UWSOD converted all predoctoral courses that began the quarter with a 4.0 scale grading to credit/no credit. The only exception were the quarterly third-year clerkships, DENTCL 633, DENTCL 636, DENTCL 637, and DENTCL 638, which had previously graded 75% of the class on a 4.0 scale and had to maintain equivalency.

2020-2021 Academic Year

In the continued best interests of our dental students, the UWSOD changed the grading for all predoctoral courses to credit/no credit for the 2020-2021 academic year.