1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda. (Video Time Stamp 00:00:56—00:01:21)

The meeting was called to order at 2:32 P.M.

Without objection, the agenda was approved.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Robin Angotti. (00:01:22—00:02:33) [Exhibit A]

Chair Angotti referred members to her video remarks.

3. Reports and Opportunity for Questions. (00:02:34—00:017:18)
   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]

Jacob Vigdor, Faculty Legislative Representative, added to his written remarks. Vigdor said he testified before the ways and means committee on the budget, and that he emphasized the negative effects that faculty and staff furloughs would have on students. Vigdor noted that the faculty regent bill passed out of committee, as did a bill requiring that the course catalogue flag courses for which the materials cost less than fifty dollars. A bill regarding equity in medical training will receive a hearing, and Vigdor asked for faculty input. Vigdor discussed a companion bill that would mandate equity training and climate surveys across the University as a whole. He noted that there will be a University response to that bill emphasizing the University’s commitment to the underlying goals but also arguing for more autonomy. Vigdor asked for faculty input.

During questions, several points were made. There will be forthcoming fiscal estimates that will affect the final budget. If the outlook improves, then the question of furloughs likely will be moot. Vigdor cautioned that seeking a salary increase, however, would be a heavier lift. He said that efforts will be made to tell the legislature that that the University is already ahead of what is required in the equity bills and that funding would be more helpful than mandates. Members added that legislatively mandated training may not be as effective as more localized approaches. Vigdor said that the medical equity bill apparently is aimed at the medical school training of M.D.’s and does not extend to the training of other health-care professionals. He added that there is another bill that applies to health care more broadly.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce. (00:17:19—00:27:05)

With respect to Olympia, President Cauce made several points. Feelings about the University are very positive, and the legislature recognizes the great work done by the UW with respect to the COVID crisis. Cauce said that each budget report gets a little better. She does not expect furloughs unless the budget suddenly takes a turn for the worse, but she went on to say that there is only a small chance of raises. With respect to the equity training bills, Cauce noted that there are mandates but no sanctions, that the University supports the underlying goals, that the University has already been doing much of what the bills envision, and that the University seeks more autonomy.

With respect to COVID, Cauce made several points. Although there may be some more on campus activity, such as providing more library access, Spring Quarter will look a lot like Winter Quarter. Cauce said she hopes that Autumn Quarter can be generally in person, but the University will follow public-health guidelines. Cauce noted that vaccine eligibility is set by the State, not the University. UW Medicine has set up a separate portal for employees who are eligible, but all are encouraged to check other sources as well.
Cauce said that work continues on diversity, equity, and inclusion. She singled out changes to campus safety and policing and the Provost's hiring and retention work.

There were no questions.

5. Requests for Information. (00:27:05—00:27:05)
   a. Approval of the November 16, 2020, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the December 3, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.

There were no requests for information.

6. Memorial Resolution. (00:27:06 – 00:28:28)

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

The resolution was approved by a moment of silence.

7. Announcements. (00:28:29 – 00:28:39)

There were no announcements.

8. New Business. (00:28:40 – 00:41:55)
   a. Class A Legislation – Title Cleanup – second consideration. (00:28:40 – 00:30:22) [Exhibit E]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      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.

      There was no discussion.

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

   b. Class A Legislation – Voting Time Limits – second consideration. (00:30:23 – 00:34:13) [Exhibit F]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      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.

      In response to a question, it was noted that the amendment to restore the 21 day period that was passed at the previous Senate meeting had been incorporated, but the description attached to the legislation failed to reflect that fact.

      There was no further discussion.

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

   c. Class A Legislation – Clinical Appointment Lengths – second consideration. (00:34:14 – 00:39:33) [Exhibit G]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      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.
During discussion, several points were made. Members expressed concern about the interaction of this legislation and the non-compete clauses used in UW medicine. Jack Lee, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, said that such clauses were outside the current expertise of the Council and that work remained to be done with respect to clinical faculty.

There was no further discussion.

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

d. Class A Legislation – Diversity Statement – second consideration. (00:39:34 -- 00:41:46) [Exhibit H]

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

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.

There was no discussion.

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

9. Discussion Items.

a. Finance Transformation update. (00:41:56 -- 01:06:50) [Exhibit I]

Ed Loftus, Assistant Vice President for Finance Transformation

Loftus referred members to the Exhibit and a previously submitted video.

In response to questions, several points were made. Operating costs will be passed on to units at the school level with no change in the figures previously supplied. Costs will be allocated to departments by the units. The formally budgeted figure is 269.3 million, but such a figure can over-estimate some costs and leave out others. As of now, the project is under budget. The State is funding the cost of integrating the UW system with the state system. Planning for faculty training is ongoing. Loftus could provide the project cost per faculty member, but Provost Richards thought that cost per employee would be a more useful figure, and he went on to note noted that the project costs were benchmarked against other universities of comparable size and complexity. President Cauce reminded members that the project will allow us to work better, but the change must take place because there simply is not the expertise available to continue to maintain the current out-of-date system. Loftus added that the cost of maintaining the current system is twice what comparable universities are paying with more modern systems. The formal implementation of the project began in early 2020, and the go-live date currently is scheduled for July 1, 2022. Loftus has a staff of 112, but some units, such as medicine, also have staff working on the project. The project is cloud-based rather than hardware-based. Richards added that a significant part of the initial cost is reconstructing and carrying over existing financial accounts as opposed to new technology. Licensing costs are less than 10% of the total. Moving from the financial and technology aspects of the project, Loftus said that in terms of operation the project task force is moving away from the regional HUB idea to a focus on efficient grouping coupled with unit autonomy; discussion with individual units is ongoing, and there should be more clarity by the end of March.


Members made a number of general comments. It was said that it is important for Senators, as leaders, to share what goes on in the Senate and to offer support to the community. It was said that it is important to talk to legislators as members of the University or as members of the community. Information was provided on efforts to provide aid to faculty caregivers. It was noted that no special recognition by the State in the vaccine rollout was made for UW employees. The feeling is that UW employees can, for the most part, work remotely in the spring as opposed to K-12 employees who will have to deal with in person instruction. In any case, it is expected that the vaccine should be generally available by fall when the UW would be back in session. Members were reminded that eligible UW employees can sign up for vaccination through UW Medicine even if they are not otherwise a patient. Some members expressed confusion about whether they are eligible, and they were told to carefully read the roll-out guidelines or check the State website.
11. Adjournment. (01:25:26 -- 01:25:30)

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 P.M.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend

Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Robin Angotti

Chair

Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, January 28 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.
Although I recognize that numerical dates are abstract, I have to admit that I am glad 2020 is now hindsight. At the University of Washington, we have fallen into some semblance of routine with virtual classes and meetings and the online format is growing more familiar to us, although it is not entirely comfortable. There is hope on the horizon with two approved vaccines and a number of future vaccines lined up for future consideration. There is much to be optimistic about as we head into 2021. There is also much work to be done.

After the whirlwind finish to 2020 with 10 pieces of legislation discussed at the final Senate meeting, I hope everyone took a little pause. This first meeting for winter quarter is a little lighter, yet no less important. We have the second consideration of four pieces of class A legislation that passed the Senate in December as well as an update on Finance Transformation.

There is a considerable amount of work ongoing in the faculty councils, which bodes for a busy winter and spring. The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs is considering the legislation on the faculty grievance and discipline policy, the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy continues to discuss potential legislation to fix inconsistencies in code language as a result of Bothell and Tacoma now having schools and Deans, the Faculty Council on Academic Standards continues its work to address issues affecting scholastic regulations which affect all the campuses. These are just a few examples of the work of the councils in this new year. All of the 11 councils are equally hard at work to improve the function of the academic enterprise of the university.

The state legislative session began on January 11 which will have huge implications for the budget for the upcoming biennium. Senate leadership looks forward to regular updates from our faculty legislative rep, Jake Vigdor and deputy rep, JoAnn Taricani.

All of the things mentioned above are forward thinking items. I know that it is hard right now to think about the future, some days it is all we can do to get through the day. But it is imperative right now to be bold. Many of the problems we face didn’t start with the pandemic, there were cracks in the foundation of higher education before 2020 and if we continue to ignore them, they will make the structure crumble. These issues include funding, diversity, equity, tenure, enrollment, and include challenges from outside entities such as big tech who are dipping into the education arena to think of different ways to educate for the job market. We have this moment to face these challenges and to creatively think about how to move the academy and the university forward for the 22nd century. Let’s not throw away our shot. We can be leaders or we can follow others who will chart the course for the future of higher education.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. Faculty Senate Vice Chair Search Update: The Senate Vice Chair Nominating Committee will soon be interviewing nominees for the 2021-22 Vice Chair. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the university and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the faculty across the university. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) in the Faculty Senate Office.

2. Committee on Committees: The Committee on Committees will soon be seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees. Contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) for further information.

3. Annual Faculty Lecture: The University Faculty Lecture Award Selection Committee is currently accepting nominations for the 2020-2021 University Faculty Lecture. Please send applications to secfac@uw.edu. The purpose of the University Faculty Lecture Award is twofold: to honor University of Washington faculty members whose scholarship or creative work is widely respected by their colleagues as original and important, and to share those accomplishments with the community, both on and off the campus, through a public lecture. Each year since 1974, a distinguished member of our faculty has been chosen for this honor.
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 once and discussed the following topics:

- A status report and in-depth discussion with leadership and staff from the Office of Global Affairs, focusing on faculty-led study-abroad programs, as well as their overall financial position, reserves, outlook, and future strategy
- Continuing detailed discussion of an administration plan for bridge funding and hiring to diversify the faculty, yielding recommendations and suggestions for implementation and assessment
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance

This report includes reflections on the events of January 6th, commentary on Governor Inslee’s proposed budget for the 2021-23 fiscal biennium, as well as an update on bills related to taxation (SB 5096), faculty representation on the Board of Regents (HB 1051), instructional materials costs (HB 1119), and diversity, equity, and inclusion training and assessments (SB 5227).

“If you see it in the Sun it’s so”
- Virginia O’Hanlon, quoting her father, 1897

Once upon a time, information was curated. Consumers of information had their choice of outlets – the daily newspapers, other periodicals, books on the shelves of their local library or bookstore. Information arrived in the consumer’s hands only after surviving the scrutiny of others – editors, reviewers, publishers, librarians.

These curation services, to some extent, absolved us of critical thought.

To be sure, the layers of review between author and reader were not sufficient to eliminate all sources of bias or error. They still aren’t. And then as now, the efforts of writers left stories untold, stories that are in many cases critical to a complete understanding of complex issues or problems, let alone a reasoned idea of what is just. There have been dark times in human history where those empowered to preserve a society’s texts have chosen to burn them. Yet faith in the information delivery industry was sufficient, in at least one place at one time, to allow an educated father to encourage his precocious 8-year-old daughter to place her complete trust in the integrity of a local newspaper.

Would any of us offer that same encouragement today?

In what we call the “information age,” the barriers between author and reader have been decimated. Anyone can be an author. Every reader, faced with a perpetual stream of content, serves as their own curator. The technological advances that made this possible have ushered in an era where any person might find a community united by interest. This is simultaneously a wonderful and frightening thing. Information, be it true or false, corroborated or speculative, can spread unchecked. Conspiracy theories find root in fertile soil. And to the reader who believes a conspiracy is afoot, the fact-checkers of the world appear as mere co-conspirators.

As information becomes ever easier to access, the importance of critical thought increases exponentially. As a young student I was taught how to use a card catalog, the key to curation. Today’s self-curators require a very different skill set. Teaching a student to leaf through alphabetically ordered index cards is easy. Teaching a student to recognize the telltale signs of misinformation is not.

We cannot claim to know what lies in the hearts and minds of every person who stormed the U.S. Capitol building on January 6th. But it seems reasonable to conclude that most members of this group had been led to believe things that are demonstrably false. These range from the ephemeral notion that President Trump won re-election in a “sacred landslide” to more enduring theories of eugenics and white supremacy.

How do we uproot these ideas? How do we train our fellow citizens to be more critical consumers of information? When we are accused of being participants in a conspiracy ourselves, how might we persuasively counter-argue? The future of humanity depends on our search for answers to these questions. In this way our elected leaders must rely on our efforts as faculty.

Governor Inslee’s Proposed Budget

The State of Washington operates using a two-year budget cycle. Our current cycle will end on June 30, 2021. In the current legislative session the state will adopt a budget for the period from July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2023. As is customary, this process kicked off with a proposed budget from the governor’s
office. This is only a proposal and the final version passed by the legislature could look quite different. Nonetheless, this document serves as a starting point for negotiations.

Higher Education

The governor’s proposed budget calls out several initiatives to support the higher education sector in general, and the University of Washington in particular. The broad initiatives center on advancing equity through improving student access to financial aid and non-financial resources to students who have experienced homelessness or foster care. Here at UW, the governor seeks to commit $112 million over two years to support care for Medicaid patients and the uninsured at UW Medicine, Harborview, and UW Dentistry. There are smaller proposals to fund mental health faculty and fellowships ($2.4M), and a new debt-financed Interdisciplinary Education Research Center for the College of Engineering ($70.4M). If passed as proposed, the budget would result in a net increase of $40M/year in support flowing from the state’s “near general fund” to UW, thanks largely to the uncompensated care provisions.

All that said, the governor’s proposal would result in a net cut of $118 million to UW’s operating budget over two years ($59M/year). I know this sounds strange. “How can a budget simultaneously forward more state money to the University and cause it to have a smaller operating budget?” It’s because beyond sending resources to our three campuses, the state has the power to influence how we spend money we earn elsewhere – through tuition, grants, contracts, patient care, and so forth.

The bulk of the UW budget reductions would accrue through cuts in employment, salaries, and benefits. The proposal calls for a two-year salary freeze, following the de facto freeze in place for 2020/21. The proposal also calls for one-day-a-month involuntary furloughs, translating into a 4.6% pay cut in effect for the next two years, as well as reduced benefit spending. These cuts are proposed in an environment where revenue for the 2021-23 cycle is projected to be over 7% higher than the current cycle, and in a budget document that also proposed to enact a new capital gains tax, discussed further below, to boost revenues another 2%.

On January 12th, I testified before the state Senate Ways and Means Committee to raise concerns about the cuts embedded in Governor Inslee’s budget. I emphasized that the price of faculty furloughs – a requirement that faculty reduce their work effort – is paid by the Washingtonians we serve. Through our teaching, research, service, and community outreach activities we serve every resident of this state, to say nothing of people residing outside our borders. But the Washingtonians who would suffer most from reduced faculty work effort would be our students. I emphasized that our time is directed disproportionately to those students who most need our assistance, who are often first-generation students and those from disadvantaged families.

The Proposed Capital Gains Tax (introduced as SB 5096)

Results from the faculty survey I circulated at the beginning of the academic year indicate that improving the progressivity of Washington’s tax regime is a significant priority for many. Governor Inslee’s budget includes a proposal for a capital gains tax. The proposed tax rate of 9% would apply to gains over $25,000 for individuals and over $50,000 for joint filing households. The tax would apply only to gains on financial assets, not homes.

Taxpayers realize a capital gain upon selling an asset worth more than what they paid for it. So, if you bought a single share of Amazon stock five years ago for $600 and sold it today for $3,300, your realized capital gain would be $2,700. If you had bought and sold ten shares instead of one, and file your income taxes as a single person, your capital gain of $27,000 would result in a state tax bill (to go alongside Federal capital gains taxes). The 9% rate would apply to the portion of your gain over $25,000. So the check you’d write to the State of Washington would amount to $(27,000 – 25,000) \times 0.09 = $180.

Capital gains taxes are considered progressive because lower-income households tend to have few assets to their name, particularly once you rule out home equity. The proposal to exempt capital gains below $25,000 for single individuals increases the progressivity still further. Capital gains are subject to state taxation in 41 states.
There’s one essential drawback to the capital gains tax: it’s not the most dependable source of revenue, particularly during economic downturns. When the stock market is down, investors may be less likely to sell – and if you do sell, your realized capital gain is likely to be smaller than it otherwise would be. Other things equal, it’s better to have sources of revenue that don’t dry up in a recession. Property taxes, for example, are pretty dependable in good times and bad. But they aren’t as progressive as a capital gains tax.

If you’ve followed Washington state tax policy for a long time, you probably know that the state operates under a court precedent, dating to 1933, that interprets our state constitution as requiring taxes to be levied at a uniform rate. That’s the main reason why we don’t have an income tax today – voters actually passed a progressive income tax ballot proposition in 1932 by a 70-30 margin. Efforts to amend the state constitution to allow a progressive income tax via a ballot proposition have failed five times since 1933, most recently in 2010.

Interpreted strictly, a tax that exempts the first $25,000 of income from a specific source would not pass muster, whereas a tax with no exemption would be fine. This raises some question as to why the governor wouldn’t just propose a simpler 9% tax on all capital gains with no exemption. It would still be a progressive tax because the wealthy are much more likely to have capital gains.

If the tax proposal were to pass the legislature in its current form, it would almost certainly be challenged in court, where its fate would be uncertain. Defenders of the tax might point to Washington’s estate tax, which features an exemption as well as a progressive rate structure (higher tax rates for more valuable estates) yet passed muster in the courts.

I am writing this report on the morning of January 14th. Later this afternoon I will testify on behalf of the faculty before the Senate Ways and Means committee in support of this step toward greater tax progressivity.

**Faculty Regent Bill (HB 1051)**

The University of Washington and Washington State University have repeatedly supported a bill that would create an 11th position on the UW Board of Regents, reserved for a member of the faculty. This bill has been introduced in multiple legislative sessions, made some progress toward being enacted as law, but fallen short each time.

There was some speculation that this might be a good year to take a break from advocating for this bill. The legislature, working remotely for this session, will likely consider fewer bills than in a typical session. Nonetheless, the bill’s perennial sponsor in the House, Rep. Gerry Pollet of the 46th district, has filed HB 1051 to be considered in the 2021 session. As of this writing, the bill has added 15 co-sponsors, reflecting bipartisan support. On January 18th I will testify before the House Committee on College and Workforce Development in support of this bill, alongside my counterpart from WSU.

This bill has passed the House on more than one occasion, but has yet to pass the state Senate. We’ve already begun outreach to state senators to build support for the bill this time around.

**Instructional Materials Transparency Bill (HB 1119)**

Representative Cyndy Jacobsen of Pierce County has introduced a bill that would require our course catalog to flag courses on the basis of instructional materials costs (HB 1119). There would be no infringement on a faculty member’s right to select course materials, however the course catalog would flag those courses for which instructional materials cost less than $50. The bill has garnered bipartisan support. On January 18th I will testify before the House Committee on College and Workforce Development in favor of this bill, on the argument that course materials costs may be a significant burden for some students and it is reasonable to provide them with the capacity to make informed decisions. The bill would also “nudge” instructors to considering whether expensive materials are really worth the price relative to materials that are freely available to students through the library or other sources.

You may hold a different opinion, and if so please contact me.
Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Antiracism Trainings and Assessments Bill (SB 5227)

Senator Emily Randall has introduced a bill that would impose new legislative mandates for training modules and assessments related to diversity, equity, inclusion and antiracism (SB 5227). At this writing the bill has not been scheduled for a hearing but as Senator Randall chairs the Higher Education and Workforce Development committee it’s likely to be heard soon.

We will be informing legislators of UW’s ongoing efforts to assess climate and offer training opportunities. There are important questions as to whether these efforts would be improved by codification in state law, or whether statutory provisions would impede us from adopting emerging best practices. I welcome your opinion on these issues as we formulate our response to the legislation.
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapters 21, 24, and 25

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code: Title Cleanup

On October 27, 2020, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate.

Background and Rationale

There are three faculty titles in the code that do not reflect current practice: Research Associate, Senior Lecturer, and Full-Time Lecturer. This is a minor revision of the code to bring it in line with current practice.

What We Propose to Do

1. **Delete the Research Associate title:** The union contract for postdoctoral scholars made this title obsolete, so we are proposing to remove all references to it from the code.

2. **Delete the Senior Lecturer title:** As a result of the faculty vote to establish the Teaching Professor titles last year, all Senior Lecturers who were either full-time or on annual contracts at 50% FTE or more were converted to Associate Teaching Professors. However, there were a few part-time Senior Lecturers hired at less than 50% who were not converted, so we left that title in the code. As of now, there are no longer any faculty members with that title, and no further hires will be made with that title, so we are proposing to remove all references to it from the code.

3. **Eliminate voting rights for Temporary Full-time Lecturers:** All full-time lecturers have been converted to Assistant Teaching Professors except those designated by the Office of Academic Personnel as “Lecturer Full-Time Temporary.” This is a job title that can be conferred without a competitive search, intended to address unanticipated short-term instructional needs. Individuals with this title are limited to annual appointments for up to 3 consecutive years. It never made much sense for individuals with this title to be given voting rights, but the faculty code did not distinguish between temporary and non-temporary full-time lecturers. Now that the only remaining full-time lecturers are in the “temporary” category, we propose to remove voting rights from this title.

Operative Date of This Legislation

This proposal stipulates that the specific part of the legislation regarding voting rights for full-time lecturers (in Section 21-32) will not become operative until September 16, 2021. This is because temporary full-time lecturers already serving on full-year contracts might have been hired with the understanding that they would have voting rights. This legislation keeps those voting rights in place through the end of current contracts, but eliminates them for any future contracts.

All other parts of the legislation will become operative according to the usual timeline (as soon as the legislation is signed by the president).
The Proposed Class A Legislation:

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection:

1. That Chapters 21, 24, and 25 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below.
2. That the amendment to Section 21-32 shall become operative on September 16, 2021.
3. That all other amendments in this legislation shall become operative in accordance with the provisions of Section 29-38 A of the Faculty Code.
Chapter 21
Organization of the University Faculty

Section 21-31 Membership in the Faculty

The University faculty consists of:

- The President,
- The Provost,
- The professors,
- The associate professors,
- The assistant professors,
- The senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
- The professors of practice,
- The lecturers and artists in residence,
- The instructors,
- The teaching and research associates,

whether serving under visiting, acting, research, teaching, clinical, or affiliate appointment, whether serving part-time or full-time, and whether serving in an active or emeritus capacity. The faculty, beginning with the professor, are listed in order for purposes of determining voting eligibility based on superior rank.


Section 21-32 Voting Membership in the Faculty

A. Except as provided in Subsection B of this section the voting members of the University faculty are those faculty members holding the rank and/or title of:

- Professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research professor, 50% appointment or greater
- Teaching professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate teaching professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Assistant teaching professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Full-time senior artist in residence,
- Full-time lecturer,
Chapter 24
Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

5. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A above with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired under research appointments.

Research professor and research associate professor appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research assistant professor appointments are for a term not to exceed three years with renewals and extensions to a maximum of eight years (see Section 24-41, Subsection H.). The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research associate appointments are for a term not to exceed three years, with renewals to a maximum of six years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in Section 24-35.


Section 24-35 Research Personnel Appointments

A. Research titles designate appointments for faculty whose primary responsibility is research. The research titles are:
   • Research professor
   • Research associate professor
   • Research assistant professor
   • Research associate

B. Research professors, research associate professors, and research assistant professors are eligible for appointment to the graduate faculty, are expected to take active roles in generating research funding, and are eligible to act as principal investigators for grants and contracts. Research faculty may participate in the regular instructional program but are not required to do so, except insofar as required by their funding source.

C. Research associate is considered a junior rank equivalent to instructor. This junior faculty appointment, which requires the same qualifications as those of an instructor, normally serves to advance the competence of a person who has recently completed higher professional training, in most fields marked by a doctoral degree. Appointees will work under the direction of principal investigators for the benefit of the research programs, the department's educational program, and their own professional growth. Research associates may not be principal investigators on research grants or contracts.

S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990: both with Presidential approval.

Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

B. Lecturer, Artist Residence, and Professor of Practice

1. Appointment as a full-time artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

   Appointment as a full-time lecturer shall be for a term not to exceed one year. Such appointments are limited to three consecutive years.

   The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

2. Appointment as a full-time senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

   The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, or professor of practice, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, or professor of practice, is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

5. Part-time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be
renewed the procedures in Section 24-53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of
funding availability and staffing needs.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 31, December 28, 1966; S-A 41, April 3, 1972; S-A 42, June 9, 1972;
S-A 49, December 4, 1975; S-A 62, December 2, 1980; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 67, December 5,
1983; S-A 68, April 19, 1984; S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 98, May 12,
S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 127, June 11, 2012; S-A 133, June 11, 2014; S-A 147, September 16, 2020:
all with Presidential approval.

Section 24-52 Procedure for New Appointments

C. In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all
available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean
to the voting members of the department faculty. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by
majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty,
research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturers to an elected committee of its
voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an
elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is
made.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 24, June 23, 1959; S-A 126, June 11, 2012: all with Presidential
approval.

Section 24-53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24-41), the
procedure described below shall be followed.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who
are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to
recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be
considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that
the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal
of the appointment of a research professor or teaching professor. Faculty with instructional titles
outlined in Section 24-34, Subsections B.1 and B.2 shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a
professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of
an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or
clinical faculty, research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an
elected committee of its voting faculty.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 41, April 3, 1972; S-A 60, June 25, 1979; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-
A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 147, September 16, 2020:
all with Presidential approval.

Section 24-57 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure
Considerations

All procedures regarding promotion, merit-based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the
relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and
between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to
protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and
scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly
interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a
department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current
and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member
to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University's obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24-32, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The reference to lecturers is removed from the following paragraph because all remaining lecturers are on at most one-year contracts, and the first sentence below already requires an evaluation of teaching effectiveness before renewal. Thus it is not necessary to stipulate separately that lecturers need to have a collegial teaching evaluation annually.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor “without tenure” under Chapter 25, Subsection D, or with the instructional title of lecturer, the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the title of senior lecturer, or professor of practice the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.

C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean or his or her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors and professors “without tenure” appointed under Chapter 25, Subsection D. The chair (or dean or his or her designee) shall confer individually with the other associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the other professors and professors of practice at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member’s record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24-55.

At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss:

1. The department’s present needs and goals with respect to the department’s mission statement and the faculty member’s present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments;
2. Shared goals for the faculty member’s teaching, scholarship, and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department’s needs and goals for the same period; and

3. A shared strategy for achieving those goals.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24-32. The chair, dean, or his or her designee should make specific suggestions, as necessary, to improve or aid the faculty member’s work.

Chapter 25

Tenure of the Faculty

Section 25-32 Criteria for Tenure

C. A faculty member does not acquire tenure under:

1. An acting appointment, or

2. A visiting appointment, or

3. Any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or

4. An appointment as teaching associate, or

5. An appointment as professor of practice, or

6. Any appointment specified to be without tenure, or

7. An adjunct appointment, or

8. A research appointment, or

9. A teaching appointment, or

10. A clinical appointment, or

11. An affiliate appointment, or

12. Any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment.

Approved by:

Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
Approved by:
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Approved by:
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Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 29

Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Code: Time Limits for Class A Legislation

On November 10, 2020, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate.

Background and Rationale

The process for amending the Faculty Code (Class A Legislation by the Faculty Senate) is deliberately long and involved, because such actions should not be taken hastily. But there’s one part of the process that is longer than it needs to be – after the second senate vote on an amendment, the Secretary of the Faculty is given 14 days to send out the text of the amendment and a ballot, and then voting faculty are given 21 days to send back their votes. This made sense when all of these things had to be done by snail mail, but now that these votes are handled electronically, such long time limits are unnecessary. Reducing them will make the amendment process a little less cumbersome and time-consuming, without undermining the deliberateness with which such amendments should be undertaken.

What We Propose to Do

Primarily, this amendment will reduce the time limit for faculty to submit their votes on Class A legislation from 21 calendar days to 14 calendar days. In addition, the time limit for the Secretary of the Faculty to send out the (electronic) ballots is reduced from 14 days to 7, and we are proposing to codify the Secretary’s current practice of sending out a reminder a few days before the voting deadline. A study of recent voting patterns has revealed that the vast majority of votes on Class A legislation are cast either during the few days after the ballots are sent out, or during the last couple of days after the reminder is sent.

The current time limit for faculty to respond to Class B legislation (everything other than amendments to the Faculty Code) is 14 days, and we are not proposing to change that, so the time limits for both classes of legislation will be the same.

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.
Chapter 21

Amendment of the Faculty Code

Section 29-36  Faculty Vote on Amendments

A.  Within 44 7 calendar days after the Senate approves a proposed amendment to the Faculty Code, the Secretary shall send to each voting member of the faculty:

1.  A statement:
   a.  Setting forth the text of the proposed amendment;
   b.  Presenting the arguments for the amendment and, if any, the arguments against it; and
   c.  Specifying the final date upon which ballots may be cast; and

2.  A ballot upon which a vote may be cast either for or against the proposal.

B.  Not less than 2 calendar days nor more than 5 calendar days before the end of the voting period, the Secretary shall send a reminder about the voting deadline to voting members who have not yet voted.

B-C.  Following the voting instructions provided by the Secretary, eligible faculty shall vote on the proposed amendment. In order to be counted, the vote shall be submitted no later than the 21st calendar day after the date on which the Secretary distributed ballots to the faculty.

C-D.  To become effective, a proposed amendment to the Faculty Code shall require either an affirmative majority vote of the eligible voting members of the faculty, or a two-thirds majority vote of those casting ballots.


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
December 3, 2020

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
January 4, 2021
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24

Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Code: Appointment Lengths for Clinical Faculty

On November 10, 2020, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate.

Background and Rationale

The current faculty code limits faculty members with Clinical titles to annual appointments only. This limitation seems to have originally been established when the Clinical title was used only as a courtesy title for clinicians who received their salaries from other sources. But now there are other types of clinical faculty, and the one-year limitation applies to all of them, whether in unpaid courtesy positions or full-time or part-time salaried positions. Many physicians are hired by the School of Medicine as full-time salaried faculty members with the titles of Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, or Clinical Professor, and the faculty code limits them all to one year appointments at a time. These faculty members are playing an essential role in the COVID-19 pandemic response, and School of Medicine has observed that these limited contract terms cause severe difficulties in recruitment and retention. A joint SOM task force including representatives of the Dean's office and the elected faculty councils has requested that we modify the code to create a pathway for multi-year appointments for salaried clinical faculty.

What We Propose to Do

There are many clinical faculty members in many units throughout the university, and there are many complicated issues that need to be addressed regarding them. In the coming year, FCFA expects to consult with all the units that hire clinical faculty and explore what comprehensive changes might need to be made to the sections of code governing their appointments. But the issue of contract lengths is an immediate problem, especially during a pandemic, so we are proposing a stopgap measure to allow multi-year appointments for clinical faculty under limited circumstances with approval of the Provost.

The new language in Section 24-34 B.11 below (“with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost”) is copied from the section on part-time lecturer appointments (24-41 B.1). It retains the default appointment length of one year, but allows the Provost to approve exceptions. Our discussions with Academic Human Resources have led to a tentative agreement on the following conditions for approval of multi-year appointments:

- Salaried Clinical Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor at 50% FTE or more
- Hired after a competitive search
- Departmental commitment to a contract of 2 to 5 years

In addition to providing the possibility for longer contracts, this amendment stipulates that appointments and reappointments of clinical faculty on multi-year contracts must be voted on by all eligible faculty, not just a subcommittee (see the changes to Sections 24-52 and 24-53 below).

These changes will affect clinical faculty in all units of the university, not only in the School of Medicine.

The Proposed Class A Legislation

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below.
Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

11. A clinical appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their experience, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual. The normal appointment period of a clinical faculty member shall be one year with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.


Section 24-52 Procedure for New Appointments

C. In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean to the voting members of the department faculty. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty, annual clinical faculty, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturers to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 24, June 23, 1959; S-A 126, June 11, 2012: all with Presidential approval.

Section 24-53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24-41), the procedure described below shall be followed.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor or teaching professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsections B.1 and B.2 shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or clinical faculty, annual clinical faculty, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and
2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.
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Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24

To: Senate Chair Robin Angotti  
From: Gautham Reddy, Chair, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs  
CC: Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs  
Date: November 9, 2020  
Re: Proposed Class A Legislation to require that candidates for certain initial faculty appointments submit a statement of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion

Introduction

In the 2018-19 academic year, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) discussed a proposal to require that prospective and current faculty members submit a statement of contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Following the circulation in the spring of 2019 of the draft legislation that contemplated changes applicable to both initial faculty appointments and promotion, the FCMA refined the proposal and provided responses to questions raised following circulation of the initial draft.

Additionally, the prior FCMA chair, Brenda Williams, met individually with numerous members of campus leadership in October and November 2019, to solicit feedback about the impact of the proposed change on both appointment and promotion.

In consideration of the questions raised, the feedback provided, and the continued discussion and debate during FCMA’s regularly scheduled meetings, the FCMA voted to amend the proposed legislation to clarify that the legislation requiring a diversity statement should apply prospectively only to new faculty appointments.

The proposed legislation was unanimously passed by the FCMA in February 2020; because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the SEC and the Senate could not consider the proposal in the spring quarter of 2020. In October 2020, the FCMA revived the proposal and voted unanimously to forward proposed Class A legislation amending Faculty code section 24-32 to the Senate Executive Committee for ultimate consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Reasons for Proposed Changes

President Cauce described the University’s mission in the UW Diversity Blueprint 2017 – 2021 as one that values diversity in perspectives, creates a welcoming learning environment for all students and promotes broad access and equal opportunity. The Blueprint articulates diversity goals, recommended priorities and suggested action steps in support of the University’s mission, including the goal and recommended priority to attract and retain diverse faculty. The plan provides the following suggested action steps in support of this goal:

1. Strengthen and diversify faculty hiring practices;
2. Utilize best practices to improve the recruitment of underrepresented faculty; and
3. Develop school/college practices that support the retention and advancement of underrepresented faculty.

Through this proposed change, the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs supports the University’s mission to strengthen the recruitment of diverse faculty and to ensure that efforts at retention and advancement become central to the university. Moreover, FCMA seeks to support the recruitment of faculty who contribute to the University’s diversity and equity mission through the implementation of a diversity statement requirement for initial appointment and to encourage all faculty to support the development of diverse faculty members and students.

Over the course of this and the previous Academic year, the FCMA reviewed and ultimately selected Faculty Code Chapter 24.32 (Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members) for proposed revision to support the University’s ongoing effort to attract and retain diverse faculty in new appointments. Requiring new faculty applicants to provide a statement of past and proposed contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion strengthens faculty hiring practices by providing additional information to appointment committees that allows for more informed decisions when deliberating on the hiring of new faculty.

Procedural Background
At the initial meeting of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs in October 2018, the council reviewed goals provided by then Senate Chair George Sandison. Among the goals was a mandate to continue to evaluate relevant sections of the Faculty Code and associated practices through the lens of multicultural affairs, diversity, and difference, with the objectives of strengthening equity and fairness.

During the course of the fall (2018) and winter (2019) quarter meetings, the Council engaged in a discussion regarding the practice on other campuses to require a statement regarding contributions to diversity for all faculty hiring. A similar policy requiring a personal statement detailing contributions to diversity exists at all University of California campuses, prior to consideration for hiring. Many of the UC campuses also consider the diversity statement during the promotion review process. The FCMA proposal includes the option to provide a statement of proposed contributions to diversity in order to include all candidates in the overall mission of the University. During the fall (2019) quarter meetings, the FCMA amended the proposed legislation to its current form, rendering the requirement applicable to initial appointments only. In the fall quarter of 2020, the FCMA unanimously reaffirmed its commitment to the proposed legislation.

Sample Diversity Statements:
See Appendix A for a local sample diversity statement:

Appendix A Sample

See below links for models from other schools:

Berkeley recommendations on Diversity Statements
UC Davis describes various types of contributions to diversity
UC San Diego offers examples of diversity statements
Six examples of submitted Diversity Statements

Overview of Questions Considered before December 2019 amendment:

- Is this intending to add “diversity” to the existing 3 aspects of appointment/promotion/tenure (scholarship, teaching, service)? Cut across them? And since we do articulate what we mean by those, why not also do so for diversity?
  - The FCMA proposed legislation intends to incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion into each of the three existing aspects of appointment (scholarship, teaching and service);
  - The FCMA is unaware of a University wide definition of diversity. Individual schools and units do have local definitions of diversity and the definitions are not uniform across the campus. This Class A legislation does not propose a definition for diversity.
- Why add to this section rather than 24-52?
  - 24-52 appears to provide procedural guidance to appointment committees, whereas 24-32 provides for the Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of faculty members.
- Would this also impact merit reviews (24-57)?
  - The FCMA proposed legislation intends to amend section 24-32 as it relates to new faculty appointments only.
- I also think there are political considerations, per Mike’s comment (the prior revision was explicitly described as *not* requiring this, which might raise concerns among many).
  - The FCMA discussed, drafted and ultimately recommended this proposed legislation following a motion by a member of the Council made during the 2018-19 Academic year.
• In a future holistic evaluation of a candidate does council anticipate just an evaluation of a personal statement assuming the candidate does not have a significant contribution in any of the three traditional areas of evaluation for appointment and promotion. Just wondering how junior faculty might respond to this requirement. (Can council members easily give example responses for themselves?)

  i. The FCMA proposed legislation intends to amend section 24-32 as it relates to **new faculty appointments** only. The legislation contemplates an opportunity by candidates to present on their planned contributions where past contributions are lacking.

  ii. The FCMA provides a model Diversity Statement in the appendix and also provides links to models statements from other campuses.

Following discussion of the questions raised and the feedback provided by campus leadership, in December of 2019, the FCMA voted unanimously to amend the proposed legislation, clarifying that the legislation requiring a diversity statement applies to new faculty appointments only.

**Proposed Change**
The FCMA proposes one change to the section governing the appointment and promotion of faculty members, specifically to the Section 24-32, governing the Scholarly and Professional Qualification of Faculty members.
Section 24-32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. All candidates for initial faculty appointment to the ranks and/or titles listed in Section 21-32. A (Voting Membership in the Faculty) shall submit a statement of past and planned contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Academic units and search committees shall consider a candidate’s statement as part of a comprehensive evaluation of scholarship and research, teaching, and service. In accord with the University’s expressed commitment to excellence and equity, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.

A. Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member’s published or other creative work.

Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees.

C. The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or continuing education. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
- The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
- The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;
- The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and

The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

D. Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.

E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.
UWFT ARCHITECT VALIDATION STAGE

REPRIORITIZING AND STAGING WORK TO ACCOMMODATE LEARNINGS TO DATE

STAGE OBJECTIVES

To provide options and recommendations to UW Finance Transformation (UWFT) program Sponsors to validate and adjust as appropriate the comprehensive program scope, schedule, and budget. This includes revising program structure and operations to support improved collaboration.

BACKGROUND

The UWFT program is nearing the one-year mark of implementation. This milestone coincides with the planned end of its Architect stage focused on business process design, which is to be followed by a transition into the Configure & Prototype (C&P) stage. Given the complexity of the transformation that the UW seeks beyond the core Workday® deployment, it has now become necessary to evaluate the program's ability to successfully achieve the planned July 2022 go-live date within the outlined scope, schedule and budget as reviewed by the UW Board of Regents in December 2019.

This additional stage – Architect Validation – will focus on integrated planning, business process maturity, completion of Architect design deliverables and, where possible, making progress against C&P deliverables.

TIMELINE

Reprioritized work has been underway since October 1st (planned end of Architect stage) and will be completed by March 31st, 2021 with formal presentation to program governance for final decision-making in April 2021. Appropriate decisions and options for Sponsor consideration will be brought forward as they develop to enable ongoing work and resource decisions.

STAGE EXIT CRITERIA

1. Updated program scope
2. Updated integrated program schedule
3. Updated program budget and funding plan
4. Updated program processes and structure
5. Criteria and clear accountability by which any ongoing shifts in the program will be determined

LEARN MORE

Visit the Change Network and subscribe to the program’s newsletter for ongoing updates.

ARCHITECT VALIDATION STAGE

Throughout the design process of the Architect stage, the program team and collaboration partners learned a significant amount about the complexities of this transformation, particularly in the technology space.

A determination was made to re-prioritize work and focus on integrated planning and re-baselining efforts to conclude if the program must make substantive changes to scope, schedule and budget prior to formally transitioning to the C&P stage.
Link to video submitted to Faculty Senate.