Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, February 10, 2020, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: Joseph Janes, Robin Angotti, George Sandison, Justin Jesty, Jeff Hou, David Socha, Marian Harris, Jack Lee, Chris Laws, Ann Huppert, Mike Townsend, JoAnn Taricani, Dan Ratner, Julie Brines, Sumit Roy, Phillip Taddei, Mark Richards, Kelty Pierce
Absent: Ana Mari Cauce, Shailendra Jain, Gautham Reddy, Doug Ramsay, Giuliana Conti

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:36 P.M.

The agenda was approved.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Joseph Janes. [Exhibit A]

Janes referred members to the prepared remarks contained in the Exhibit.

   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]

A member asked which unit was being considered for the MOU discussed in the Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. George Sandison, Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting, said that the unit is the School of Law.


Provost Richards reiterated President Cauce’s support for the Class A legislation on alignment of faculty ranks, emphasizing that the President sees this a major, but not the final, step in the process of recognizing the commitment and contributions of all faculty. Richards added that neither he nor the President subscribe to the argument that the legislation will affect public/student perceptions of the tenure-track faculty.

Richards said that the University is actively looking at the use of the SAT/ACT in the admissions process. He noted that there are arguments and voices on all sides and with respect to many aspects of the issue. There is less urgency now that the UC system has postponed final action on the question, but the Faculty Senate has a significant role to play in determining the timeframe for addressing the issue. Janes said the faculty is starting a discussion internally and with the administration.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the January 6, 2020, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the January 23, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Council and Committee. [Exhibit E]
   d. Confirm the 2020-2021 Vice Chair nominees. [Exhibit E]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

   a. Class A Legislation – Proposed alignment of faculty ranks – second consideration. [Exhibit F]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
Action: Final review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.

A motion was made and seconded to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for second consideration.

There was no discussion.

The motion was approved.

b. Class C Resolution – Conversion of lecturer titles. [Exhibit G]
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to submit the resolution to the Faculty Senate.

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

In response to questions, Lee noted that nothing will change with respect to the processes of appointment and promotion. Some members were concerned that departments might conflate the appointment and promotion requirements of teaching and ladder faculty because of the common use of the professoriate language. Lee also noted that current senior lecturers at 50% or more on annual or multi-year contracts will be converted even in the absence of an earlier competitive search. He also said that all the non-converted titles will eventually “flush out” of the system as people retire or move to another title through the appropriate appointment process.

Lee discussed the desirability of changing parts of lines 26 to 28 to read “no new appointments should be made with the title of Principal Lecturer or Senior Lecturer (whether part-time or full-time) ....” Such a change would make clear the intent that current appointments could be renewed, but that the promotion pathway for teaching faculty should be through the teaching professoriate ranks.

That change was adopted as an amendment by consent.

As amended the motion was approved.

c. Class B Legislation – Grading. [Exhibit H]
   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS), summarized the material contained in the Exhibit.

In response to questions, several points were made. Huppert said that there is no explicit specification of who should receive the referenced documentation. The current practice is to submit it to FCAS, but a new process might be developed. The difference in language between a “sufficient,” “exceptionally strong,” and “extraordinary” justification indicates a degree of justification. In particular, the latter is to indicate that approval for an exception under that Section is not likely—units should not create a one-course barrier to finish. Huppert also noted that Section 2 is meant to cover hidden requirements such as a minimum grade requirement in a prerequisite.

The motion was approved.

d. Approval of the February 27, 2020, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit I]
   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda for distribution.

There was no discussion.
The motion was approved.

8. Discussion Items.
   a. Task Force on the faculty disciplinary code and process update. [Exhibit J]
      Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor and co-chair of the task force on disciplinary code and process.

Barsness summarized the material presented in the Exhibit.

In response to questions, several points were made. Barsness, and Mike Townsend, co-Chair of the task force, noted that after University processes have been exhausted, faculty members still retain their right to go to court. Barsness said that the current thinking is to have one faculty body from which both the grievance and disciplinary panels would be selected. Members said it would be helpful to have examples showing how the grievance steps would play out. Several members expressed concern about a single individual having to confront administrators in a position of power. Townsend and Barsness said that the current Code process allows for consolidation of individual petitions and the inclusion of so-called non-party participants, but there is no general explicit mechanism for multiple grievants. Barsness said that the proposal envisions “faculty liaisons” who can provide some support. Amanda Paye, support staff for the task force, noted one way of dealing with this issue in the labor setting is through a union alleging an unfair labor practice. Barsness acknowledged the general concern and said this will be a topic of discussion going forward.

b. Enrollment Management update. [Exhibit K]
   Phil Reid, Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs.
   Dan Ratner, Associate Professor of Bioengineering.

Reid and Ratner summarized the material presented in the Exhibit.

During discussion, several points were made. Reid pointed out that student advising takes place both pre- and post-major, with two sets of advisors. He said that it is important to make sure each set has the proper skills and knowledge base. He also said it is important to have some coordination between these sets of advisors. Some members raised concerns about whether a “common application” provides enough particularization to allow each academic unit to properly match the student desires with institutional resources.

9. Good of the Order

Janes noted that there are a number of forthcoming Class A and B proposals. This will put pressure on the remaining Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee meetings. With respect to the Senate, there likely will be a special meeting on April 30. There also is the possibility of a continuation of the March 30 Senate Executive Committee meeting.

10. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:34 P.M.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Approved by: Joseph Janes, Chair
Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty
Janes
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, February 17 at 2:30 p.m. in Gerberding 142.
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Joseph Janes Associate Professor, Information School

It’s a little hard to believe, but we’re just about at the midpoint – of the Winter Quarter, and of the academic year. For me, this is the time of year when I can’t help thinking about what is to come: the cherry blossoms returning to the Quad in a few weeks, longer and warmer (and drier and sunnier) days, students wrapping up papers, projects and portfolios and capstones and programs and getting ready to take on the world, all our sun-splashed celebrations of their achievements, and the mutual satisfaction of jobs well done. Much to look forward to. (Not to mention the sun.)

It’s also the midpoint of the legislative year, and thus matters are moving thick and fast through the various councils and committees. Today we have a series of important items to work through, both in terms of business and discussion, ranging from the second consideration of the teaching faculty proposal and its implementation, to another update to academic regulations, to further discussion of the ongoing work regarding processes for dispute resolution.

It can be easy, in meetings such as this, to focus on the details of what’s before us, and as we all know, those details matter in making sure we do things in the right way. I would encourage us all, in addition, to reflect on these issues and imagine the potential impacts they will have. Several hundred of our faculty, with titles and ranks that befit their contributions to our students and the university. A modern, comprehensive set of procedures and policies by which disputes can be resolved, mediated and in many cases addressed earlier, more effectively, and more justly. And an updated set of processes by which academic and curricular policies can be approved and implemented more efficiently.

We want to do things the right way – as we want to do the right things. I’m very much looking forward to our discussions on all of these; thanks, as ever, for all your work on behalf of our community.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty  
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. Vice-Chair Nominations: The Senate Vice-Chair Nominating Committee has completed its work. Three names have been forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration as submissions to the full Senate at the February 27 meeting.

2. Senate Elections: Senate elections are currently ongoing.

3. 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) or Jordan Smith (jjsmith4@uw.edu) for further information.

4. Annual Faculty Lecture: The Nominating Committee has received nominations and will begin deliberations later this month.

5. Council Support Analyst: The application process is closed and the interviewing process has begun. We hope to fill the position shortly.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
George Sandison, Professor, School of Medicine

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.

At the time of writing SCPB has met four times since the previous report to the Senate Executive Committee held 01/06/20. In these four meetings the committee has acted and advised as follows.

- UW state legislative requests for the 2020 60 day short session were discussed as well as Governor Inslee’s proposed 2020 supplemental operating and capital budgets that were released December 2019. Relevant summary documents are available on the UW office of planning and budgeting (OPB) webpages. In even-year short sessions the state legislature is primarily concerned with making minor corrections and technical changes to the biennial budget passed in April 2019. Because of this focus and the fact that UW had fared well in operating, capital and special proviso budgets the UW request numbers were low but important for 2020 and the thanks to legislators high. It was stated that much of the lobbying effort this session would be productively concentrated on retaining UW gains from the last biennial budget. Work to prepare next biennium budget requests is already underway.

- The Provost was advised on a unit adjustment proposal from the School of Nursing.

- OPB presented on changes in financial status of various units with special emphasis on those having a downward trend from their previously reported status. Action is being considered under a Memorandum of Agreement for at least one unit with a growing cumulative deficit.

- An update on the activity and financial status of CoMotion was presented. A new advisory body for CoMotion has been formed, UW Innovation Roundtable, that incorporates UW administrators, venture capital broker companies, entrepreneurs, assorted small and large business administrators and an administrative member of the Gates Foundation. A new model of patent licensing income was discussed and greater faculty input on this model requested through the Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property, Policy and Practice (ACIP3).

- UW Transportation presented their proposal for UW parking increases based on data for the University District non-UW parking costs and the benefits granted to staff as part of union negotiations. As part of UW Master Plan approval a commitment to the City was made to reduce UW SOV parking from 19% to 12% over a multi-year period. A goal that in practice means a significant loss in parking spots. Possibly balanced by an increasing number of faculty and staff using the light rail. As was advised last year, SCPB strongly urged UW Transportation to develop a budget model that was sustainable. The present model is a direct and unsustainable subsidy of the UPASS and other costs by faculty and staff who park. Since fewer and fewer people will park in the future it is unsustainable and it is clear that for many faculty and staff there is no available public transport option or a social or disability need to park it becomes and increasingly costly need.

- Advice was offered on the student enrollment management plan.

- A presentation and discussion took place regarding the Delaware Cost study participation by UW Seattle and the opportunities provided for fiscal review and analysis by departments.

- UW Medicine presented their annual financial report indicating they are on track regarding their Financial Improvement (FIT) plan.

SCPB will continue to monitor the fiscal health of the various academic, research and business units especially those units in debt or in a weak fiscal condition. Future meetings will include student life investments, ABB phase III update, student financial and tuition aid and faculty/staff benefits.
Several pieces of legislation appear to be moving forward; I am writing this report five days before the first major cutoff for legislation, and these are the bills that appear to be moving forward in the House (the Senate has not yet posted the bills it intends to move forward): HB 2283, asking for details of admissions information after each cycle, and the use of special admission criteria; HB 2523, requiring that more detailed financial aid information be provided to undergraduate students at the point of admission; HB 2327, requesting annual reports that would provide more detailed information on investigations where there has been a finding of sexual misconduct; HB 2514, creating a new Washington common application, or requiring all four-year institutions to use a current type of common application, such as the national Common App (the UW currently uses the Coalition Application); HB 1084, regarding the rights of use of name and image for student athletes, and possible payment to athletes; California recently passed legislation providing more rights to student athletes, and the NCAA has indicated that it will also discuss this issue. It is a complex set of financial and regulatory issues that likely will require federal oversight rather than piecemeal state-by-state legislation, because of course student athletes typically cross state borders to attend college. Bill language can be viewed at https://apps.leg.wa.gov/billinfo/

Our main faculty priority from the 2019 session is legislation that would create a faculty regent at the UW and WSU. This legislation easily passed the House higher education committee and full House (as it does every year), and for the first time, we had enough votes in the full Senate for the legislation to pass. The process of getting a bill advanced for the full vote has many steps, however, and other legislation had a priority in 2019. I hope that we will be able to proceed through the funnel of process to get a final vote on this legislation in 2020.

A reminder from past messages: 2020, and all even-numbered years, is a short legislative session of 60 days; the main budget items addressed are corrections and adjustments to the full 2019-21 biennial budget, rather than dealing with new budget requests. The university is requesting an adjustment and re-appropriation to some salary funding and criteria set in the 2019-21 budget, along with a few other adjustments in operational funding. The next budget session is in 2021, and Winter-Spring of 2020 will be the period of planning the next biennial budget request, in consultation with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
2019-2020 Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees

Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

Alece Stancin, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2020.

Confirm 2020-2021 Vice Chair Nominees

Chris Laws, Principal Lecturer, College of Arts & Sciences

Gautham Reddy, Professor, School of Medicine

Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy 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.

Recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations

The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations has reviewed the proposed amendment to the Faculty Code which was approved on first reading by the Faculty Senate. We detected no '(in)consistency with other provisions of the Faculty Code, relevant statutes, resolutions, and executive orders' in our review.

We did, however, notice some inconsistencies (or lack of clarity, or stylistic infelicity) in the proposed text and felt they may warrant comment, and possible revision:

1. The deletion of 'senior lecturer' from the list of voting faculty (Section 21-32.A [line 41]), but its continuing in the list of University faculty (Section 21-31 [line 18]), would appear to leave open the possibility of appointments of senior lecturers who--no matter whether part-time or full-time, annual or quarterly--would be denied voting rights. Is this indeed the intention? If so, how would it be made clear in the Code?
2. In Section 24-34.A.3 (line 334), the comma before 'and/or' is unnecessary, even if it were intended in some manner to isolate 'national or international recognition' as a criterion for 'research' and not 'teaching'; that differentiation might be more effectively accomplished by putting parentheses around 'as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition'.
3. At line 368, we think 'at the rank of professor' would be better wording than the present 'at rank of professor'.
4. In Section 24-34.B.3 we note that subsection ii (lines 380-81), unlike subsections i and iii, omits any specific mention of 'teaching ability', 'excellence in instruction', or their equivalent. Ostensibly based upon Section 24-34.B.2, it noticeably omits anything like the 'special instructional roles' which define 'senior lecturer' there. We'd recommend rephrasing the subsection by inserting 'for its special instruction roles' between 'requires' and 'extensive'.

For the Advisory Committee,

Mícheál Vaughan
Chair
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 21, 24, and 25.

On December 10, 2019, FCFA approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate.

Background and Rationale

Years ago, the core research and teaching faculty of the UW used to be essentially all tenure-stream assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, whose job description has always included a combination of research, teaching, and service. But as the economic realities of higher education have changed, the university has broadened the core faculty to include, in addition to tenure-stream faculty members, some more specialized classes of faculty members – notably the research professors, who are hired, evaluated, and promoted primarily on the basis of research, and the lecturers, who are hired, evaluated, and promoted primarily on the basis of teaching.

For nearly a decade, the Faculty Senate has been working to improve the working conditions of our teaching faculty. Now we believe it’s time to take another step in that direction, by retitling most of our full-time lecturers with professorial ranks and titles.

What We Propose to Do

This is a proposal to replace many of the “lecturer” titles in the faculty code by “teaching professor” ranks and titles. (Technically, the only “ranks” recognized by the faculty code are professor, associate professor, and assistant professor; all other faculty designations are termed “titles.”) Specifically, the following replacements will be made:

- Principal Lecturer → Teaching Professor
- Full-Time Senior Lecturer → Associate Teaching Professor
- Part-Time Senior Lecturer (with at least 50% FTE annual or multi-year appointment) → Associate Teaching Professor
- Full-Time Lecturer (competitively hired) → Assistant Teaching Professor

For the present, we do not propose to change any other titles, including Part-Time Lecturer, Full-Time Lecturer (Temporary), or Part-Time Senior Lecturers hired at less than 50% or less than annual contracts. We also do not propose any change to the salary or contract expiration date of any faculty member whose title is changed (except for very rare cases in which it might be necessary to raise an individual’s salary to the minimum for his or her new rank).

FCFA realizes that this is only one step in the longer-term process of addressing working conditions for teaching faculty, and we plan to explore at a later date whether changes need to be made to the code to address other faculty categories, such as part-time lecturers, clinical professors, and artists in residence. We also recognize that changing titles in the code will not, by itself, change hiring practices or the status of these faculty within the academic cultures of specific units.

As far as possible (with two important exceptions noted below), we have made the new code language regarding qualifications, appointments, merit evaluations, reappointments, and promotions the same for the new teaching professor ranks as it was for the corresponding lecturer titles. In particular, these will not be tenure-track positions, and nothing in these code changes will require colleges or departments to commit increased financial resources or contract lengths, or change any expectations regarding teaching, research, or service loads of individual faculty members. As is currently the case for lecturers, degree requirements for individual positions will be determined locally.

The actual conversion of titles of current lecturers to teaching professors, a one-time event, is something that cannot readily be done by a change to the faculty code, so we are proposing a companion Class C resolution calling on the provost to effect those conversions at the same time as the new code goes into effect (on September 16, 2020).
What Will Change?

In addition to the title changes, there are two substantive changes in this proposal.

1. **Maximum Contract Lengths.** The revised code language allows for maximum contract lengths of five years for Assistant Teaching Professors, seven years for Associate Teaching Professors, and ten years for Teaching Professors, as compared with a maximum of five years for all full-time lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers. Nothing in the code will require units to award these longer contracts, but we want to make them available for those unusual situations in which units can foresee a long-term need for highly qualified teaching faculty, and want to reward and retain some of their most valuable faculty members.

2. **Voting Rights.** Because voting rights in the code are intimately tied to ranks and titles, and the proposed changes would confer professorial ranks on those faculty members affected, this proposal would result in changes in who can vote on the cases of various faculty members regarding merit, salary, and reappointment, and, to a much lesser extent, promotion and tenure.

For promotion and tenure, the proposal entails only one change in voting rights. Under the new code, tenure-track and WOT associate professors, who currently can vote on the promotion of senior lecturers to principal lecturer, will no longer vote on the analogous promotion of associate teaching professors to teaching professors. Otherwise, nothing will change. In particular, the proposal includes language that precludes teaching professors of all ranks from voting on promotion of tenure-track, WOT, and research faculty members, just as research faculty are currently precluded from voting on tenure and promotion of tenure-track, WOT, and teaching faculty.

For merit, salary, and reappointment, however, the changes will be more extensive. The faculty code stipulates that for those purposes, faculty members vote on the cases of all faculty of lower rank and title; and the proposed changes will make teaching professors, associate teaching professors, and assistant teaching professors equal in rank to all other professors, associate professors, and assistant professors, respectively. This is intentional: an important goal of this proposal is to realign faculty ranks so that the positions of teaching faculty in the faculty hierarchy are more closely aligned with their actual roles in the work of the university, and are equivalent to those of the research track faculty. The following table summarizes how the voting hierarchy will be modified under the new code. (WOT faculty members vote at the same level as their tenure-track counterparts.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes in Voting Hierarchy for Merit, Salary, and Reappointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(Each faculty member votes on the merit, salary, and reappointment of everyone below their level)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Profs &amp; Research Profs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Artists in Residence &amp; Senior Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors of Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Artists in Residence &amp; Full-time Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research Associates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why Are We Proposing This?

FCFA has identified a number of compelling reasons why we believe this change is essential at this time.

- **Equity:** Most lecturers are women, and a higher percentage are people of color than in the professorial ranks. Relegating this population to titles that are often perceived as inferior is not consistent with our values.

- **Recruitment and Retention:** In some colleges, it’s getting harder to recruit and retain excellent teaching faculty, because other universities offer professorial titles.
- **Parity:** Other categories of non-tenure-track faculty at UW, mostly with no higher qualifications than our lecturers, carry professorial titles, such as Research Professor, Clinical Professor, and Professor of Practice.

- **Morale:** Because our teaching faculty are carrying an ever-increasing portion of the teaching load in this university, they should have ranks that demonstrate clearly that they are respected and valued, not “second-class faculty.”

- **It’s a National Trend:** Just a few years ago, a half-dozen universities were conferring professorial titles on their teaching faculty. Now we know of at least 40 such universities. (See the list provided in a separate document.)

- **Professionalism:** Professorial ranks and titles are likely to encourage departments that hire teaching faculty to consider them as career professionals.

- **Respect:** Professorial ranks and titles command more respect from students, graduate admissions committees, and granting agencies.

- **Commitment to Undergraduate Teaching:** Professorial ranks and titles will demonstrate to students, parents, legislators, and donors that our courses are taught by “real” faculty on a career path, not just fill-ins. (Many undergraduates already refer to their classroom teachers as “professor,” even those who are lecturers.)

**Frequently Asked Questions**

- *Will these new titles confer different expectations regarding teaching load, research, service, etc.?* The revised faculty code will not mandate any changes in expectations. To the extent that there are detailed expectations for faculty members at different ranks, they tend to be set by colleges and/or departments, and this legislation won’t change that.

- *Will 7 and 10-year contracts become the expected norm for associate teaching professors and teaching professors, thus effectively forcing units into longer contracts than they are comfortable with?* Very unlikely. When this question came up at a recent meeting of the Board of Deans and Chancellors, the deans and chancellors made it clear that they had no intention of awarding longer contracts if they cannot afford them. We expect that the longer contracts will be uncommon, and will be conferred by departments on distinguished teaching faculty that departments can foresee needing for the long term.

- *Will this change suggest to outsiders that “regular professors” don’t teach?* Communicating clearly with the public about the work of the faculty of a major research university has been a challenge for as long as there have been research universities. It’s already the case that we have “professors” who do a combination of research, teaching, and service, and “research professors” whose job is focused much more on research. Adding “teaching professors” to the mix will just make it all the more important to make sure we communicate clearly and convincingly about all of the ways we contribute to the state and the nation.

- *Will the new teaching professor ranks require terminal degrees?* Not necessarily. It is our goal to make the requirements for appointment, merit evaluation, and promotion of teaching professors as closely parallel to those of the corresponding lecturer titles as possible, so we left the establishment of degree requirements to the colleges and departments, as is the case now for lecturers. If we were designing a new faculty structure from scratch, a case might be made that all faculty with professorial titles should have terminal degrees; but since we are trying to make the transition from our current system as painless as possible, we left degree requirements unchanged. In addition, “terminal degree” means different things to different units and in different fields or specialties.

- *Will this change encourage colleges to hire more teaching faculty and fewer tenure-track?* It is clear that maintaining our status as a major research university will require us to maintain a critical mass of tenure-stream faculty, whose jobs include substantial amounts of both teaching and research, and we believe that decision-makers at all levels understand that. But it will be important for the faculty senate – and individual units – to continue to monitor the balance of research, teaching, and tenure-stream faculty and take steps to correct it if it gets skewed too far in any direction.
Could tenure-track assistant professors be placed at risk by an inconsistency between voting rights for merit, salary, and reappointment vs. those for promotion and tenure? The inconsistencies between the merit/salary/reappointment review and tenure/promotion processes are already embedded in current code and extend well beyond voting rights. In the current code, research professors and associate professors vote on the merit, salary, and reappointment of all faculty at lower ranks and titles, including tenure-track ones, but they vote on promotion only for other research faculty. In realigning the ranks of teaching faculty to be parallel with those of research faculty, we took our cue from the existing voting rights. Regardless of voting rights, there is a distinction between the processes, of which all tenure-eligible faculty should be aware: decisions on merit, salary, or reappointment are based on how well the faculty member is fulfilling the expectations of his or her current rank, a standard which the Faculty Code explicitly sets forth as internal to the University. But a decision about promotion or tenure for tenure-track faculty is based in part on external perceptions of the faculty member's record, provided by scholars who may have a better sense of the state of faculty member's research subfield than any colleague internal to the University. Thus, with or without these proposed revisions, the possibility exists that the internally focused merit review process will fail to identify concerns that might arise in an externally informed tenure or promotion review process. This is one reason why all assistant professors have required annual meetings with their chairs (or deans), and that is the appropriate place to discuss the faculty member's prospects. In any case, after we have had some experience with these new titles, the faculty senate may wish to revisit these voting rights.

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 these amendments to the Faculty Code shall become operative on September 16, 2020.

Chapter 21

Organization of the University Faculty

Section 21-01 Statutory Provision Relating to Faculty

See RCW 28B.20.200.

In addition to adding the three new titles and ranks (Teaching Professor, Associate Teaching Professor, and Assistant Teaching Professor), the changes in this section will eliminate the principal lecturer title (since all principal lecturers will be converted to teaching professors), and account for the fact that the only remaining lecturers and senior lecturers will be part-time or temporary.

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 principal lecturers,
- 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,
- Principal lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 50% or greater,
- Senior lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 50% or greater,
- Full-time senior artist in residence,
- Full-time lecturer,
- Full-time artist in residence, or
- A retired assistant professor, associate professor, or professor during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or a retired research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, principal lecturer, or senior lecturer, during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis. A retired assistant professor, associate professor, or professor (including those with research or teaching titles), or a retired principal lecturer or senior lecturer, during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis.

B. Notwithstanding the rank or title held, the following are not voting members of the faculty:

- Persons serving under acting or visiting appointments,
- Persons on leave of absence,
- Persons serving under clinical or affiliate appointments,
- Persons serving under professor of practice appointments,
- Persons of emeritus status unless serving on a part-time basis,
- Persons serving under adjunct appointments insofar as their adjunct appointments are concerned.

[For definitions of faculty titles, see Section 24-34.]

C. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles:

- Senior artist in residence
- Senior lecturer,
- Principal Lecturer,
- Associate teaching professor,
- Teaching professor,
- Associate professor,
- Professor,
- Associate professor WOT,
- Professor WOT.

D. Teaching faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles:
Section 21-33  Officers of the Faculty

A. The President of the University is the presiding officer of the University faculty.

B. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be a member of the faculty with tenure.

Section 21-41  Delegation of Faculty Legislative Powers to the Senate—Reservations

Except as specifically provided in Chapter 23, particularly in Sections 23-31, 23-43, and 23-44, all legislative powers of the University faculty are vested in the Faculty Senate as constituted under the provisions of Chapter 22. The faculty, however, reserve the power to approve or reject certain actions of the Faculty Senate in accord with the provisions of Chapter 22, Section 22-74 and Chapter 29, Section 29-36.

The University faculty, in addition, reserves the right and power by a majority vote of the voting members of the entire faculty to rescind the delegation of legislative powers to the Faculty Senate provided that such vote is taken at a meeting called specifically for the purpose of considering such action, that notice of such meeting is given to each voting member of the faculty at least two weeks before the date of the meeting and that the date of the meeting is set for a school day between October 15 and May 30.

Section 21-42  Official Representation of the Faculty

No person except an official representative of the faculty, appointed by the Senate in accord with Chapter 22, Section 22-34, shall represent or speak for the University faculty, or purport to do so.

Section 21-51  Scope and Purpose of Faculty Meetings

A. The University faculty shall hold meetings for the purpose of receiving information from the President, from other administrative officers, and from the Senate, and for the purpose of discussing any matter of general faculty interest.

B. In accord with its delegation of legislative power to the Faculty Senate, the faculty shall take no action of a legislative nature at a faculty meeting, but by resolution, approved by a majority of the voting members present, it may recommend legislative action to the Senate.

C. At any meeting of the faculty at which 50% or more of its voting members are present, the faculty, through a resolution approved by a majority of those present, may make recommendations to the Board of Regents or to the President upon any matter pertaining to the welfare of the University.

D. If at any meeting the faculty passes a resolution directed to, or affecting persons outside the University, the resolution shall be transmitted to the Senate for consideration and shall not be effective unless approved by a majority vote of the Senate.

Section 21-52  Calling of Faculty Meetings

A. There shall be a meeting of the University faculty upon call of the President, or the Senate, or 10% of the voting members of the faculty.
B. The Secretary of the Faculty shall fix the time and place of each faculty meeting and shall provide notice thereof, together with a statement of the business to be transacted, to each member of the faculty.

Section 21-53  Agenda of Faculty Meetings

The President shall determine the order of business at each meeting of the faculty, and in so doing shall provide opportunity for introduction of new business from the floor.

Section 21-60  Faculty Councils and Faculty Committees Defined—Power to Appoint

A. The standing committees of the University faculty, authorized by Chapter 13, Section 13-31, Subsection B, shall be designated faculty councils.

B. The power to select and appoint the chair and members of each faculty council is delegated by the University faculty to the Senate.

C. The term "faculty committee" or "committee of the faculty" as used in Chapters 21, 22, 25, 41, and 42 means a special or an ad hoc committee of the University faculty, of the Senate, or of a faculty council, appointed by the Senate, or by the Senate Executive Committee, or by a faculty council and responsible to the Senate, or to the Executive Committee, or to a faculty council.

Section 21-61  Membership of Faculty Councils and Faculty Committees

A. Except as specified under Subsection B below, only voting members of the faculty are eligible for appointment to, and continued service on, a faculty council or a faculty committee as defined in Section 21-60, Subsection A.

B. Retired members of the faculty, nonacademic officers of the University (ex officio), and members of the Associated Students of the University of Washington, the Graduate and Professional Student Senate, the Professional Staff Organization, and the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington are eligible for one-year appointments to faculty councils or faculty committees with or without vote as determined by the Senate Executive Committee (see Chapter 41, Section 41-34, Subsection B.).*

*At its meeting of 29 April 1996, the Senate Executive Committee interpreted the word "eligible" to be permissive rather than mandatory; it allows, but does not require, appointments in each of the categories named in this subsection.

C. The President of the University is a member ex officio of each faculty council or faculty committee. At his or her discretion the President may designate an alternate delegated to serve upon a faculty council or faculty committee.

Section 21-62  Terms of Service Upon Faculty Councils and Faculty Committees

A. The term of service upon a faculty council is three years, beginning on the sixteenth day of September following appointment.

B. A person appointed to fill a vacancy on a faculty council shall be appointed as specified in Chapter 41, Section 41-33.

C. Members of faculty committees as defined in Section 21-60 shall serve until discharged by whosoever appointed the committee.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 29, June 8, 1964; S-A 35, June 17, 1970: all with Presidential approval.

Section 21-63  Meetings and Reports of Faculty Councils

A. Each faculty council shall meet at the call of its chair.
Section 21-71  The Faculty Code and Governance

A. The Secretary of the Faculty shall make the current edition of the Faculty Code and Governance available to the University of Washington community.

B. Each new member of the faculty at the time duties are assumed shall be advised about the Faculty Code and Governance.

C. The Secretary of the Faculty shall advise the faculty when revisions are made to the Faculty Code and Governance.

Chapter 24  Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Section 24-31  General Appointment Policy

The principal functions of a university are to preserve, to increase, and to transmit knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The policy of this University should be to enlist and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956 with Presidential approval.

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. 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.


Section 24-33 A Statement of Principle: Academic Freedom and Responsibility

Academic freedom is the freedom to discuss all relevant matters in teaching, to explore all avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression, and to speak or write without institutional discipline or
Faculty members have the right to academic freedom and the right to examine and communicate ideas by any lawful means even should such activities generate hostility or pressure against the faculty member or the University. Their exercise of constitutionally protected freedom of association, assembly, and expression, including participation in political activities, does not constitute a violation of duties to the University, to their profession, or to students and may not result in disciplinary action or adverse merit evaluation.

A faculty member’s academic responsibility requires the faithful performance of professional duties and obligations, the recognition of the demands of the scholarly enterprise, and the candor to make it clear that when one is speaking on matters of public interest, one is not speaking for the institution.

Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and regents an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus. The expression of dissent and the attempt to produce change, therefore, may not be carried out in ways that injure individuals and damage institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one’s instructors or colleagues. Speakers on campus must not only be protected from violence, but also be given an opportunity to be heard. Those who seek to call attention to grievances must not do so in ways that clearly and significantly impede the functions of the University.

Students and faculty are entitled to an atmosphere conducive to learning and to evenhanded treatment in all aspects of the instructor-student relationship. Faculty members may not refuse to enroll or teach a student because of the student’s beliefs or the possible uses to which the student may put the knowledge to be gained in a course. Students should not be forced by the authority inherent in the instructional relationship to make particular personal choices as to political action or their own roles in society. Evaluation of students and the award of credit must be based on academic performance professionally judged and not on matters irrelevant to that performance. (Examples of such matters include but are not limited to personality, personal beliefs, race, sex, gender, religion, political activity, sexual orientation, or sexual, romantic, familial, or other personal relationships.)

It is the responsibility of the faculty members to present the subject matter of their courses as approved by the faculty in their collective responsibility for the curriculum. Within the approved curriculum, faculty members are free to express ideas and teach as they see fit, based on their mastery of their subjects and their own scholarship.


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

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

1. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and/or research ability that evidences promise of a successful career. For tenure-eligible or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required.

2. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and/or research. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

3. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and/or accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition. For tenured, tenure-eligible, or WOT appointments, both of these shall be required.
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.

3. Principal lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

3. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a teaching title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon teaching. Such an appointment requires completion of professional training appropriate to the teaching, scholarship, and service requirements of the position. Appropriate degree requirements shall be determined for each position by the college, school, or campus making the appointment. Tenure is not acquired under teaching appointments.

Teaching professor, associate teaching professor, and assistant teaching professor appointments are term appointments for periods not to exceed the limits specified in Section 24-41. 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 teaching professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Teaching professors, associate teaching professors, and assistant teaching professors are eligible for appointment to the graduate faculty, and are eligible to act as principal investigators for grants and contracts.

i. Appointment with the title of assistant teaching professor requires a demonstration of teaching ability that evidences promise of a successful teaching career.

ii. Appointment with the title of associate teaching professor requires extensive training, competence, and experience in the discipline.

iii. Appointment with the title of teaching professor requires a record of excellence in instruction, which may be demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field.

4. Individuals appointed to one of the instructional titles in Sections 1–3 above may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of ways (Section 24-32), including but not limited to: introduction of new knowledge or methods into course content; creation or use of innovative pedagogical methods; development of new courses, curricula, or course materials; participation in professional conferences; evidence of student performance; receipt of grants or awards; contributions to interdisciplinary teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations; or significant outreach to professionals at other educational institutions. While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required.
The next change is just a clarification, to make the wording parallel to 25-32 C and 24-34 B.3, and to avoid confusion with “service” as one of the criteria for appointment and promotion.

5. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired under through service in 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 24-41.

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.

6. Appointment with the title of professor of practice is made to a person who is a distinguished practitioner or distinguished academician, and who has had a major impact on a field important to the University’s teaching, research, and/or service mission.

Professor of practice 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 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. This title is available to address a unique appointment need and is intended to be sparingly used. Tenure is not acquired through service in this title.

7. Appointment with the title of instructor is made to a person who has completed professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or affiliate instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks. These appointments are limited to acting, affiliate, or clinical.

8. An affiliate appointment requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; 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.

9. An adjunct appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research or teaching professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary
department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department.

10. A joint appointment recognizes a faculty member's long-term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved.

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 expertise, 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 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.

12. Appointment with the title of teaching associate is made to a non-student with credentials more limited than those required of an instructor. Teaching associate appointments are annual, or shorter; 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.

13. The emeritus appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, research, teaching, or clinical faculty member who has retired under the UW Retirement Plan or is receiving benefits as if he or she retired under another state of Washington retirement plan and whose scholarly, teaching, or service record has been meritorious. Such a recommendation requires approval by the college dean and the President of the University. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are at least ten years of prior service as a member of the faculty and achievement of the rank of professor or associate professor. Under certain circumstances the President may grant emeritus status to an administrator at the level of dean or vice president, or at other levels if deemed appropriate.

14. The acting title denotes a temporary appointment for properly qualified persons in the instructor title or at the professorial ranks. It commonly is used for persons who are on the faculty for a year or less or for persons who have not yet completed the requirements for a regular appointment. In the latter case, the acting title is dropped when the requirements are completed. The total service of a faculty member with an acting appointment may not exceed four years in any single rank or title, or six years in any combination of ranks or titles. A faculty member whose appointment as assistant professor has not been renewed may not be given an acting appointment.

15. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a visiting title indicates that the appointee holds a professorial position at another institution of higher learning and is temporarily employed by the University. An employee who does not hold a professorial position elsewhere, but who is otherwise qualified, may be designated as a visiting lecturer.
16. The visiting scholar title is an honorary title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions and who are visiting the University but who are not employed by the University during their stay. The purpose of this title is recognition of the visitor’s presence at the University, and to make University facilities and privileges (library, etc.) available.


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 24-36 Qualifications for Extension Appointments

Persons giving instruction in extension classes offered for academic credit shall have scholarly and professional qualifications equivalent to those required for the teaching of regular University classes.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956 with Presidential approval.

Section 24-40 Faculty Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT)

A. A professor or associate professor without tenure by reason of funding (WOT) is qualified for tenure by virtue of rank. Such a faculty member holds his or her appointment on a continuing basis. The term of appointment of an assistant professor WOT is governed by Section 24-41, Subsections A and D.

B. Faculty appointed WOT do not hold tenure because all or part of his or her annual University-administered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. Except for this distinction, WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. The description of their duties and qualifications for promotion and salary increases for reasons of merit are the same. Except for termination of funding as defined in Section 24-41, Subsection J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52), such faculty members are not subject to removal, or discriminatory reduction in salary, except for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51.)
C. Faculty members WOT are expected to be integrated fully into the research, instructional, and service activities of their departments, schools, and colleges, warranting their status as voting members of the University. This expectation is the basis for their appointment being continuing and distinguishes such faculty from other non-tenured and term appointments (see Section 24-41).

D. Faculty members WOT have their salaries supported from a variety of department, school, and college resources, including, but not limited to, state funds, grant and contract funds, departmental, clinical and service funds. As defined in Section 24-57, faculty member's WOT shall have a written understanding with the chair describing their duties to be performed to meet the department's missions. This understanding will specify the sources, distributions and levels of funds supporting their salaries for these purposes. Salary funding shall be related to the faculty member's involvement in these departmental activities. Classroom instructional duties shall be supported from departmentally administered funds.

E. To maintain the integration of WOT faculty members in the ongoing activities of the appointing unit during a temporary lapse in funding sources, appointing departments, schools, or colleges shall develop a process to identify and evaluate the availability of alternative salary sources. This process shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit and the dean's office shall forward the policy to the Secretary of the Faculty. Should alternative resources be made available, a new version of the understanding specified in Subsection D shall be required.


Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

The only change in Subsection A below is insertion of language making it clear that this six year up-or-out provision does not apply to all assistant professors; in particular, it doesn’t apply to assistant teaching professors. It is stipulated separately for research assistant professors in subsection F below.

A. The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor who is eligible for tenure, or who is without tenure by reason of funding as described in Chapter 24, Section 24-40, is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in Subsection D. Procedures governing the reappointment of assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;

   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will terminate at the end of the third year; or

   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:

   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or
The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

B. Lecturer, and Artist in Residence, and Professor of Practice

The only changes in this subsection are (1) removing references to “principal lecturer” and “full-time senior lecturer,” which will no longer exist; (2) changing the maximum appointment duration for full-time lecturers to one year, because once this change is passed, the only full-time lecturers remaining will be those currently labeled “temporary,” who are currently limited to no more than three one-year appointments; and (3) moving professor of practice here for reasons explained below.

1. Appointment as a full-time lecturer or 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 lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

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

A technical correction: The six-month notice stipulation for professor of practice is moved to the following two paragraphs from Subsection H (formerly G) below, to clarify that professor of practice, like lecturer and artist in residence, are term appointments and not subject to the provisions of Subsections I through M (formerly H through L) below. Nothing substantive is changed.

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 lecturer, principal lecturer, or 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, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer 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, principal 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.

C. Teaching faculty
1. Appointment as an assistant teaching professor shall be for a period not to exceed five years.

2. Appointment as an associate teaching professor shall be for a period not to exceed seven years. The normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Appointment as teaching professor shall be for a period not to exceed ten years. The normal appointment period shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

4. At least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of an assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or teaching professor, 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. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment of an assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or teaching professor is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

5. Assistant teaching professors, associate teaching professors, and teaching professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51) or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52).

CD. An assistant teaching professor, associate teaching professor, or full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, an associate teaching professor, teaching professor, or senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

Clarification: The generic term "assistant professors" in the following paragraph, coupled with the reference to Subsection A, might suggest that it applies to all assistant professors, including tenure-track ones. This change clarifies that contracts contingent on continued availability of grant or contract funds are allowable only for WOT or research assistant professors, not tenure-track or teaching ones.

DE. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, appointments of WOT or research assistant professors who are supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state-appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.

EF. The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than 50% of full-time status shall be made on an annual, or shorter, basis. A faculty member who is appointed to a position with less than 50% of full-time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.

FG. The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. Procedures governing the reappointment of research assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.
2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:

   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment or
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not renewed, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. Not later than the end of the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

   a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure;
   b. The appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year. In cases b and c the appointment is extended by one year.

4. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the extension year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

   a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure, or
   b. The appointment is to cease; in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year.

5. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

   I. At least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a research associate professor, or research professor, 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. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment of a research associate professor, research professor, 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.

   J. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, research assistant professors are subject to removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51), for termination of funding, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52.)

   K. Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51), for termination of funding as defined in Subsection J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52.)

   L. Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least 50% of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support.

   M. In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall be converted to initial three-year appointments in conformance with Subsection H.
The procedures prescribed in Section 24-53 for renewal of appointments and in Section 24-54 for Procedure for Promotion shall govern actions taken under this section.

Section 24-45 Appointment of Part-Time Professors

A. The University may appoint faculty to professorial, teaching professorial, or research professorial ranks (see Section 24-34, Subsections A.1 through A.3 and Subsections B.3 and B.5) on less than a full-time basis. The percentage of appointment at the time of hire shall be documented by the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) and clearly communicated in writing to the faculty member.

The addition to the following paragraph clarifies that these considerations for part-time appointments apply only to titles subject to the up-or-out rule.

B. The first appointment of a part-time assistant professor who is eligible for tenure, or who is without tenure by reason of funding as described in Chapter 24, Section 24-40, or who is a research assistant professor at 50% or greater of full-time shall be for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. In Spring Quarter of the second year of appointment, the dean of the assistant professor’s college or school shall decide whether:

1. The appointment is to be renewed;
2. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the three-year period, in which case the assistant professor will be notified that the appointment ceases at the end of the third year; or
3. The decision concerning reappointment is postponed to the following year, in which case the assistant professor will be notified that the three-year appointment is extended to include a fourth year.

C. Should the decision in Subsection B above result in a postponement, during Spring Quarter of the third year the dean shall decide whether:

1. The appointment is to be renewed for a further period consistent with Subsection D below; or
2. The appointment is not to be renewed, in which case the assistant professor shall be notified that the appointment ceases at the end of the fourth year.

D. Should the initial appointment of a part-time assistant professor be renewed pursuant to Subsection B or C above, the following renewal periods pertain to the second appointment:

1. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments of 90% time and above, the second appointment period shall be for three years.
2. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between 70% and 89%, the second appointment shall be for four years.
3. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between 60% and 69%, the second appointment shall be for five years.
4. For part-time assistant professors who hold appointments between 50% and 59%, the second appointment shall be for six years.
In all cases, a mandatory review for promotion and tenure (or in the case of WOT faculty, for promotion and continuous appointment) must occur no later than the end of the last year of appointment as specified in Subsections D.1 through D.4 above.

E. At any time during the appointment, the faculty member may change his or her percentage of appointment with the written agreement of the dean. In the event of a change, the time for mandatory review shall be stated in the agreement consistent with Subsection D above.


Section 24-50 Conflict of Interest Regarding Appointment, Employment, and Academic Decisions

A conflict of interest exists when a person participating in a decision has a substantial connection or interest related to individual(s) affected by the decision that might bias or otherwise threaten the integrity of the decision process or that might be perceived by a reasonable person as biasing or threatening such decisions. This includes familial, romantic, or sexual relationships and financial conflicts of interest. This may also include some professional relationships. No list of rules can provide direction for all the varying circumstances that may arise; good judgment of individuals is essential.

The procedures set forth in this chapter shall apply in all cases, except that no faculty member, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, appointment, tenure, promotion, salary, or other status or interest of a faculty or staff member with whom he or she has a conflict of interest. [See also Executive Order No. 32.]

In addition, no faculty member, teaching assistant, research assistant, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the employment, promotion, academic status or evaluation of a student with whom he or she has a conflict of interest.

Conflicts of interest resulting from romantic or sexual relationships are detrimental to the functioning of the University because, if present, the professional authority under which decisions are made may be called into question. The University's responsibilities to the public and to individual members of the University community may be compromised if such conflicts of interest are not avoided.

The faculty's decision-making responsibilities should not restrict the faculty's rights as citizens, including the personal rights of association and expression, unless the exercise of those freedoms conflicts with the institutional necessity of impartiality in academic and employment decisions. In that case, the faculty member must restrict his or her participation in such decisions.

State law and University rules preclude a faculty member from participating in decisions which directly benefit a member of his or her family. The same rules should apply to decisions involving sexual or romantic relationships between faculty and students, since these relationships, like formal family relationships, may call into question the ability of the faculty member to assess the performance of another solely on academic or professional merit.

Romantic or sexual relationships between faculty and students may in some instances infringe on the rights of that student or other students or colleagues. The possibility of sexual harassment may arise, if the faculty member's immediate power to influence a student's academic progress brings into question the ability of the student genuinely to consent freely to the relationship. The possibility of impeding the student's academic or professional progress may also arise if the faculty member is already in a position of significant decision-making authority with respect to the student, since the faculty member must abstain from further participation in such decisions, thereby denying the student access to the faculty member's professional assessment. The possibility of an unwelcome, hostile or offensive academic environment may also arise if the faculty member fails clearly to separate personal interests from his or her professional decision-making.

Faculty members should be aware that the harms listed above do not arise only from existing relationships, but may also arise if an individual in a position of authority to a student makes overt sexual or romantic advances upon that student. Even if the advances are welcome, the faculty member should...
remove him or herself from the teaching or supervisory role, which may impede the student's academic progress. If the advances are unwelcome, the student may suffer unneeded stress, and the academic relationship may suffer.


Section 24-51 Responsibility for Appointments

A. The President and the appropriate college or school faculty share responsibility for recommending faculty appointments to the Regents. Full and discriminating consideration by that faculty of the scholarly and professional character and qualifications of a proposed appointee is essential in an effective appointment procedure.

B. The appropriate faculty, therefore, shall carefully judge the scholarly and professional character and qualifications of a prospective appointee, shall determine from all available evidence his or her suitability for employment, and shall provide the Regents, through the President, with the information needed for a wise decision.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 83, April 30, 1991: both with Presidential approval.

Section 24-52 Procedure for New Appointments

A. Faculty recommendations of appointments are ordinarily rendered through committees, and the procedure depends upon the level of appointment.

1. For recommendation of a departmental appointment other than that of chair, the department members act as an advisory appointment committee. A department may delegate this responsibility to a departmental committee.

2. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a department chair should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean of the appropriate college, or if the President so desires, by the President.

3. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a dean should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the President.

B. The duty of an appointment committee is to search for suitable candidates, to study and determine their qualifications (Sections 24-32 to 24-36), and to obtain and evaluate all data related to the problem of appointment. When, after such a study, the committee finds a candidate or candidates who appear to be qualified it shall transmit its information and recommendation to:

1. The department chair, if the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, or

2. The appropriate dean, if the appointment is to be one of a department chair, or

3. The President, if the appointment is to be one of a dean.

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.
Recommendations in favor of appointment, based on a majority vote of the voting members of the faculty or of the elected committee with delegated authority, shall be sent with pertinent information to the appropriate dean. If the chair concurs in the department recommendation, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if it is favorable, shall transmit it together with the vote of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President. In the unusual case where the chair does not concur in the department recommendation, he or she may communicate objections to the dean and may also submit a separate recommendation to the dean from among the candidates who have been considered by the department. If the dean concurs in the chair’s recommendation, or has additional information which raises doubts concerning the department's recommendation, or finds that the President has such information, the dean shall refer the matter again to the department along with an explanation and comments. After considering the evidence, the department may then either reaffirm its original recommendation, or transmit a new one. After the department's final recommendation has been sent to the dean, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if an appointment is to be recommended, shall transmit it together with the final recommendation of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President.

2. If the appointment is to be one of a department chair, the dean shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision. The department concerned shall be consulted in making the appointment, but a formal vote is not required.

3. If the appointment is to be one of a dean, the President shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision.

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 associate, 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.

B. If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

C. The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24-41 and inform the faculty member concerned of the decision.

D. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non-renewal of his or her appointment, the dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days.

Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles and not upon length of service.

In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24-32.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

After these changes, the only promotable title remaining in 24-34 B will be artist in residence.

Artists in residence Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above), the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate’s summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.
C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate’s department may be excused.

D. After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean’s designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

If the recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the promotion decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate’s response to the Provost for information purposes.

E. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case, and if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

Section 24-55 Procedure for Salary Increases Based Upon Merit

Faculty at the University of Washington shall be reviewed annually by their colleagues, according to the procedures detailed in this section, to evaluate their merit and to arrive at a recommendation for an appropriate merit salary increase. Such reviews shall consider the faculty member’s cumulative record, including contributions to research/scholarship, teaching, and service, and their impact on the department, school/college, University, and appropriate regional, national, and international communities.

The evaluation of a faculty member's merit and salary shall be arrived at after review of the individual’s performance in relation to that of their colleagues and by comparison of individuals' present salaries to those of their peers. In evaluating a faculty member's eligibility for merit-based salary increases (Section 24-70, Subsections B.1 and B.4; Section 24-71, Subsections A.1 and B.1) and for “market gap” salary increases (Section 24-71, Subsection B.2), the following procedure shall be followed.

A. In arriving at their recommendations for salary decisions the appropriate faculty, department (unit) chairs, and deans shall each consider the following:

1. The cumulative record of the candidate, taking into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles;

2. The candidate's current salary;

3. Documentation of the review conference required by Section 24-57, Subsection D; and

4. Any documents produced under Subsection H of this section.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 130, June 14, 2013; S-A 142, June 22, 2018: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]
Salary recommendations shall seek to minimize salary inequities. Salary compression and other inequities, including those resulting from variations in the level of merit funds available over time, may be considered in making merit salary recommendations.

B. The merit and salary of each faculty member below the rank and title of professor shall be considered by the voting members of the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are his or her superiors in academic rank and title, and they shall recommend any salary increase which they deem merited.

C. The chair of a department, or the dean of an undepartmentalized school/college, shall consider the merit and salary of each full professor in his or her unit. Before forwarding his or her recommendations the chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) shall seek the advice of the full professors according to a procedure approved by the voting members of the unit.

D. If the recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean with any supporting data the dean may request. If the chair does not concur in the recommendations he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

E. The dean shall review the department's recommendation and forward his or her recommendation regarding faculty merit and salary to the President.

F. The dean of each college/school shall review the record and salary of the chair of each department and shall recommend an appropriate salary increase to the President.

G. The President shall authorize the salary increases of the faculty, and of each dean.

H. At the option of the faculty member affected, and mandatorily in the event of two consecutive annual ratings of no merit (as a result of reviews under this section), the chair of the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall, after consultation with the faculty member, appoint an ad hoc committee of department (or school/college) faculty superior (or, in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member. This committee shall meet at its earliest convenience with the faculty member and review more fully the record and merit of that faculty member.

The committee shall, upon completion of its review, report in writing the results to the faculty member and to his or her department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school/college) and the committee shall advise them what actions, if any, should be undertaken to enhance the contributions and improve the merit ranking of this colleague, or to rectify existing misjudgments of his or her merit and make adjustments to correct any salary inequity. The faculty member may respond in writing to this report and advice within 21 calendar days to the department chair (or dean) and committee (unless upon the faculty member's request and for good cause the response period is extended by the chair or dean). The committee's report and advice, the faculty member's written response (if any), the response by the chair, and any agreement reached by the faculty member and the chair shall be incorporated into a written report.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 58, May 16, 1978; S-A 75, April 6, 1987; S-A 82, November 21, 1990; S-A 99, July 9, 1999; S-A 124, July 5, 2011: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]

Section 24-56 Procedure for Resignations

A. A faculty member has a professional obligation to give a written notice of resignation at the earliest possible opportunity. Normally such resignations should be given at least three months prior to the termination date, or within 15 days of notification of terms of a reappointment, whichever occurs later, and should ordinarily become effective at the end of an academic year.

B. If the faculty member resigns orally, then the dean shall attempt to obtain a written resignation. If this is not forthcoming sooner, no later than 15 days after the purported oral resignation the dean shall send by certified mail to the faculty member's last known home address, and at the same time send by delivery or campus mail to the faculty member's campus address, a letter stating his
or her understanding that the faculty member has resigned. If, within 30 days after the dean
mailed and sent this letter, the faculty member notifies the dean in writing that he or she denies a
resignation took place, none shall be deemed to have occurred. Otherwise, the faculty member
shall be deemed to have resigned.

S-A 60, June 25, 1979 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 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,
Section 25-32, 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, principal 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, Section 25-32, 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, principal lecturers, 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.

D. Documentation

The chair, dean, or his or her designee, shall, in a timely manner, document in writing, with a
copy to the faculty member, that such conferences occurred, and shall list the subject matter
discussed.

This conference document shall also articulate in sufficient detail the discussed commitments and
responsibilities of the faculty member for the coming year(s) and how these commitments and
responsibilities are consistent with institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in
Chapter 24.

Should the faculty member not agree with the summary or statements in this conference
document, he or she shall indicate so in writing. The failure of a faculty member to object in
writing to the chair's (or dean's) conference document within ten days of receiving it (unless upon
the faculty member's request and for good cause the period is extended by the chair or dean)
shall constitute his or her official acceptance of its terms and conditions.

If the faculty member disagrees with the conference document, the chair (or dean) shall either
withdraw it and issue a revised one to which both parties can agree, or reaffirm the accuracy of
the original conference document.

In the event the faculty member disagrees with the resulting conference document, the chair of
the faculty member's department (or dean of an undepartmentalized school or college) shall
appoint an ad hoc committee comprised of three department (or school/college) faculty superior
(or in the case of full professors, equal) in rank or title to the faculty member, or faculty members
from the Conciliation Board, and selected in the following manner. The faculty member and the
chair, or dean, shall each select one member of the ad hoc committee and those two members
shall select the third member. At its earliest convenience, the ad hoc committee shall review fully
the records relating to the conference, meet with the faculty member, and meet with the chair,
dean, or his or her designee.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty member shall then meet with the ad hoc
committee to discuss the issues, with the purpose of achieving a resolution. In the event
resolution is not achieved, the committee shall, in a timely manner, report in writing the results of
its review to the faculty member, to his or her department chair or dean, and to the designee, if
any. The committee’s report and advice, if any; the faculty member’s written response, if any; the response by the chair, dean, or his or her designee, if any; and any agreement between the faculty member and chair, dean, or his or her designee shall be incorporated into a written report that shall be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file.

A faculty member’s record upon the stated duties and responsibilities in the conference document will be assessed in accordance with Section 24-55. Nothing in this section is intended to alter the institutional standards for promotion and tenure as defined in Chapter 24.

[The University Handbook included Board of Regents Governance and Executive Orders No. 29, No. 45, and No. 64 as footnotes to this section.]

Section 24-70 Faculty Salary System: Policy and Principles

A. Faculty at the University of Washington shall be salaried on a merit-based system that reflects the University’s standing among its peer institutions. Under this system, all faculty deemed meritorious shall be regularly rewarded for their contributions to their department, school/college, and university. Resources permitting, the University shall provide its meritorious faculty with salaries commensurate with those of their peers elsewhere.

B. Advancement in salary can be effected in several distinct, but not mutually exclusive, ways. A salary increase:

1. Shall be granted to provide an initial minimum equal-percentage salary increase to all faculty following a successful merit review (conducted in accord with procedures of Section 24-55);

2. Shall attend, in addition to awards under Subsection B.1 above, promotion in rank (approved in accord with Section 24-54);

3. Shall be awarded to raise individuals’ salaries to the minimum salary for each faculty rank (in accord with Section 24-71, Subsection A.3 below);

4. May be awarded as an additional merit salary increase beyond that available under Subsection B.1 (following review procedures of Section 24-55);

5. May be awarded as a result of unit-level adjustment (in accord with Section 24-71, Subsection B.2 below);

6. May be offered in response to a potential or actual external offer of appointment (upon review in accord with Section 24-71, Subsection B.3 below); and

7. May be allocated as a University-wide increase in the faculty salary base that shall be distributed in equal dollar amounts or equal percentage salary increases to all meritorious faculty.

S-A 99, July 9, 1999 with Presidential approval.

Section 24-71 Procedures for Allocating Salary Increases

A. The Provost shall consult with the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and, each biennium, shall subsequently recommend to the President the allocation of available funds for salary increases, for distribution among all categories listed in Section 24-70, Subsection B. The President shall make the final decision on these allocations and shall report the decision to the Faculty Senate.
1. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide an initial minimum equal-
percentage salary increase to all faculty deemed meritorious under Section 24-55.

2. This allocation shall each year make available funds to provide salary increases to all
faculty awarded promotions approved in accord with Section 24-54.

3. Every two years, the Provost shall, after consultation with the Senate Committee on
Planning and Budgeting, determine the minimum salary for each faculty rank. This
determination shall take account of the recent salaries of beginning assistant professors
at the University of Washington, and shall endeavor to reflect in the floors for other ranks
the general expectation of salary advancement for faculty.

B. The Provost may distribute, in the course of a biennium, funds allocated by the President:

1. To provide additional merit salary increases (beyond those awarded under Subsection
A.1). This allocation shall be distributed as equal-percentage increases to all units to fund
merit increases for faculty (in accord with Section 24-55).

2. To address the market "gap" of an individual unit. Allocation of such funds to units shall
follow close consideration of individual units and consultation with the Senate Committee
on Planning and Budgeting. The Provost shall periodically gather updates on salary
information from appropriate sources, including unit heads, and shall make those findings
available to the faculty. The department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized
school/college) shall consult with the unit's voting faculty who are senior (or, in the case
of full professors, equal) in rank—or the unit's designated faculty committee(s)—about
the appropriate distribution of these funds; and

3. To retain a current faculty member, based on the recommendation of the dean. Prior to
preparing a response, the dean shall first consult with the unit's chair. The faculty of each
academic unit shall be provided the opportunity to cast an advisory vote on the
appropriate response; alternatively, the faculty may establish, consistent with the
procedures of Chapter 23, Section 23-45, a different policy regarding the level of
consultation they deem necessary before a competitive salary offer may be made. This
policy shall be recorded with the dean's office of the appropriate unit and a copy
forwarded to the Secretary of the Faculty. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or
amend this policy biennially.

C. The deans of the schools and colleges shall, after consultation with their elected faculty councils
(Chapter 23, Section 23-45, Subsection B), allocate to the faculty of the constituent units of their
school/college, all funds made available to provide salary increases under Section 24-70,
Subsection B. Distribution of these awards to individual faculty shall be carried out following the
requisite procedures of Chapter 24.

Chapter 25

Tenure of the Faculty

Section 25-01 Statute Relating to Tenure

[For a statute relating to tenure, see RCW 28B.20.130 (1)(2).]

Section 25-11 Statement of Policy by the Board of Regents

[See Board of Regents Governance, Regent Policy No. 2.]

Section 25-31 Definition of Tenure

Tenure is the right of a faculty member to hold his or her position without discriminatory reduction of
salary, and not to suffer loss of such position, or discriminatory reduction of salary, except for the reasons
and in the manner provided in the Faculty Code.
Section 25-32 Criteria for Tenure

A. Unless he or she is disqualified under any other provision of this section, a full-time member of the faculty has tenure if:

1. He or she is a professor or associate professor; or
2. He or she has held full-time rank as assistant professor in the University for seven or more years and has not had his or her term of appointment extended by the Provost or received notice terminating his or her appointment.

B. Generally, recommendation for tenure (Section 25-41) is made concurrently with recommendation for promotion to the rank of associate professor (except in the circumstances listed in the subsequent paragraphs of this section.)

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, principal lecturer, 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
910. A clinical appointment, or
10. An affiliate appointment, or
11. 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.

D. Appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor "without tenure," as specified in Subsection C.6 above, are limited to not more than two consecutive appointments, each of three years' duration. The first appointment is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. During the second year of the initial appointment, the appointment will be considered for renewal consistent with the provisions of Chapter 24, Section 24-41, Subsection A for assistant professors. If the associate professor or professor is reappointed, the three-year period of reappointment must include a tenure decision and terminal year in the event that tenure is not granted. To meet this expectation, the tenure review must be conducted no later than the second year of the second three-year appointment; during this second term of appointment, postponement of the tenure decision is not an option. In the case where tenure is not granted in the mandatory fifth year, the sixth year will be the terminal year of appointment. The part-time renewal periods provided for assistant professors in Chapter 24, Section 24-45, Subsection D do not apply to associate professors and professors without tenure.
Appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor "without tenure by reason of funding," as specified in Subsection C.11 above, are continuing appointments governed by Chapter 24, Section 24-40.

E. A faculty member with tenure may resign a portion of his or her appointment with the agreement of his or her department chair, dean, and the President, while retaining tenure in his or her part-time appointment.

F. A part-time assistant professor appointed pursuant to Chapter 24, Section 24-45 accumulates eligibility for tenure under Subsection A of this section.

G. Time spent on leaves of absence from the University does not count in the accumulation of time toward tenure.

Section 25-33 Tenure of Faculty Members in Administrative Positions

The tenure of a faculty member who holds an administrative position, such as that of dean or department chair, extends only to the faculty position which she or he holds conjointly with such administrative position.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956 with Presidential approval.

Section 25-41 Granting of Tenure: Policy and Procedure

[For "Documentation of Qualifications and Recommendations for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases," see Executive Order No. 45]

A. Tenure should be granted to faculty members of such scholarly and professional character and qualifications that the University, so far as its resources permit, can justifiably undertake to employ them for the rest of their academic careers. Such a policy requires that the granting of tenure be considered carefully. It should be a specific act, even more significant than promotion in academic rank, which is exercised only after careful consideration of the candidate's scholarly and professional character and qualifications.

B. Consistent with the timelines set in Section 25-32, Subsection A.2 for full-time assistant professors and Chapter 24, Section 24-45 for part-time assistant professors, and Section 25-32, Subsection D for associate professors or professors "without tenure," a decision shall be made in the following manner:

A recommendation that the faculty member be granted or denied tenure shall be sent to the dean of the school or college. This recommendation shall be based upon a majority vote of the eligible professors and associate professors of the department, or of the school or college if it is not departmentalized. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation she or he may also submit his or her own recommendation.

The dean, advised as prescribed in Chapter 24, Section 24-54, Subsection C shall then make his or her recommendation to the Provost, and if tenure is to be granted it shall be conferred by the President acting for the Board of Regents.

If the faculty member's tenure is granted, the President shall so notify him or her in writing. If tenure is denied, the dean shall notify the individual in writing that the appointment will terminate at the end of the succeeding academic year.
A faculty member whose tenure is denied may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings described in Chapter 27, and may file a petition for review as provided in Section 25-64.

If a tenure decision is postponed for reconsideration, the assistant professor's dean shall cause him or her to be notified in writing that the appointment will terminate at the end of the second succeeding academic year unless reconsideration in the meantime shall have resulted in the granting of tenure.

C. If it is desired to appoint to a position with tenure other faculty members referred to in Section 25-32, Subsection C, the procedures for recommendation and granting described in Subsection B above shall be followed, except that a denial of tenure shall not of itself lead to termination of appointment.


Section 25-51 Grounds for Removal of Persons with Tenure for Cause

A faculty member having tenure under the provisions of this chapter may be removed for cause from his or her position or subjected to reduction of salary only for one or more of the following reasons:

A. Incompetence.
B. Neglect of duty.
C. Physical or mental incapacity to perform academic duties.
D. Unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment (see Executive Order No. 31).
E. Scientific and scholarly misconduct, consisting of intentional misrepresentation of credentials, falsification of data, plagiarism, abuse of confidentiality, or deliberate violation of regulations applicable to research (see Executive Order No. 61).
F. Conviction of a felony.
G. Intentional and malicious interference with the scientific, scholarly, and academic activities of others. To warrant a removal for cause or reduction of salary, conduct falling within these categories must in a substantial way adversely affect the faculty member’s or the victim’s academic, scholarly, or professional ability to carry out his or her University responsibilities.


Section 25-52 Removal of Faculty for Reasons of Program Elimination

A. The removal of tenured faculty, or the removal of non-tenured faculty prior to the end of a specified term of appointment, may be effected upon program elimination within the University. Such removals shall be termed “Removal for Reasons of Program Elimination.”
B. Removal for reasons of program elimination may be effected only in conformance with procedures set forth in Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs, and the provisions of this section.
C. Notification
1. Each faculty member proposed by the dean for removal for reasons of program elimination shall be so notified in writing by the dean pursuant to Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsection C.2.h.
2. When the President's decision to eliminate a program becomes final pursuant to Chapter 26, Section 26-41, Subsection C.7, and the subsequent decision is made as to which faculty members notified under this subsection are to be removed, each faculty member to be removed for reason of program elimination shall be notified in writing by the dean and the effective date of such removal shall be stated. The dean shall deliver a copy of this notification contemporaneously to the chair of the Adjudication Panel (Chapter 28.) No faculty member shall be removed for reason of program elimination prior to the end of the academic year following the one in which a final decision is transmitted to the faculty member.

D. Appeal

Each faculty member notified of removal for reason of program elimination may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27. He or she may deliver an appeal to the chair of the Adjudication Panel and to the Secretary of the Faculty as provided in Chapter 28, in which case a Hearing Committee shall determine whether the faculty member was properly identified as a member of the program eliminated; whether the procedures in this section were followed; whether the decision to remove the faculty member was reasonable; and, if the faculty member so alleges, whether he or she was unlawfully discriminated against because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, handicap, sexual orientation, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran.

E. Placement in Another Unit

The University shall make every reasonable effort to place faculty members notified of removal for reason of program elimination in other University employment for which they are qualified with comparable terms of employment. Priority in such employment shall be given to the faculty member in accordance with University and state employment procedures. In addition to the required notification period, special assignments with pay may be provided to enable the faculty member to prepare for changed employment responsibilities.

F. Reinstatement

In the event that the academic program which has been eliminated is reinstated within a period of five years, new positions shall not be filled through normal appointment search procedures until removed faculty members qualified for the position have been offered reappointment on terms at least comparable to terms which applied to the position previously held. Such removed faculty members shall be given 30 calendar days to accept or decline an offer of reinstatement.


Section 25-53 Necessity for Hearings in Tenure Proceedings

No faculty member having tenure as defined in this chapter shall be removed from his or her position or subjected to discriminatory reduction of salary until she or he has been given opportunity for a full review and hearing as provided in Sections 25-62, 25-71, or Chapter 26, Section 26-31 as applicable to the case, and in Chapter 28.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 73, May 24, 1985: both with Presidential approval.

[The former Sections 25-54, Financial Emergency, and 25-55, Procedures for Elimination of an Academic Program, have been renumbered and now appear as Chapter 26, Sections 26-31 and 26-41 respectively. The former Sections 25-61, Tenure Committee, 25-65, Grievance Committee, and 25-72 through 25-76, Faculty Conduct Committee, have been replaced by Chapters 27 and 28. S-A 73, May 24, 1985: all with Presidential approval.]

Section 25-62 Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences
The policies and procedures detailed in Chapters 24, 25, and 26 are intended to ensure academic freedom and to protect the rights of the individual to careful consideration of his or her merits, and also to enhance the ability of the University and its academic units to select and maintain a faculty of the highest quality possible. Occasions may arise in which a faculty member may state that his or her academic freedom or employment rights were or will be impaired if some action or inaction of his or her academic unit or of the University as a whole is permitted, as well as occasions where the University may proceed against a faculty member. A faculty member facing such action or inaction may wish to contest the administrative behavior in question. Such a person is entitled to use the following proceedings:

1. **Administrative** (Chapter 27, Section 27-31), conciliatory (Chapter 27, Section 27-42), and adjudicative (Chapter 28). The University Ombud is available for consultation and advice. Cases subject to these proceedings may include allegations of unlawful discrimination because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, handicap, sexual orientation, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran. These proceedings serve to protect the rights both of the individual concerned and the University. In a larger sense they fulfill an important role in protecting the academic profession from infringement of the prerogatives necessary for its proper functioning; and by the same token they protect these rights and the status of the academic profession in our society by assuring that the prerogatives are not demeaned through misuse as a shelter for incompetence or neglect of duty.

2. **Section 25-63 Dismissal of a Nontenured Faculty Member**

A nontenured faculty member may be dismissed prior to the expiration of the period for which she or he was appointed for the grounds stated in Section 25-51, and in such cases the procedure described in Section 25-71 shall be followed, or for reasons of program elimination, and in such cases the procedure described in Section 25-52 shall be followed; or for reasons of financial emergency, in which cases the procedure described in Chapter 26, Section 26-31 shall be followed.

3. **Section 25-64 Discriminatory Reduction in Pay or Improper Non-Reappointment**

A. In a case in which a tenured or non-tenured faculty member alleges that he or she has suffered discriminatory reduction in pay, or in which a non-tenured faculty member alleges violation of the Faculty Code in connection with his or her non-reappointment, including denial of tenure, the faculty member making the allegation may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27. He or she may file a petition for review with the Chair of the Adjudication Panel and the Secretary of the Faculty, in which case the procedures set forth in Chapter 28 shall be followed. The petition for review may include allegations of unlawful discrimination because of race, religion, color, sex, national origin, age, handicap, sexual orientation, or status as a disabled or Vietnam era veteran.

B. The procedures set forth in Section 25-62 shall be followed. The burden of proof shall rest with the faculty member making the allegation.

4. **Section 25-71 Standard of Conduct**

A. The University is an institution having special public responsibility for providing instruction in higher education, for advancing knowledge through scholarship and research, and for providing related services to the community. As a center of learning, the University also has the obligation to maintain conditions which are conducive to freedom of inquiry and expression in the maximum degree compatible with the orderly conduct of its functions. For these purposes the University is governed by rules and regulations which safeguard its functions, and which, at the same time, protect the rights and freedoms of all members of the academic community. All members of the academic community, including members of the faculty, have an obligation to comply with the rules and regulations of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments.

B. If a member of the faculty is alleged to have violated a rule or regulation of the University, its schools, colleges, or departments, the department chair or the dean in a non-departmentalized
school or college shall fully inform the faculty member of the nature and specific content of the alleged violation and shall offer to discuss the alleged violation with the faculty member and with the party raising the issue. The faculty member and the party raising the issue may each be accompanied by one person. The matter may be concluded at this point by the mutual consent of all parties.

C. If he or she so wishes, the department chair, the dean, or the faculty member may initiate conciliatory proceedings at any time by contacting the University Ombud as provided in Chapter 27, Section 27-42.

D. If a mutually agreeable resolution is not achieved under Subsection B or C of this section, and if the dean (after consultation in the case of a departmentalized school or college with the department chair and the faculty member) determines that the alleged violation is of sufficient seriousness to justify consideration of the filing of a formal statement of charges that might lead to dismissal, reduction of salary, or suspension for more than one quarter, he or she shall follow one of the following procedures:

1. In cases concerning allegations of unlawful discrimination or sexual harassment, the dean shall request an investigation by the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office (UCIRO) as provided in Administrative Policy Statement 46.3.

2. In cases concerning allegations of scientific and scholarly misconduct as defined in Section 25-51, the dean shall proceed as provided in Executive Order No. 61, "Policy for Addressing Allegations of Scientific and Scholarly Misconduct."

3. In all other kinds of cases the dean shall appoint a special investigating committee of three faculty members who are not directly involved in the matter being considered. The committee shall assist the dean in the informal and confidential gathering of information and documentation and shall advise the dean in its interpretation. If as a result of the foregoing investigation the dean concludes that further action is not merited, then the matter shall be dropped (although a faculty member aggrieved as a result of these activities has recourse to the conciliatory proceedings of Chapter 27 and to the adjudicative proceedings described in Chapter 28, Section 28-32, Subsection A.)

E. If, after engaging in the procedures specified in Subsection D.2 or D.3 above, the dean concludes that further action is warranted, he or she shall deliver to the Provost a written record stating that reasonable cause exists to adjudicate charges of wrongdoing brought against the faculty member, with enough of the underlying facts to inform the Provost of the reasons for this conclusion. Upon filing of the written report with the Provost, the case shall be decided in the manner prescribed in Chapter 28.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
January 6, 2020

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
January 23, 2020
Class C Resolution: Conversion of lecturer titles.

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate is considering Class A legislation to create a Teaching Professor track; and

WHEREAS, if the legislation passes, its implementation requires that certain Lecturer titles be converted automatically to Teaching Professor titles and ranks; and

WHEREAS it is undesirable to encumber the Faculty Code with language intended to effect a one-time change, which will be irrelevant a year later; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that if the pending Class A legislation creating a Teaching Professor track is passed and becomes operative on or before September 16, 2020, the Faculty Senate calls on the Provost to make the following title changes effective on September 16, 2020:

- Principal Lecturer: change to Teaching Professor
- Senior Lecturer Full-Time: change to Associate Teaching Professor
- Senior Lecturer Part-Time (with an annual or multi-year appointment of 50% or greater): change to Associate Teaching Professor
- Lecturer Full-Time (not designated by Academic Human Resources as Temporary): change to Assistant Teaching Professor
- Adjunct Principal Lecturer: change to Adjunct Teaching Professor
- Adjunct Senior Lecturer: change to Adjunct Associate Teaching Professor
- Adjunct Lecturer: change to Adjunct Assistant Teaching Professor

No other lecturer titles should be automatically changed.

For any faculty member whose title is changed as described above, the salary and expiration date of his or her appointment should be the same as they were before the conversion, unless it is necessary to raise an individual’s salary to the minimum for his or her new rank (in accord with Section 24-71, Subsection A.3 of the Faculty Code). If a renewal or a salary increase had been approved but had not taken effect before the title change, the renewal or increase should be applied to the new title. If a new appointment or a promotion in rank and/or title had been approved but had not taken effect before the title change, the rank and/or title to which the individual is appointed or promoted should also be changed as listed above.

Once these conversions have been made, no further appointments should be made with the title of Principal Lecturer or Senior Lecturer Full-Time, and all new full-time appointments as Lecturers should be designated as Lecturer Full-Time (Temporary), limited to annual appointments for up to three consecutive years.

During the period after the President signs the legislation and before the effective date of the new titles, faculty members whose titles will be changed by this action should be allowed to use the new titles informally in internal and external correspondence. However, any new voting rights or other privileges that the code changes confer on the new titles should not become effective until the official effective date of the new titles.

The Faculty Senate recognizes that the full integration of the new titles into the university’s computer systems might not be completed by September 16, 2020; nevertheless, the new titles should become effective for all purposes related to the Faculty Code as of that date.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 114; Section 2 (Requirements for the Bachelor’s Degree)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 114.2.A (Required Grade Point) based on the following findings:

- The University has set a minimum required cumulative GPA (2.00) requirement for graduation. Programs may want to establish a higher minimum cumulative GPA or a minimum grade requirement for individual courses, but the intent of this policy is that such changes are subject to approval and require justification. This policy is designed to afford programs the flexibility to request grade and GPA minimums consistent with their programmatic and academic needs, while maintaining protections for students through a rigorous process of review and approval on a case-by-case basis.

2. Requirements for the Bachelor’s Degree

A. Required Grade Point

To be eligible for the bachelor’s degree, an undergraduate student must achieve a minimum cumulative grade-point average of 2.00. Only resident credits and credits from DL courses will be used to compute the graduation grade-point average.

1) Cumulative Grade Graduation Requirements:

a) Programs may establish a requirement that students achieve a minimum 2.00 cumulative grade-point average for courses required for their major.

b) Programs may establish a requirement that students achieve a minimum cumulative grade-point average of higher than 2.00 for courses required for their major only if the program provides sufficient documentation and justification. Programs may establish a minimum cumulative grade-point average requirement higher than 2.50 only if the program provides exceptionally strong justification.

2) Minimum Grade Graduation Requirements in Individual Courses:

a) Programs may establish a requirement that students achieve a minimum grade in the range of 0.8 to 2.0 in each course of a subset of the courses required for a major or for every course required for a major only if the program provides sufficient documentation and justification.

b) Programs that request a minimum grade requirement exceeding 2.0 in each course of a subset of the courses required for the major or for every course required for a major must provide extraordinary justification.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, February 27, 2020, 2:30 p.m.
Johnson Hall 102

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Associate Professor Joseph Janes.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate on Planning and Budgeting.
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative.

4. President’s Remarks– Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   a. Approval of the January 6, 2020 Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of January 23, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.

8. Announcements.

   a. Nomination of Candidates for 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Vice Chair.
      Chris Laws, Principal Lecturer, College of Arts & Sciences; Gautham Reddy, Professor, School of Medicine; Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance.
   b. 2020-2021 Faculty Senate Vice Chair Candidate’s Presentations.
   c. Class A Legislation – Proposed alignment of faculty ranks – second consideration.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
   d. Class C Resolution – Conversion of lecturer titles.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   e. Class B Legislation – Grading.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

10. Discussion Items.
   a. Update on Finance Transformation
      Brian McCarter, Vice President for Finance
   b. Task Force on the faculty disciplinary code and process update.
      Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor and co-chair of the task force on disciplinary code and process.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by: 

Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: 

Joseph Janes, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, March 5 at 2:30 p.m. in Johnson Hall 102
Task Force on the faculty disciplinary code and process update

Executive Summary of Revisions to the Faculty Disciplinary Code and Process

1. Overview

In the fall of 2017, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, Thaisa Way, and Secretary of the Faculty, Mike Townsend charged the Faculty Senate Task Force on the Faculty Disciplinary Code and Process to review and revise the faculty disciplinary process and related policies as reflected in the Faculty Code to align with legal labor standards, relevant federal and state research funding requirements, and additional standards as determined appropriate.

The motivation for this work was three-fold. First, with completion of the revised Student Code of Conduct in spring of 2017, it was clear that the Faculty Code and related processes should be made equally strong and clear to assure due process, timely resolution/redress, equitable treatment and fairness.

Second, as the Faculty Code and sections of the UW Policy Directory which pertain to the faculty disciplinary process had not been substantially reviewed for over two decades, Senate leadership in consultation with administrative leadership and other key faculty disciplinary system stakeholders, felt it was time to conduct a full review of the system and propose revisions to it as deemed appropriate. Our current system, which was once state of the art, no longer reflects or adequately leverages scholarly and practical advances in conflict management and dispute resolution or labor relations best practices. In addition, it does not sufficiently meet the demands imposed by changes that have occurred in our regulatory and governing contexts (e.g., federal research and Title IX compliance requirements, changes in the Washington Administrative Procedures Act and other controlling legal decisions). Our current system, which has experienced many tweaks in response to changes in that regulatory landscape over the last two or more decades, creaks along but does not serve us as well as we would like or should expect. Stakeholders across the system express significant levels of dissatisfaction.

Finally, as the diversity and complexity of our university faculty increases, including the current engagement of three robust campus communities, we must assure that our disciplinary, grievance and dispute resolution processes and code are reflective of the values and principles we hold yet better suited to address the complex landscape of our university.

2. Key provisions of the Faculty Code (administrative, conciliatory and adjudicative processes) need review and substantive updating, because of significant shortcomings in our current system.

Current System Shortcomings

- Employs one set of adjudicative processes to serve all problems, both disciplinary cases and grievances. Current processes are not tailored to the nature of the conflict, problem or dispute and all conflicts, problems and disputes—whether minor or major—are addressed the same way.
- Fails to encourage and facilitate early intervention at the lowest levels of conflict, problem or dispute intensity or severity, when these are more amenable to resolution and mitigation. Consequently, interpersonal conflicts and minor disciplinary issues or grievances tend to be suppressed or escalated, exacerbating conflicts, problems and disputes.
- Relies on heavily protracted and legalistic processes that are difficult and costly—emotionally and financially—to navigate.
• Highly adversarial. Rather than encouraging and supporting a problem-solving orientation first, our current system encourages parties tend to hunker down and entrench their positions in anticipation of legalistic battles they expect to engage down the road.
• Time and resource intensive
• Fosters inconsistency and inequity; outcomes vary across time, units and by decision maker
• Complex and reliant on siloed systems
  o No clear connection with other policy provisions on discrimination and harassment, research misconduct, financial impropriety
  o Negatively impacts the alignment of appropriate processes and expertise required to support problem solving and accurate, appropriate means to address misconduct
  o Increases costs, reduces timeliness, diminishes further ease of navigability, negatively impacts accuracy, equity and fairness of outcomes
• No systematic data collection so it’s hard to assess how the system is performing

Implications of current system shortcomings:
• Processes/options not easily navigable, understood or implemented--faculty and administrators are not aware of options
• Difficult to achieve closure; it’s not clear when appeals are exhausted
• Limited ability to monitor and identify trends to inform continuous improvement and identify needed education, training, or policy changes
• Does not adequately address the interests of the parties, increases costs, erodes community well-being and creates risk for the institution

3. Three committees – Faculty Disciplinary Steering Committee, Values & Principles Committee, Drafting Committee – were charged to:

To tackle this complex project, a tri-part committee structure was established that includes a Steering Committee, which oversees two work groups: Values and Principles and Legal and Regulations (i.e., the Drafting Committee).

Steering Committee Charge:
The Steering Committee is charged with overseeing the process of review and revision of the Faculty Code regarding the faculty disciplinary process and policies. This includes, but is not limited to: 1) an identification and articulation of the values and guiding principles that motivate our approach to faculty discipline, 2) the options available within the framework of labor law and policy requirements to inform our faculty disciplinary process, 3) the appropriate delegation of authority of the elements that comprise the faculty disciplinary code and related policies and 4) the design principles and process specifications for the proposed system. This committee will consider and approve all recommendations emerging from the two work groups. To emphasize, this committee will confirm that all appropriate parties have been consulted prior to the legislative and policy proposals being submitted for any final approval by faculty and/or administration. It will be responsible for the final proposal of the revised faculty disciplinary code and associated policies to the UW Faculty Senate and administrative leadership.
Values and Principles Work Group Charge:
The Values and Principles Work Group is charged to identify and clearly articulate the values and guiding principles that will serve as the foundational framework for the revised Faculty Code and related policies relevant to the faculty disciplinary process and policies. This effort will include, but not be limited to: 1) an inventory and assessment of current dispute resolution, disciplinary and adjudication processes and resources; 2) a review of disciplinary and adjudication models from other universities; 3) interviews with key thought leaders on all three campuses that will help inform the work group’s discussions and conclusions and 4) articulation of the design principles and process specifications for the proposed system. This work group will then respond to the Legal and Regulations Work Group draft faculty disciplinary code and policy to assure alignment with the values and principles framework. They will establish recommendations for all areas of the faculty disciplinary code and associated and relevant policies that are not pre-determined by labor law or other external regulations and will articulate the design principles and process specification for the proposed system. This work group will report to the Steering Committee and make the final recommendation to the Steering Committee for adopting a revised Faculty Code on disciplinary process and associated and relevant policies and practices.

Legal and Regulations Work Group (i.e. Drafting Committee) Charge:
The Legal and Regulations Work Group (i.e., Drafting Committee) is to develop a clear and complete legislative and administrative framework for the disciplinary and adjudication processes addressed in the Faculty Code and UW Policy Directory. The Legal and Regulations Work Group will identify all policies and practices that are relevant to the disciplinary process that do not require being in the Faculty Code but require delegation elsewhere. They will advise the Values and Principles Work Group on recommended decisions regarding proposed changes to the faculty disciplinary code and respond to feedback from external groups and individuals. They will meet as needed with the Steering Committee to explain the legislative and policy frameworks that are being proposed. The Legal and Regulations Work Group will determine the process for sharing draft legislation and policy with faculty and appropriate administrative personnel and leadership and subsequently guide the response to feedback.

See Appendix A for information on task force membership.

4. The committees developed a motivating values framework to guide their work (See Appendix B):
   - Principles for dispute resolution processes:
     - Clear, equitable, fair, transparent, ethical, timely
   - Principles for dispute outcomes:
     - Efficacy, accountability, accuracy, proportionality, education, alignment and consistency
   - Community values
     - Academic and intellectual freedom
     - Academic, research and professional integrity
     - Equity and inclusion
     - Ethical behavior, fairness and respect
     - Individual and community health and well-being
     - Accountability to each other and the community as a whole
     - Learning and continuous improvement
5. **Proposed system:**

Proposed system strives to create better alignment of process to disciplinary, conflict and dispute resolution needs.

**Development of design principles and process specifications:**
- Mapped current disciplinary, grievance and dispute resolution landscape at UW; identified stakeholder pain points, concerns and issues
- Reviewed peer practices and AAUP recommended best practices
- Sought input from relevant University stakeholders
- Assessed alignment with motivating values framework

**Proposed system approach**
- Leverages evidence-based research on organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) and dispute resolution
- Reflects AAUP best practices
- References applicable federal and state legal frameworks
- Incorporates modern labor relations practices

**Introduction to three (new) buckets rather than current one**
- Grievances
  - Focus on problem solving: an individual's problem becomes a problem for the institution, and as such must be addressed for good organizational functioning
  - Informal ADR processes available before and after grievance is filed
- Corrective action and discipline
  - Now separated from grievances
  - Expanded toolbox offers variety of tools (including opportunities for education and early intervention) for corrective action, instead of one blunt instrument (adjudication)
  - Notice and due process provisions – as required by the APA – are retained; new process to replace Chapter 25-71 (discipline)
- Resolution of interpersonal conflict
  - Conciliation
  - Mediation
  - Options for addressing interpersonal conflict when it verges on misconduct

6. **Conclusion and summary: tying these pieces together**

*How and why proposed new code language is an improvement ... demonstrate how values and principles are visible in new processes*

**Proposed system benefits**
- Better aligns processes employed with the intensity and type of conflict, issue or problem being addressed
- Improves the use of resources and time
- Addresses issues at the appropriate level, reducing risks and minimizing costs associated with escalation and adversarial conflict
  - Effects a cultural shift to focus on problem solving first and whenever possible
  - Supports and guides efforts to intervene early, at the lowest levels of conflict or issue intensity and resolve—when possible—in a manner that addresses the parties’ interests yet preserves institutional and communal ability to hold faculty and decision makers accountable for their behavior and actions in ways that are proportional to the behaviors and actions in question
- Enhances consistency, equity and fairness of outcomes
7. Timelines (See Presentation PDF)
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## APPENDIX B
Motivating Values for Faculty Disciplinary Code and Dispute Resolution Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY VALUES</th>
<th>DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESSES</th>
<th>DISPUTE OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear</strong></td>
<td>People know what to expect</td>
<td><strong>Efficacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes are understandable and navigable</td>
<td>Seek to achieve resolution at the lowest level of dispute intervention possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equitable</strong></td>
<td>Equal access to process for everyone</td>
<td>Strive to address all parties’ concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes and procedures are conducted in a consistent and uniform manner across time, disputes and institutional units</td>
<td><strong>Alignment &amp; Consistency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processes are neutral/lack bias:</td>
<td>Outcomes are aligned/consistent with community values as well as the values of the appointing academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o No person or group is singled out for discrimination or ill-treatment</td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Provide protections for all community members regardless of status or power (e.g., tenure/non-tenure track faculty, faculty of different rank, staff, students, etc.)</td>
<td>Decision makers are responsible for exercising their roles with integrity, in a manner consistent with the faculty code and our community values and are responsible for the consequences associated with implementing decision outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fair</strong></td>
<td>Assures appropriate levels of due process</td>
<td><strong>Proportionality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All appropriate parties are included in the process</td>
<td>A range of disciplinary actions is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parties are treated with dignity, courtesy, and respect</td>
<td>Disciplinary action matches the presenting transgression and considers relevant history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanisms are available for fixing mistakes</td>
<td>Appointment, promotion and merit outcomes match responsibilities and performance expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transparent</strong></td>
<td>Relevant information is shared with appropriate parties in a timely manner</td>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making process and criteria are communicated; parties know:</td>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate and available information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o What is happening, when;</td>
<td><strong>Educational</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The outcome received;</td>
<td>Decisions are shared to assure broad understanding of community values, expectations and norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Why decision outcome occurred</td>
<td>Opportunities for learning, reconciliation and grace are provided as appropriate (e.g., decision outcomes promote a culture that creates space for people to make honest mistakes and come back from them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethical</strong></td>
<td>Norms of professional conduct are not violated</td>
<td><strong>Alignment &amp; Consistency</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timely</strong></td>
<td>Seek to address disputes at earliest point of intervention possible</td>
<td>Outcomes are aligned/consistent with community values as well as the values of the appointing academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disputes are resolved as quickly as practicable given the nature of the dispute and dispute resolution procedure employed</td>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decision makers are responsible for exercising their roles with integrity, in a manner consistent with the faculty code and our community values and are responsible for the consequences associated with implementing decision outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community members are held responsible for their behaviors and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proportionality**
- A range of disciplinary actions is available
- Disciplinary action matches the presenting transgression and considers relevant history
- Appointment, promotion and merit outcomes match responsibilities and performance expectations

**Accuracy**
- Decisions are based on accurate and available information

**Educational**
- Decisions are shared to assure broad understanding of community values, expectations and norms
- Opportunities for learning, reconciliation and grace are provided as appropriate (e.g., decision outcomes promote a culture that creates space for people to make honest mistakes and come back from them)
Proposed Grievance Model
Faculty Senate Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution

Senate Executive Committee
February 10, 2020
FUTURE STATE

- Misconduct
- Contracted administrative decisions
- Interpersonal conflict

FUTURE STATE

- Misconduct
- Contracted administrative decisions
- Interpersonal conflict

Discipline
Faculty member's behavior is questioned and the University has the obligation to address it.

FACULTY CODE: Administrative, Disciplinary and Adjudicatory Processes

Decision by an administrator that affects terms or conditions of employment.
Faculty member disagrees with a decision, or has a problem and needs to engage the administration to solve it.

Other disputes between/among faculty members
Does not include allegations of misconduct or policy violation.

Concerns about administrative decisions are addressed at an appropriate level with those who can solve the problem.
Multi-step process that encourages parties to engage in mutual problem solving with recourse to more formal resolution, if necessary.
PROPOSED GRIEVANCE MODEL

Chair of the faculty grievance panel decides whether to move to Step 3

Step 3 standard not intended to be more restrictive than current standard

Optional faculty member requests informal discussion with faculty administrator

Exhibit J

Questions?
SUMMARY TIMELINE FOR CLASS C RESOLUTION AND CLASS A LEGISLATION

Fall 2019 and prior
Models and concepts developed by Steering Committee, Values and Principles Committee

Winter 2020
Presentation of models and concepts for Class C resolution to FCTA, FCTCP, CEFC, CUFCS, BoDPC and other vetting bodies

Spring 2020
Faculty Senate and SEC review; Class C resolutions introduced
- Design principles
- Process specifications

Summer 2020
Drafting committee; actual code language

Fall 2020
Review of code language to ensure alignment with models and concepts; Class A legislation introduced

PROCESS PARTNERS
- Office of Academic Personnel
- University Ombud
- Compliance Services
- Office of Research Misconduct Proceedings
- School of Medicine Administration
- Internal Audit
Applications

- Increase in applications across all three residency groups until 2019.

- Significant decrease observed for international students in 2020 (consistent with national trend).

Enrollment

- WA resident enrollment is relatively stable over this time period.
- Reduction in state support during the great recession resulted in UW’s need to grow in U.S. nonresident and international nonresident enrollments beginning in 2011.

Yield

- Yield is stable for WA residents over this time period.
- International yield is relatively stable, peaking during intentional expansion of enrollment.
- U.S. non-resident yields are decreasing reflecting demographic changes and increased competition.
Admit Rates

- Goal: Admit rate WA residents > U.S. non-resident (and international).
- Leveling/decrease in U.S. non-resident applications combined with decreasing yield results in increased admit rate.
- To meet goal we need to increase yield and/or increase number of applications.

U.S. INTERNATIONAL STUDENT ENROLLMENTS: 2007–2019*

- U.S. aggregate data on new international student enrollments.
- Decrease in enrollments begin in 2016.
- UW did not see decreased applications from international students until the 2019/2020 application cycle.

DEMographics & demand for higher education

- Changes in college-going populations will vary by region and institution type.
- Northeast and Midwest will feel decreases most acutely.
- PNW spared from 'birth dirth' to some extent, but UW will face increased competition from other institutions.

From: "Demographics and the Demand for Higher Education" by N. D. Grawe

ApPlicant program of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built Environments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (A&amp;S)</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences (A&amp;S)</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities (A&amp;S)</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (A&amp;S)</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>24.52</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science Engineering</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>9.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster Business School</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Information School</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>7.51</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Applicants by Select Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Requested</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>All Apps Recd</th>
<th>All Offers</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>All Enrolled</th>
<th>Percent of Total Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART H</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCI</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1245</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>9.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHED</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGT</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACKSON SCHOOL</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>ARTS &amp; SCIENCES</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENG</td>
<td>INTERSCHOOL</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFO</td>
<td>INFORMATION SCHOOL</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR WA JRDI</td>
<td>ENGINEERING</td>
<td>6724</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>13.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDOS TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,470</td>
<td>6695</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>33.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OF ALL APPLICATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td>46,664</td>
<td>22,696</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>5304</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Direct Admit to College of Engineering: Yield Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yield (WA Direct)</th>
<th>Yield (WA Not)</th>
<th>Yield (Domestic Direct)</th>
<th>Yield (Domestic Not)</th>
<th>Yield (Inter. Direct)</th>
<th>Yield (Inter. Not)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Direct to Department through 2017. Changes to Direct to College (DtC) in 2018.
- "Brand" is important to WA residents; however, yields decreased for non-direct admit ("Not").
- Decrease in yield for domestic non-resident and international students observed with implementation of DtC (we expected the trend, but we’re learning about the magnitude).
ELEMENTS OF STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

- Multiple elements to strategic enrollment management
- Need to develop effective strategies in each element in order for overall strategy to be successful
- Currently implementing strategic initiatives throughout all four elements.
- Strategic Enrollment Management through the lens of, “To, through, and beyond”.

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

Communications and Outreach

> Improving admissions web presence (done)
> Refining communications strategy to non-direct admit applicants (in progress)
> UW-wide admitted-student preview day (3 days this year, 1 next year)
> Meta-majors: Helping students with degree program exploration (initiated)
> Connecting degree program to career through machine learning (done)

> Non-resident and international recruitment (proposal ready for Provost)
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

Admission

> Ability to consider area of interest in constructing entering class (done)
> Refinement of holistic review (done)
> Selection tools (version 1.0 ready in mid-Feb.)

> Purple and Gold scholarship expansion to increase domestic non-resident yields (in exploration)
> Accept the Common Application (early planning stages)

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

Journey to Major

> Curriculum development
  > Exploration courses: Humanities (in pilot)
  > APLU “Powered by Publics” working group (in progress)
> Data analysis: “Happy Paths” (done)
> Meta Majors (initiated)

> Application platform for competitive entry programs (in exploration)
> Intended major platform (in exploration)

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT INITIATIVES

In Major and Beyond

> Enhanced Degree Programs
  – Data Science Minor (in progress)
  – Global competency (initiated)
  – Emphasizing research (initiated)
> Data analysis: Connecting degrees to careers (done)

> Skills in context (in exploration)
> Expanded internship opportunities (in exploration)

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON