Minutes  
Senate Executive Committee Meeting  
Monday, November 16, 2020, 2:30 p.m.  
Zoom

Present: Robin Angotti, Chris Laws, Joseph Janes, Ana Mari Cauce, Ann Frost, Maya Sonenberg, Angel Fettig, Kimberly Muczynski, Kenneth Steinberg, Whasun Chung, Keith Nitta, Sarah Hampson, Jack Lee, Lauren Montgomery, Ann Huppert, Mike Townsend, Jacob Vigdor, JoAnn Taricani, Mark Richards, Camille Hatwig  
Absent: Kristiina Vogt, Aaron Yared  
Guests: Margo Bergman, Elizabeth Umphress, Helen Garrett, Gautham Reddy, Brenda Williams, Cheryl Cameron

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 P.M.

The agenda was amended to move item 7f to position 7c and then move everything else down. The ordering below reflects that change.

As amended, the agenda was approved.

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

Chair Angotti took time to thank the faculty councils for their efforts.

   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]

There were no questions.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

Cauce said that we are not where we want to be with respect to COVID. She added that although the Governor’s new restrictions do not apply to higher education, they do make clear that we are still not safe. The UW has reached out to students and asked them to get tested before and after any Thanksgiving travel. The UW is examining what can be mandated, and the current belief is that testing can be mandated for students entering residence halls in the fall. The UW is working with other state institutions to see what can be mandated when students return in January. There has been no final call yet on classes in Spring; the hope is that there can be a few more in-person classes because it might be possible to do more things outdoors. There is hope that vaccines will have be available for college students before the fall, and the UW is looking into whether vaccination for COVID can be mandated as already done for the flu. Cauce said that the upcoming holidays will be like no other, and it will continue to be a very tough time. Cauce highlighted the Provost’s DEI hiring initiative, and she said that the UW has already made two hires with those funds.

There were no questions.

5. Consent Agenda.  
   a. Approve the October 5, 2020, SEC minutes.  
   b. Approve the October 22, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.  
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. Announcements.
There were no announcements.

   a. Class A Legislation – Improving transparency in the promotion and tenure process – second consideration. [Exhibit F]
      Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

      A motion was made and seconded to submit the legislation to the Faculty Senate for second consideration.
      There was no discussion.

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

   b. Class A Legislation – Procedures for promotion – second consideration. [Exhibit G]
      Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

      During discussion, Jack Lee, Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs, discussed some comments that the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations had made but were outside the scope of what could be considered under the Code at this point in the process because they did not come under the matters authorized in Sections 29-33:E and 29-34:A.3. Lee said that two of the comments were reasonable suggestions for clarification, but that the third involved a substantive suggestion with which he disagreed. In any case, Lee suggested that amending 29-33:E and 29-34:A.3 might be worth considering in the future.

      There was no further discussion.

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

   c. Class A Legislation – Diversity Statement – first consideration. [Exhibit K]
      Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
      Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

      Gautham Reddy, Chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, and Brenda Williams, Former Chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, spoke to motion, summarizing the material in the exhibit.

      During discussion, several points were made. In response to questions about why the legislation does not cover promotion and merit, it was said to be cleaner to focus on hiring with the expectation that commitments to diversity would become part of the culture. It also was noted that the Code already mandates that contributions to diversity coming under scholarship, teaching, and service be considered in promotion cases. Some wondered whether the phrase “diversity, equity and/or inclusion” would be better to emphasize that someone could focus on one of the three areas. In this regard, it was argued in response that the phrase “diversity, equity, and inclusion” is a term of art with a well-understood meaning along the suggested lines already.

      It was noted that the faculty covered by the legislation as written is not the same as the voting faculty described in Section 21-32:A.

      A motion was made and seconded to amend by replacing the description of covered faculty with the phrase “to the ranks and/or titles listed in Section 21-32.A (Voting Membership in the Faculty).”

      There was no discussion.

      The motion to amend passed.
There was no further discussion on the main motion as amended.

As amended, the motion to submit the legislation to the Senate was approved.

d. Class A Legislation – Title Cleanup – first consideration. [Exhibit H]
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

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

There was no discussion.

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

e. Class A Legislation – Voting Time Limits – first consideration. [Exhibit I]
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

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

In response to a question, Lee noted that the voting process could be completed in as little as roughly 15 days, down from roughly 22 days.

There was no further discussion.

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

f. Class A Legislation – Clinical Appointment Lengths – first consideration. [Exhibit J]
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

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

During the discussion, several points were made. It was reported that the Provost’s Office and the School of Medicine support the proposal. Lee acknowledged that the legislation is a stopgap aimed at the medical school and that there are other questions involving clinical faculty. He went on to say that it would be desirable to include in the discussion other schools and colleges that hire clinical faculty. Lee said that next steps have not been fleshed out, but that discussions have included moving the salaried clinical faculty to the teaching faculty ranks, creating a separate salaried clinical track, and changing the voting matrix. He added that the Faculty Council on Faculty affairs is unlikely to devote a lot of time to this issue in the remainder of the academic year because of other pressing matters. It was reported that there are 885 salaried clinical faculty, but it was not expected that all would be offered longer-term contracts. Lee explained the discretion given the Provost’s Office by noting that Provost guidelines for appointments longer than a year require a competitive search and this makes a blanket extension provision problematic. It was reported that the Provost’s Office will produce guidelines for implementing the new provision; this should address transparency concerns about the discretion given the Provost’s Office. Lee noted that multi-year appointments under the legislation would require a vote by all eligible unit faculty and could not be delegated to a subcommittee. Although there is no explicit upper limit, the expectation is that the Provost guidelines will put a five-year limit on multi-year contracts as was suggested by the School of Medicine.
Lee also noted that the legislation does not give voting rights.

There was no further discussion.

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

  g. Class B Legislation – Grades, Honors, and Scholarship. [Exhibit L]
      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 for consideration.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Helen Garrett, University Registrar, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the exhibit. Garrett added that the legislation helps students avoid hard questions about why withdrawals occur.

During discussion, Garrett said that the changes referring to academic honors merely reflect current practice.

There was no further discussion.

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

  h. Class B Legislation – Withdrawals. [Exhibit M]
      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 for consideration.

Ann Huppert, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Helen Garrett, University Registrar, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the exhibit. Garrett added that the legislation extends student control over their own academic success.

There was no discussion.

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

  i. Class B Legislation – Equivalent Courses. [Exhibit N]
      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 for consideration.

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

There was no discussion.

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

  j. Class C Resolution – Equity in Caregiving. [Exhibit O]
      Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
      **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

Margo Bergman, Chair of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, and Elizabeth Umphress, member of the Council, spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the exhibit. Umphress gave specific examples of people facing caregiving issues.
There followed a wide-ranging and detailed discussion. There was general support for the basic reasoning and goals of the resolution, as well as its urgency, but members described several concerns. Umphress said that wording changes to address concerns were welcome.

Some members noted that the legislation could be read to say that faculty will be paid for full-time even when they are not working full-time. It was pointed out that this would not be consistent with university policy, does not reflect what happens with other members of the community who face the same issues, and would not be a desirable message to send, especially to the state legislature. In response, it was argued that many faculty are already working more than full-time, as defined by 40 hours a week. It was suggested that the resolution could be more closely tied to Code language that already recognizes workload flexibility (Section 24-32) and provides a mechanism for its achievement (Section 24-57 Conferences).

Other members asked how caregiving status would be defined and whether the status would be self-determined. If applied too broadly, caregiving status would not protect those most affected and make it difficult for the University to do its business. In this regard, it was suggested that wording be added to emphasize a focus on parents with school-age children. Umphress said that the caregiving status was intended to be self-defining, but other approaches that respect confidentiality could be acceptable.

Members were worried about the power imbalances inherent in the proposed discussion with unit leaders. Umphress said that allowing faculty members to have an advocate present in the discussion with the unit leader would be desirable, but there was not time to get supporting language in the resolution.

Still other members asked whether there were potential interactions with the Family Medical Leave Act. Umphress noted that the Act has a limited time frame and a restricted definition of caregiver.

A number of amendments were proposed.

A motion was made to change lines 47 and 48 by inserting “and caregivers” after “teaching resources” on line 47, and by inserting “for caregivers” after “service obligations” in line 48.

Without objection, the motion to amend was approved.

A motion was made to change line 45 by inserting “while striving to maintain a high quality student experience” after “instructor.”

Angotti asked for objections, and it was objected that the language gave administrators an easy way of requiring faculty to do the impossible.

Angotti then asked for further discussion. It was pointed out that the proposed amendment highlights the underlying conflict between the needs of the affected faculty and the business needs of the University. It was argued that faculty teaching essential classes could get no meaningful relief under such a provision. In response, it was said that faculty should remember that many other people are facing the same issues without the possibility of any relief whatsoever. It was noted that flexibility could be shown by combining sections, moving essential courses into one quarter, and allowing for asynchronous teaching. In response, it was argued that many administrators are not showing any flexibility.

There was no further discussion.

The motion to amend was approved by a vote.

A motion was made and seconded to change line 41 by replacing “between 25%-75% reduction” with “meaningful redistribution.”

During discussion, there was some argument about whether the word “redistribution” adequately reached the idea of reduction.

There was no further discussion.
The motion to amend failed.

A motion was made and seconded to change line 41 by replacing “between 25%-75% reduction in performance expectations” with “meaningful redistribution of teaching and reduction of service and research expectations.”

During discussion, there was general support for the change. It was understood that the word “redistribution” could refer to redistribution across faculty.

There was no further discussion.

The motion to amend was approved.

A motion was made and seconded to change line 45 by inserting “in accordance with Section 24-32 of the Faculty Code” after the word “instructor.”

There was no discussion.

The motion to amend was approved.

There was no further discussion on the main motion as amended.

As amended, the motion to submit the legislation to the Senate was approved.

k. Approval of the December 3, 2020, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit P]
   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

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

During discussion, it was pointed out that a continuation meeting, if needed, would be December 10 at 2:30 P.M.

8. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 4:49 P.M.

Prepared by: Mike Townsend
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by: Robin Angotti, Chair
Faculty Senate

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Monday, November 23 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.
As you can see from the agenda, the University Faculty Councils have been hard at work over the last few weeks. The University Faculty Councils are the deliberative and advisory bodies for all matters of university policy. The current legislation they are bringing forward at this meeting runs the gamut from issues of promotions, length of faculty contracts, and diversity and equity to several pieces of legislation on academic standards. In addition to the legislation listed in the agenda, all eleven University Faculty Councils have been hard at work debating a myriad of issues facing the university and working to get faculty voice on topics such as the structure of the tri-campus relationship, envisioning the future use of the UW Club, support for internet connections for online teaching, concerns around part-time faculty, and the effects of the pandemic on faculty careers particularly as it relates to teaching, research and career trajectories. Our University Faculty Councils perform an incredible service for the faculty as your representatives and they make an impact on a wide range of issues facing the university. Anyone seeking to be more involved in the governance process should volunteer to be on a council whose focus may interest them.

One of the largest pieces of legislation that will come before the Senate this year is a product of three years of hard work from the Faculty Senate’s Task Force on Disciplinary Code and Process, co-chaired by Mike Townsend and Zoe Barsness and with staff support by Amanda Paye. This legislation will update the policies surrounding misconduct, grievance and interpersonal conflict. It maps out a pivotal change in the way faculty conflicts at the University of Washington are handled. The hope of the task force is that this process will create a culture of cooperation and collaboration rather than the current conflict resolution process which contributes to a culture of fear and retribution. Due to its importance and size, this legislation will require two additional special Senate meetings. Information regarding those meetings will be distributed soon.

Senate leadership has regular quarterly meetings with the chairs of all our University Faculty Councils, as well as the Elected Faculty Councils of the schools, colleges, and campuses. As is often the case, issues under discussion in the various units differ based on local circumstances, from budgetary and long-range planning matters through curricular reviews and revisions, to preparing for changes in administration, bylaw reviews, and merit processes and so on. At the next meeting of the elected faculty councils, we plan to discuss the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic on faculty career trajectories.

Faculty Senate leadership recently attended the virtual meeting of the PAC-12 Academic Leadership Coalition, made up of the faculty governing bodies of the PAC-12 institutions, hosted by our colleagues at the University of Colorado at Boulder. It was a great opportunity to discuss commonalities and differences across our campuses, to hear from the Provost of CU Boulder and to have a lively discussion on issues of Academic Freedom; Diversity, Equity and Inclusion; and the future and relevancy of the Academy. With the anticipation of the state legislative session in the spring, it’s the time of year when many thoughts turn to budget priorities. The SCPB under the leadership of Joe Janes in consultation with Vice Provost of Planning and Budgeting, Sarah Norris Hall, is in full swing and is already tackling the most complex and pressing issues facing the university. Simultaneously, our new legislative representative, Jake Vigdor is gearing up to represent us in Olympia during what will be a critical session on state budget.

As always, we thank all those faculty throughout the institution who give of their time on our mutual behalf, and look forward to more great work to come.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

1. Vice-Chair Nominations: The search for the 2021-22 Faculty Senate Vice Chair is beginning and currently seeking nominations. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the university and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the faculty across the university. If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) in the Faculty Senate Office.

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

3. Faculty Disciplinary Task Force: Drafting is in progress on the revisions to the Faculty Code. It is anticipated that Code language will be presented for adoption during the current academic year.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Joseph Janes, Associate Professor, Information School

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

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

- Status reports from UW Medicine, Intercollegiate Athletics, and Housing and Food Services regarding COVID-related impacts to revenues, expenditures, budget, reserves, and near-future scenarios and planning
- A discussion of the state legislative agenda for the upcoming session
- A detailed update on the FY21 budget to date
- The beginnings of the annual budget review process for FY22, including analytical tools, planning resources
- Initial review of an updated set of tools for tracking and monitoring unit deficits
- An update and discussion on the current status of the finance transformation project, including the operating model, budget, potential cost savings, schedule, and overall goals
- A discussion of future long-term capital, facilities, and real estate strategies
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy & Governance

This report includes commentary on the outcome of the November elections and highlights examples of faculty public service. As the legislature will almost certainly not convene until January, there is little in the way of state legislative business to discuss. At the Federal level, there is a question of whether a stimulus bill can pass Congress and earn the President’s signature during the lame duck session. I am not optimistic on the prospects, given the continued partisan jostling over the results of the November election and the focus on what will be very contentious January Senate runoff elections in Georgia.

Lux Sit

The 2020 election gives us a snapshot of a nation deeply and bitterly divided.

Nationwide and here in Washington state, returns point to the application of something resembling centrifugal force. In King County, Joe Biden received 180,000 more votes than Hillary Clinton obtained in 2016. Democratic state legislators faced serious threats from candidates running to their left. In areas like southwestern Washington which tilted Republican in 2016 this tilt became more pronounced. Donald Trump earned 57% of the vote in Cowlitz County, up from 51% four years ago. Democratic state legislators faced serious threats from candidates running to their right. Given this evidence of deepening polarization, I don’t see this election as making my job of representing faculty interests in Olympia any easier.

Many dissertations will be written about this deepening divide. It has proven profitable, both politically and economically, to sow division in the electorate. To take what are in reality complicated public problems and attribute failures to solve them to conspiracies and corrupt actors, rather than their inherent complexity. The goal of electoral politics shifts from persuasion to sheer outnumbering of the opponent.

This divide places higher education at risk. The academy values open inquiry, robust debate, the careful weighing of evidence, consideration of diverse perspectives, and above all the willingness to be open to persuasion. The forces driving polarization work in opposition to these values. Where we would encourage citizens to engage with arguments that challenge their beliefs, others have conditioned them to dismiss such arguments as “fake news.” Higher education itself is at times accused of peddling political orthodoxy, of indoctrinating rather than enlightening. Such accusations are to be expected when our work threatens the economic or political spoils of other actors in society.

Unity and University derive from the same Latin root, signifying oneness. The University promotes unity, but not in the politician’s sense of the word. To the politician, unity is achieved in a process where some stakeholders compromise their principles in the interest of the common good. The unity we promote has more to do with the beginning of this process than the endpoint. It is a oneness of knowledge, a unity of awareness, a foundation of shared understanding supporting civil civic debate. A condition where there is no such thing as an “alternative fact.” The University promotes unity by falsifying what is objectively incorrect, illuminating what is complicated, facilitating the respectful exchange of diverse perspectives, and contextualizing what might be misleading.

In these dark times we must remember that we are keepers of the light.

Stories of Engagement

The people of our state, and their representatives in the legislature, deserve to have a full understanding of the work faculty do on their behalf. Classroom instruction, research, and service to the academy are core components of this work. But stories of faculty efforts to place their knowledge in direct service to Washingtonians help to bring the abstract notions of research, teaching, and service to life. I will occasionally share these stories with you, to celebrate the good our colleagues are doing across this state and inspire you to imagine new ways of placing your expertise in public service. If you or a constituent have a story to contribute please use this link to contribute.
Volunteer Income Tax Assistance Project, Foster School of Business, Seattle campus

In 2016 Assistant Professor Phillip Quinn and Associate Teaching Professor Elizabeth Weber conceived of a way to provide accounting students with hands-on practical experience while serving the community: offer income tax preparation assistance to immigrants and lower-income families. To get the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance (VITA) project up and running, Professors Quinn and Weber sought and obtained certification from the IRS to provide tax assistance to international students, refugees, and other non-citizens – the first such certification in King County. They extended the reach of their services by partnering with the United Way.

Since filling out their first 1040 in January 2017, VITA has helped local low-to-moderate income households file over 1,700 Federal income tax returns, helping families secure over $1.6 million in tax refunds.

Doris Duke Conservation Scholars Program

Led by Professors Martha Groom (Interdisciplinary Arts & Science, Bothell campus) and Joshua Lawler (Environmental and Forest Sciences, Seattle campus), this program brings students from across the United States to the Pacific Northwest for two consecutive summers, where they engage in a combination of field instruction and practical work in conservation with a focus on biodiversity and environmental justice. Scholars work with agencies ranging from the Friday Harbor labs to King County to the Quinault Nation, providing service as they learn.

Haring Center for Inclusive Education, College of Education, Seattle campus

From its inception in 1967, the Haring Center has been dedicated to improving educational opportunity for children with disabilities. The Experimental Education Unit supports both research into inclusive education and training opportunities for students in the context of operating an early childhood program for students with and without disabilities.

Professor Ilene Schwartz, the director of the Haring Center, has secured several Federal grants to support the work of the Haring Center in identifying models and approaches for serving preschool-age children diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder.

Human Rights and the Northwest Detention Center

U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) operates a major detention facility in Tacoma. In January 2019, assistant professor Rachel Hershberg (Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences, Tacoma campus) in cooperation with the Center for Human Rights on the Seattle campus, organized a press conference and panel discussion regarding immigration enforcement and undocumented communities in the region. The event was attended by 150 members of the community and was livestreamed on YouTube.
2020-2021 Appointments to Faculty Councils and Committees

Advisory Committee on Faculty Code & Regulations

- Sandra Silberstein, College of Arts and Sciences, as an emeritus member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
- Karen Boxx, School of Law, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards

- Steve Groening, College of Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
- Jennifer Payne, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Susanne Redalje, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Clara Coyote, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Sarah Garner, College of Arts and Sciences Advising, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Luz Iniguez, Central Advising Units, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Benefits & Retirement

- Stephan Siegel, Foster School of Business, as chair for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Deci Evans, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Jason Sokoloff, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Charles Hirschman, University of Washington Retirement Association, as an emeritus member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

- Xin Ying Hsu, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Cassandra Hartnett, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Jennette Kachmar, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

- Leyla Salmassi, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
- Jessica Jerrit, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Clara Coyote, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Faculty Council on Research**

• Larry Pierce, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Jenny Muilenburg, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Michael Rosenfeld, University of Washington Retirement Association, as an emeritus member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Faculty Council on Student Affairs**

• Kat Eli, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Jonathan Franklin, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Clara Coyote, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning**

• Ruben Casas, UW Tacoma School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, as a member for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2023.
• Kat Eli, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Deepa Banerjee, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy**

• Annette Anderson, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Suzan Parker, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Clara Coyote, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Lawrence Knopp, University of Washington Retirement Association, as an emeritus member without vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services**

• Matt Weatherford, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Alena Wolotria, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Bruce Balick, University of Washington Retirement Association, as an emeritus member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

**Faculty Council on University Libraries**
• Betty Lanman, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Gordon Aamot, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Kate O’Neill, University of Washington Retirement Association, as an emeritus member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

• Dani Smith, Professional Staff Organization, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Keiko Hill, Association of Librarians of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Clara Coyote, Associated Students of the University of Washington, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
• Pamela Mitchell, University of Washington Retirement Association, as an emeritus member with vote for a term beginning immediately and ending September 15, 2021.
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24.

To: The Senate Executive Committee
From: The Faculty Council on Women in Academia
Re: Proposed Class A Legislation Revising Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code: Improving Transparency in the Promotion and Tenure Process
Date: February 7, 2020

On February 7, 2020, FCWA approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate. On September 28, 2020, the proposed legislation was reaffirmed by the 2020-2021 membership of FCWA.

Background and Rationale

Hiring

The promotion and tenure process truly starts before a faculty member is even hired. The faculty recruitment process is a lengthy and expensive dialog intended to ensure a good fit between the University and the faculty member. As tenure-track positions decline in number, the competition for the highest quality candidates becomes more fierce. Articles about what to expect in the tenure process make the assumption that tenure guidelines are available, so not having them puts the University of Washington at a disadvantage in the hiring process, as well as when our qualified candidates are preparing for their tenure dossier.

The AAUP 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure, as updated and endorsed in 1970, identifies that instructors in their “probationary period” be offered the precise terms and conditions of their appointment, in writing, prior to the appointment. While this can be interpreted to mean salary and benefits, the Statement also indicates that it is a living code, subject to reinterpretation with changing times. The Statement lists no other reason for termination prior to the end of probationary period other than incompetence, moral turpitude, and financial exigency, so it would therefore seem to imply that the terms of passing out of the probationary period would have been included in the “terms and conditions” of appointment. This can, in modern terms, be interpreted in part as the tenure and promotion guidelines.

Peer Institutions

While each individual department or school may use a different set of peer institutions for their own comparison or accreditation purposes, the Office of Planning and Budget uses the U.S. News Top-25 Public Research Institutions for its main comparison group. The FCWA also used this group, therefore, to determine the current state of practice for publicly accessible tenure and promotion guidelines. A list of these schools, and their practices regarding the publication of P&T policies and guidelines can be found in Appendix A. We would like to highlight a few of the specifics from our research here. One peer institution, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, expressly identifies the lack of articulation of P&T standards for junior faculty as negatively affecting their beliefs about the transparency regarding the university leadership, and its ability to mentor future leaders. A task force commissioned by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill recognized the need for tenure criteria to be “up-to-date, clear, and applied fairly,” in order to promote transparency in the criteria and their application, which will in turn ensure better quality decision making in the tenure granting process. The University of Maryland, in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures document, specifically require their institutions to have written procedures for tenure and promotion that state criteria, procedures, and methods for appeals. In total, 15/21 schools had posted guidelines. Of those 6 that did not, 4 were in one University System (UC) and likely subject to similar internal policies. Clarity, specificity, and transparency remain the overarching themes.

1 https://www.chronicle.com/article/10-Things-No-One-Told-Me-About/246187?cid=rclink
3 https://www.washington.edu/opb/tuition-fees/peer-comparisons/
4 https://faa.illinois.edu/strategy-overview-2014%E2%80%9317
5 https://provost.unc.edu/taskforce-future-promotion-tenure-policies-practices/
6 https://president.umd.edu/administration/policies/section-ii-faculty/ii-100a
Our University
A review of the Schools at the University of Washington (counting the University of Washington Bothell and University of Washington Tacoma as one unit each, per the current state of University governance), shows that of the 19 Schools and Colleges, 9 have no published guidelines, 1 is available through an Intranet, 4 are accessible through a site-based Internet search, and 3 are easily findable from the main page of the school. This does not fit with the themes of clarity, specificity, and transparency. Further details are available in Appendix B.

What We Propose to Do
This is a proposal to add the word “published” to the following section of the Faculty Code:
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 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.

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 published 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.

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.]

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2020

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
October 22, 2020

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
What Will Change?

This change will not affect the content or process of these guidelines. Those will still be determined by the units, according to their own needs. This requirement will simply require those guidelines to be made publicly accessible.

Why Are We Proposing This?

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

- **Equity**: Increasing the transparency of promotion and tenure guidelines will benefit women-identifying faculty, faculty of color, and faculty who have disabilities relating to information processing. Each of these groups are harmed when guidelines are inconsistently applied or unknown.

- **Recruitment and Retention**: Many of our peer institutions have published guidelines, so having a lack of the same leaves us at a competitive disadvantage in the hiring market.
## Appendix A
### Peer Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Posted Guidelines</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh - Pittsburgh Campus</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook/School webpages</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-handbook/ch2_appt_tenure">https://www.provost.pitt.edu/faculty-handbook/ch2_appt_tenure</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.as.pitt.edu/faculty/governance/criteria-appointment-">https://www.as.pitt.edu/faculty/governance/criteria-appointment-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation-and-reappointment-non-tenure-stream-faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University - Main Campus</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Academic Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://artsandarchitecture.psu.edu/facstaff/promten">https://artsandarchitecture.psu.edu/facstaff/promten</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia - Main Campus</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Individual schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://as.virginia.edu/procedures-renewal-promotion-and-tenure-TT">http://as.virginia.edu/procedures-renewal-promotion-and-tenure-TT</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://engineering.virginia.edu/promotion-and-tenure-policy-tenured-">https://engineering.virginia.edu/promotion-and-tenure-policy-tenured-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and-tenure-track-faculty-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://faculty.med.virginia.edu/facultyaffairs/advancement/pandt/pt-">https://faculty.med.virginia.edu/facultyaffairs/advancement/pandt/pt-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>resources/department-committees/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan - Ann Arbor</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/provosts-">https://provost.illinois.edu/policies/provosts-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communications/communication-9-promotion-and-tenure/promotion-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tenure-frequently-asked-questions/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Academic Personnel</td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td><a href="https://regents.umich.edu/governance/bylaws/chapter-v-the-faculties-">https://regents.umich.edu/governance/bylaws/chapter-v-the-faculties-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and-academic-staff/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University - New Brunswick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://policies.rutgers.edu/view-policies/human-resources-hr-%E2%80%25">https://policies.rutgers.edu/view-policies/human-resources-hr-%E2%80%</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>93-section-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bylaws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Davis</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - San Diego</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Irvine</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Los Angeles</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Policies Only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Faculty Handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/3.3.7-promotion-">http://www.policylibrary.gatech.edu/faculty-handbook/3.3.7-promotion-</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and-tenure-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/Department</td>
<td>Guidelines Posted</td>
<td>Guidelines Easily Accessible</td>
<td>Guidelines Clearcut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster School of Business</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Science</td>
<td>Yes <a href="https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dept-guidelines">https://admin.artsci.washington.edu/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dept-guidelines</a></td>
<td>Searchable, found under the administrative gateway. No obvious link.</td>
<td>Yes, both process and criteria are included.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Process Details</td>
<td>Criteria Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Under “My CoE”, two clicks.</td>
<td>Yes, on both process and criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Environment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Under Intranet, Policies A-Z</td>
<td>Only on Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Law</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Information School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Computer Science and Engineering</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td><a href="https://homes.cs.washington.edu/~lazowska/chair/faculty.evaluation.html">https://homes.cs.washington.edu/~lazowska/chair/faculty.evaluation.html</a></td>
<td>Searchable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Sort of</td>
<td><a href="https://education.uw.edu/my-coe/facstaff/faculty-resources#Faculty_Promotion_and_Tenure">https://education.uw.edu/my-coe/facstaff/faculty-resources#Faculty_Promotion_and_Tenure</a></td>
<td>Under My Coe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson School of International Studies</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans School of Public Policy</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Bothell</td>
<td>Sort of</td>
<td><a href="https://www.uwb.edu/gfo/officers#ccpt">https://www.uwb.edu/gfo/officers#ccpt</a></td>
<td>Searchable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Medicine</td>
<td>Yes for some schools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Searchable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Pharmacy</td>
<td>Yes, sort of</td>
<td><a href="https://uwnetid.sharepoint.com/sites/MySOP/SitePages/Promotion%20">https://uwnetid.sharepoint.com/sites/MySOP/SitePages/Promotion%20</a></td>
<td>Searchable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy only.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Public Health</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UW Tacoma</td>
<td><a href="https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-tenure#Resources%20and%20Policies">https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-tenure#Resources%20and%20Policies</a> If you know to look under the “Faculty Assembly” page, they can be found in 3 clicks. For some units, they are similar to the Ohio State ones. For other units, they are more vague.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24

On March 10, 2020, FCFA approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate, but it was not submitted because of the governor’s COVID-19 restrictions. On September 25, 2020, the proposed legislation was reaffirmed by the 2020-2021 membership of FCFA.

Background and Rationale

Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code describes the process for promotion of faculty members. The crux of the process is an optional subcommittee report, followed by a vote by the eligible voting faculty on whether to recommend promotion.

Before 2018, it was possible for a promotion subcommittee to include voting members of the faculty from outside the candidate’s own department or college, provided they were superior in academic rank and title to the person up for promotion. A change was made to the code in 2018 to adjust the voting hierarchy so that assistant professors would no longer vote on the promotion of senior lecturers to principal lecturers; but the wording of that code change inadvertently stipulated that members of a promotion subcommittee had to be members of the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school). This greatly reduced the number of faculty members available to serve on promotion subcommittees and caused hardships for some departments and colleges.

When FCFA was contemplating a way to fix this problem, we discovered a second problem that did not have to do with the 2018 change: sometimes, in very small departments, the number of faculty members of sufficient rank to vote on a particular promotion case can be extremely small, with only two, one, or even no faculty members eligible to vote. This can be particularly acute for promotion of a tenured faculty member from Associate Professor to Professor, in which case only tenured or WOT full professors can vote. Conducting a “departmental vote” (or college vote in an undepartmentalized college) with so few voting members can create a perception of unfairness and a lack of confidentiality on the part of those voting.

What We Propose to Do

To solve the first problem, we propose to explicitly allow promotion subcommittees to include members from outside the candidate’s department or college who have appropriate expertise, provided they are qualified by rank and title to vote on such a promotion case. Then to solve the second problem, we propose to require such a subcommittee (with three or more members) in cases where there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the candidate’s unit, and then to use the report of that subcommittee in lieu of a departmental vote. (Note that all subcommittee reports and departmental promotion votes are advisory to the chair and, ultimately, to the dean.)

What Will Change?

The biggest change will be that in cases where there are fewer than three voting faculty members in a unit who are eligible by rank and title to vote on a particular promotion case, there will no longer be an official departmental vote (or college vote in the undepartmentalized colleges) on the case. Instead, a subcommittee of at least three will be formed, which may include faculty members from outside the candidate’s department, college, school, or campus, and that committee’s report will serve in lieu of the departmental (or undepartmentalized college) vote. If there are any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s unit, they must be offered the opportunity to serve on the committee.

A more minor change is that in units that do have at least three eligible voting faculty members, we will revert to the situation before 2018: if a subcommittee does issue an initial report, it may contain members from outside the candidate’s unit.
The Proposed Class A Legislation:

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below.

1. **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.

   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.

   An initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion may be produced by a subcommittee. Such a subcommittee must consist of at least three eligible voting faculty members (where eligibility is defined in Subsection A above), and may include faculty drawn from other departments, schools, colleges, or campuses who have appropriate expertise. Members of the subcommittee shall be given the opportunity to review the candidate's record, including external letters.

   The following paragraph defines "eligibility" to serve on a promotion subcommittee, to participate in departmental or college deliberations, and to vote on the case. (Further limitations are described below.) Sections 21-32 C and D referred to here stipulate that research faculty don't vote on promotion of teaching faculty or vice versa, and neither research nor teaching faculty vote on promotion or tenure of tenure-track and WOT faculty.
If there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the department (or undepartmentalized college or school), a subcommittee shall be formed as described above, and it shall include any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are available to serve.

For a department (or undepartmentalized college or school) 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. The written summary shall identify the members of the subcommittee. 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 eligible voting faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school).

The next two paragraphs describe the procedure to be followed in case there are at least three eligible voting faculty members in the unit. The basic procedure is discussion of the case (including all subcommittee members if they so choose), followed by a vote (where only eligible voting members may be present), followed by a chair’s report to the dean.

If there are three or more eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school), those eligible voting faculty members shall then meet to discuss the candidate’s record, and following the discussion they shall vote whether to recommend promotion. If an initial report was produced by a subcommittee, all members of the subcommittee may choose to participate in the discussion, but only eligible voting faculty in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may be present for the vote. 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.

And now the simpler procedure in the case that there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the unit.

If there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school), the recommendation of the subcommittee shall be used in lieu of a vote by the department (or undepartmentalized college or school).

For departmentalized colleges, this final paragraph enumerates the situations in which the case must go forward to the dean: if the departmental recommendation is favorable, or it’s mandatory decision time, or the candidate writes a response to the departmental decision.

If the candidate is a member of a departmentalized college or school, then in case the departmental recommendation (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department) is a departmental one, and is favorable or the promotion decision is mandatory or the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department), 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.

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.]

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
October 5, 2020

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
October 22, 2020

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24

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

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Reasons for Proposed Changes

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

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

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

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

Procedural Background

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

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

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

Appendix A Sample

See below links for models from other schools:

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

Overview of Questions Considered before December 2019 amendment:

- Is this intending to add “diversity” to the existing 3 aspects of appointment/promotion/tenure (scholarship, teaching, service)? Cut across them? And since we do articulate what we mean by those, why not also do so for diversity?
  - The FCMA proposed legislation intends to incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion into each of the three existing aspects of appointment (scholarship, teaching and service);
  - The FCMA is unaware of a University wide definition of diversity. Individual schools and units do have local definitions of diversity and the definitions are not uniform across the campus. This Class A legislation does not propose a definition for diversity.
- Why add to this section rather than 24-52?
  - 24-52 appears to provide procedural guidance to appointment committees, whereas 24-32 provides for the Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of faculty members.
- Would this also impact merit reviews (24-57)?
  
  i. The FCMA proposed legislation intends to amend section 24-32 as it relates to new faculty appointments only.

- I also think there are political considerations, per Mike’s comment (the prior revision was explicitly described as *not* requiring this, which might raise concerns among many).
  
  i. The FCMA discussed, drafted and ultimately recommended this proposed legislation following a motion by a member of the Council made during the 2018-19 Academic year.

- In a future holistic evaluation of a candidate does council anticipate just an evaluation of a personal statement assuming the candidate does not have a significant contribution in any of the three traditional areas of evaluation for appointment and promotion. Just wondering how junior faculty might respond to this requirement. (Can council members easily give example responses for themselves?)
  
  i. The FCMA proposed legislation intends to amend section 24-32 as it relates to new faculty appointments only. The legislation contemplates an opportunity by candidates to present on their planned contributions where past contributions are lacking.

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

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

**Proposed Change**

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

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution. All candidates for initial faculty appointment to the ranks and/or titles listed in Section 24-32.A (Voting Membership in the Faculty) pursuant to Faculty Code 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles, 24-35 Research Personnel, 24-36 Qualifications for Extension Appointments, 24-40 Faculty Without Tenure By Reason of Funding (WOT), and 24-45 Appointment of Part-Time Professors shall submit a statement of past and planned contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Academic units and search committees shall consider a candidate’s statement as part of a comprehensive evaluation of scholarship and research, teaching, and service. In accord with the University’s expressed commitment to excellence and equity, any contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that address diversity and equal opportunity shall be included and considered among the professional and scholarly qualifications for appointment and promotion outlined below.

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

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member’s published or other creative work. Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees.

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

- The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
- The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
• The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;

• The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;

• The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;

• The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and

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

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

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

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

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


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapters 21, 24, and 25

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code: Title Cleanup

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

Background and Rationale

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

What We Propose to Do

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

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

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

Operative Date of This Legislation

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

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

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

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

Organization of the University Faculty

Section 21-31 Membership in the Faculty

The University faculty consists of:

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

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


Section 21-32 Voting Membership in the Faculty

Since the establishment of the teaching professor titles, the only full-time lecturers remaining on the faculty are those designated “temporary.” The following change will eliminate their voting rights as of September 16, 2021.

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

- Professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research professor, 50% appointment or greater
- Teaching professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate teaching professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Assistant teaching professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Full-time senior artist in residence,
- Full-time lecturer,
• Full-time artist in residence, or
• 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) that person is serving on a part-time basis.


Chapter 24
Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

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

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

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

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

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

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

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

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.

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.

Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

B. Lecturer, Artist Residence, and Professor of Practice

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


Section 24-52 Procedure for New Appointments

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

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

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

Section 24-53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

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

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


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

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

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

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

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

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

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under Chapter 25, 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, 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 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.

Section 25-32 Criteria for Tenure

C. A faculty member does not acquire tenure under:

1. An acting appointment, or
2. A visiting appointment, or
3. Any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or
4. An appointment as teaching associate, or
5. An appointment as professor of practice, or
6. Any appointment specified to be without tenure, or
7. An adjunct appointment, or
8. A research appointment, or
9. A teaching appointment, or
10. A clinical appointment, or
11. An affiliate appointment, or
12. Any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment.

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

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

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

Background and Rationale

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

What We Propose to Do

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

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

The Proposed Class A Legislation

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Chapter 29 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below.
Chapter 21

Amendment of the Faculty Code

Section 29-36 Faculty Vote on Amendments

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

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

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

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

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

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


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
Proposed Amendment to the Faculty Code: Appointment Lengths for Clinical Faculty

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

Background and Rationale

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

What We Propose to Do

There are many clinical faculty members in many units throughout the university, and there are many complicated issues that need to be addressed regarding them. In the coming year, FCFA expects to consult with all the units that hire clinical faculty and explore what comprehensive changes might need to be made to the sections of code governing their appointments. But the issue of contract lengths is an immediate problem, especially during a pandemic, so we are proposing a stopgap measure to allow multi-year appointments for clinical faculty under limited circumstances with approval of the Provost. The new language in Section 24-34 B.11 below ("with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost") is copied from the section on part-time lecturer appointments (24-41 B.1). It retains the default appointment length of one year, but allows the Provost to approve exceptions. Our discussions with Academic Human Resources have led to a tentative agreement on the following conditions for approval of multi-year appointments:

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

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

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

The Proposed Class A Legislation

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

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

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


Section 24-52  Procedure for New Appointments

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

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

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

Section 24-53  Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

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

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

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and

2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 110, Grades, Honors, and Scholarship

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

- With the creation of the Registrar Drop (RD) withdrawal grade annotation defined in the Scholastic Regulations Chapter 113, Section 3. A, 2 & 3, the System of Grade section of this chapter updated in May 2020, this chapter needs to reflect this new grade annotation.

- In the spirit of honoring gender inclusivity, prior references to “his and her” are being changed to “their.”

Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 110
Grades, Honors, and Scholarship

1. The Grading System

A. System of Grades

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

1) Numeric Grades

Numeric grades shall be entered as numbers, the possible values being 4.0, 3.9, . . . and so on decreasing by 0.1 until 0.7 is reached. The numbers 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2, 0.1 shall not be assigned as grades. The number 0.0 can be assigned as a grade.

Correspondence between numeric grades and letter grades is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Grade-Point Equivalent</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0-3.9</td>
<td>Honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.8-3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.4-3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.1-2.9</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.8-2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.4-2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.1-1.9</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.8-1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.4-1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.1-0.9</td>
<td>Poor (low pass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.8-0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (or F)</td>
<td>0.6-0.0</td>
<td>Failure or other than official withdrawal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Letter Grades
The following letter grades also may be used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Satisfactory without grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Official Withdrawal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/NS</td>
<td>Satisfactory/Non-Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR/NC</td>
<td>Credit/No Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW RD</td>
<td>Hardship Withdrawal Registrar Drop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete descriptions of the above letter grades follow.

3) The Grade I

a) An Incomplete shall be given only when the student has done satisfactory work to within two weeks of the end of the quarter and has furnished proof satisfactory to the instructor that the work cannot be completed because of illness or other circumstances beyond the student's control. A written statement of the reason for the giving of the Incomplete, listing the work which the student will need to do to remove it, must be filed by the instructor with the head of the department or the dean of the college in which the course is given.

b) In order to obtain credit for the course, a student must convert an Incomplete into a passing grade by the last day of the following quarter. An Incomplete grade not made up by the end of the next quarter shall be converted to the grade of 0.0 (E) by the Registrar unless the instructor has indicated when assigning the Incomplete grade that a grade other than 0.0 (E) should be recorded if the incomplete work is not completed. For Spring Quarter, the following quarter is considered to be Fall Quarter. A student may petition the Registrar to retain the Incomplete grade on his or her record for a maximum of three additional quarters. Petitions will be granted by the Registrar if approved by the instructor of the course involved. Petitions must be received by the Registrar's Office prior to the end of the quarter in which the I grade will convert to a failure.

c) In no case shall an Incomplete on the record at the time a degree is granted be subsequently changed to any other grade.

d) The grade I shall count neither for registered hours nor in computation of grade-point averages.

e) For DL courses that do not follow the quarter schedule, an Incomplete shall be given only when the student has done satisfactory work to within two weeks of the maximum term for completion of the course, as specified at the time of registration. In order to obtain credit for the course, a student must convert an Incomplete into a passing grade by the end of the quarter following the one in which the Incomplete was given. All other provisions and deadlines of Subsections 1.A.3.a through 1.A.3.d shall also apply.

4) The Grade N

The grade N may be given in thesis, research, and hyphenated courses in which the grade is dependent upon the work of a final quarter. When the grade of N is given in a course it may indicate that the work has been completed to the end of the quarter in which the N is given. It shall carry with it no credit or grade until a regular grade is assigned. The use of the N grade also Subsection 1.B.3."

5) The Grade W RD

The grade W RD will be assigned to any course dropped after the 14th calendar day of the quarter through the seventh week, to be followed by a number representing the week in which the course was dropped.
a) The Office of the Registrar will assign a grade of W RD to any course in which a student is enrolled when a University withdrawal is filed after the 14th calendar day of the quarter.

b) Proportional schedules will be published in the Time Schedule for Summer Quarter a and b terms.

c) The grades of W and W RD are not computed in the grade-point average.

d) Students unofficially dropping a course will receive a grade of 0.0.

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

6) S/NS

a) An undergraduate may earn up to 25 elective credits of the 180 minimum credits required for graduation on a satisfactory/non-satisfactory (S/NS) basis. Each instructor shall report numeric grades to the Registrar, who shall convert satisfactory grades (2.0 or greater) to S, and non-satisfactory grades (less than 2.0) to NS for the student's transcript. S/NS shall not be considered in computation of the grade-point average.

b) An undergraduate student may register for up to a maximum of 20 credits under the satisfactory/non-satisfactory basis, with exceptions possible by approval of the campus Registrar.

c) Subject to the maximum credit limitation above, the student may indicate at the time of registration if she or he elects to take a course on an S/NS basis. The student can change to and from an S/NS option through the seventh week of the quarter through electronic registration. There is no limit to the number of S/NS credits that a student can register for in a given quarter. Withdrawal from an S/NS course is subject to the same regulations as for any other course.

d) An instructor may not submit an S or NS in a course. S/NS grades shall appear on the transcript only in the event that the student is registered on an S/NS basis.

e) Under campus-wide extraordinary circumstances, the campus registrar, in consultation with the appropriate campus faculty body, may waive the restrictions in Sections a through c above so that undergraduate students may opt for S/NS grading for elective or required courses without a maximum credit limitation. S/NS grading for campus-wide extraordinary circumstances deemed quarters will meet graduation and degree requirements. Temporary modifications to the S/NS policies will be clearly communicated to the campus community by the campus registrar.

7) Credit/No Credit

a) With appropriate departmental review and approval, faculty may offer a course or courses on a CR/NC basis. The standard for granting credit in CR/NC courses shall be the demonstration of competence in the material of the course. Grading should be consistent with the University’s policy for numerically graded courses, in which students receive credit for grades of 0.7 or greater. Students demonstrating such competence shall have CR entered on the transcript; those who do not shall have NC entered on the transcript.

b) Although CR and NC grades are entered on the transcript, they are not used in the computation of the grade-point average.

c) CR/NC courses must be so designated in the Time Schedule.
2. Change of Grade

A. Grade Error

Except in cases of error no instructor may change a grade which he or she has turned in to the Registrar.

B. Written Appeal of Grade Error

A student who believes that the instructor erred in the assignment of a grade, or who believes a grade recording error or omission has occurred, shall follow the following procedure to resolve the matter:

1) The student shall first discuss the matter with the instructor before the end of the following academic quarter (not including Summer Quarter.)

2) A student who is not satisfied with the instructor's response may submit, no later than ten class days after his or her discussion with the instructor,* a written appeal to the chair of the department (or the dean in a non-departmentalized school or college), with a copy of the appeal to the instructor. Within ten calendar days of receipt of the appeal, the chair shall consult with the instructor to determine whether the evaluation of the student's performance was fair and reasonable or whether the instructor's conduct in assigning the grade was arbitrary or capricious. Should the chair believe the instructor's conduct to be arbitrary or capricious and should the instructor decline to revise the grade, the chair (or the dean in a non-departmentalized school or college), with the approval of the voting members of his or her faculty, shall appoint an appropriate member, or members, of the faculty of that department to evaluate the student's, or students', performance and assign a grade. The dean and Provost shall be informed of this action.

   *This time may be extended by the chair in exceptional circumstances, such as the situation in which the student did not learn of the appeals process deadlines in time.

3) Once a student submits a written appeal, this document and all subsequent actions on this appeal shall be recorded in written form for deposit in a department (or college) file.

C. Instructor Unable to Assign Grades

In the event that an instructor is physically or mentally incapacitated and unable to assign course grades, or unable to address requests for grade changes as provided in Subsection 2.B, or in the event that the instructor is no longer in the employ of the University and is unavailable or refuses to address requests for grade changes as provided in Subsection 2.B, the chair (or the dean in a non-departmentalized school or college) with the approval of the voting members of his or her faculty, may designate another instructor, or instructors, to act in the stead of the original instructor to assign grades or address requests from students in accord with Subsection 2.B.


3. Honors Awards

A. Annual Senior Awards

Four Medals shall be conferred at the annual commencement ceremonies.

1) At the Seattle commencement ceremony, a President's Medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior who has completed at least three-fourths of his or her degree requirements at the University of Washington Seattle campus and who has the most
distinguished academic record among such students. The President's Medalist shall be selected from among graduating seniors eligible for University Honors.

2) Also at the Seattle commencement ceremony, a President's Medal shall be conferred at the Seattle commencement ceremony upon the graduating senior who entered the University of Washington Seattle campus with at least 60 transfer credits from a Washington community college, and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students. The President's Medalist shall be selected from among graduating seniors eligible for University Honors.

3) At each of the Bothell and Tacoma commencement ceremonies, a medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior with the most distinguished academic record.

B. Annual Junior, Sophomore, and Freshman Awards

The following awards shall be presented annually by the President in the name of the faculty:

1) The Junior Medal, which shall be awarded to the senior having the highest scholastic standing for the first three years of his or her course. To be eligible, students must have completed at least 40 credits in residence at the University of Washington.

2) The Sophomore Medal, which shall be awarded to the junior having the highest scholastic standing for the first two years of his or her course. To be eligible, students must have completed at least 40 credits in residence at the University of Washington.

3) The Freshman Medal, which shall be awarded to the sophomore having the highest scholastic standing for the first year of his or her course. To be eligible, students must have completed at least 36 credits in residence at the University of Washington.

C. Quarterly Dean's Lists

Quarterly dean's lists shall include the names of registered undergraduate students who have attained a grade-point average, non-cumulative, of 3.50 in the final grades for at least 12 registered credits. They are published in many newspapers in Washington State about four weeks after the end of each quarter.

D. Annual Dean's List

The yearly dean's list shall include the names of all undergraduates who have achieved a cumulative grade-point average of 3.50 or better for at least 36 credits in resident instruction in three quarters or 46 credits of resident instruction in four quarters at the University of Washington during the preceding academic year.


4. Degrees with University Honors

Degrees with University honors may be conferred by determination of the Registrar and deans of the colleges and schools, following guidelines provided by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards with the confirmation of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Students are eligible for honors if they have earned at least 90 approved credits at the University of Washington of which at least 60 are numerically graded.

HB, 1966; S-B 177, April 14, 2010 with Presidential approval.

5. Alumnus Summa Laude Dignatus Award
Annually at Commencement, the University of Washington Alumni Association awards to a former student who is judged to be an outstanding living alumnus, distinguished for service over a period of years, the designation of Alumnus Summa Laude Dignatus. The recipient of the award is chosen by a special committee composed of representatives of the Alumni Association and the University. The award is given for achievement not only during the preceding year, but also during an individual's entire career. "Alumnus" is construed to mean a student who has been awarded any bachelor's degree, or a graduate student who, after not less than two years of resident study, has been awarded a degree, or a former student who, in the opinion of the committee of selection, has qualified for this honor.

A1, March 1966; S-B 158, March 1995 with Presidential approval.

6. Honorary Degrees

Upon the recommendation of the faculty, the Board of Regents may confer honorary degrees upon a person or persons of exceptional merit, other than graduates of this University. The Special Committee on Honorary Degrees will have jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to the award of honorary degrees. Nominations for candidates may come from a variety of sources, including faculty councils, committees, departments, programs, schools, colleges, or campuses. The names of nominees approved by the special committee will be forwarded to the President of the University. After consultation with the President, the special committee will, on behalf of the faculty, recommend candidates for honorary degrees to the Regents. Honorary degrees will be presented at either a commencement ceremony or a formal academic convocation.

S-B 168, February 2002; S-B 176, January 13, 2010: both with Presidential approval.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 113 (Withdrawals)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards and the Office of the University Registrar, recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 113 (Withdrawals) based on the following findings:

- In the process of implementing the updates to Scholastic Regulations Chapter 113, section 3, made in May 2020, there was significant interest on the part of advisers and students to extend the Current Quarter Drop process through to the last day of instruction. The current process extends to the 7th week of the quarter since grading begins on the 8th week. The Current Quarter Drop process will be amended to allow students to submit a Current Quarter Drop - Adviser Assist request through the last date of instruction, as the drops will not have a negative impact on grading since current systems do not reflect students who have been dropped or are inactive. After the 8th week a courtesy email will be sent to the instructor to let them know that the student has dropped after grading has commenced.

- This section continues to reference the former “W” grade, which has been replaced by the Registrar Drop (RD) grade and this chapter needs to be updated accordingly.

- In the spirit of honoring gender inclusivity, prior references to “his and her” are being changed to “their.”

Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 113

Withdrawals

1. Withdrawal from the University
   A. Voluntary Severance
      Withdrawal from the University is voluntary severance by the student of his or her their connection with the University for a specified quarter.
   
   B. Official Notice
      Withdrawal from the University is official when a signed written notice is submitted of the withdrawal is received by to the Registrar’s Office or the student withdraws from all classes using the Current Quarter Drop withdrawal process.

   C. Transcript Entry
      University withdrawals received prior to the quarter will result in no entry on the transcript for that quarter.

   D. Withdrawal During the First 14 Days
      University withdrawals during the first 14 calendar days of the quarter will result in the student’s transcript showing only the date of withdrawal. No courses will be listed.

   E. Withdrawal After the First 14 Days
After the first 14 calendar days of the quarter, an official withdrawal will be entered on the student's record with a grade of WRD for each course held at the time of withdrawal and the date of the withdrawal.

F. Last Day to Withdraw

The last day to withdraw from the University will be the last day of instruction in each quarter. No withdrawals can be made once the final examination period has begun.

G. Summer Quarter

A proportional withdrawal schedule will be printed in the Time Schedule for Summer Quarter a and b terms.

H. Unofficial Withdrawals

Withdrawals accomplished by any other method are not official, and result in the entry of the grade 0.0 in each course for which the student is registered in that quarter.


2. Withdrawal from the University for Military Service

If a student is conscripted into the Armed Forces, or is called to active military duty, he or she may take advantage of military withdrawal from the University under the conditions listed below. Students who voluntarily enlist are subject to the regular withdrawal procedures specified in Section 1 above.

A. Credit and Refunds for Courses Begun

A student who withdraws may receive credit for courses and refund of fees, under the following schedule:

1) Withdrawal through the seventh week of the academic quarter: No credit. Full refund.

2) Withdrawal after the seventh week of the academic quarter: University withdrawal with full refund of fees, or credit with grades reported by instructors as either credit (CR), no credit (NC), or numeric grades (1.7-4.0). Students may elect to have passing numeric grades recorded as reported or to have them recorded as a CR. NC grades will be recorded as withdrawals.

B. Last Quarter Before Obtaining a Degree

If a student is in his or her last quarter before obtaining a degree from the University, he or she will be granted the degree PROVIDED: that at the beginning of the quarter his or her cumulative grade-point average is high enough for graduation; that his or her degree has been approved by his or her department chair and dean; and that his or her grades for the completed portion of the quarter are 1.7 or greater in each course necessary for graduation. The third proviso may be waived if the withdrawal occurs so soon after the beginning of the quarter that determination of a grade is impossible.

C. Report Date

The student will be expected to attend classes and withdraw no more than 15 calendar days before his or her date to report for duty.

D. Duty Requirement
The privilege of military withdrawal will be granted only to students whose induction or enlistment is for extended active duty, not for short-term National guard or Reserve duty, or annual active-duty requirement.

E. UW Continuum College Courses

The provisions of military withdrawal apply to students enrolled in UW Continuum College classes as well as those in day school.

F. Authority of Dean or Chair in a Professional College or School

Should the foregoing provisions conflict with standards imposed upon a professional college or school by accrediting or licensing agencies, the dean or chair of the college or school shall approve the conditions of military withdrawal.


3. Dropping a Course

A. Officially Dropping a Course

A drop from a course is voluntary severance by the student of their connection with the course. To be official it must be made under the following conditions:

1) Before the 14th Calendar Day

Courses may be dropped for any reason through the 14th calendar day after the start of the quarter. In some cases, departmental approval will be required. There will be no transcript entry for courses dropped by the 14th calendar day of the quarter.

2) Current Quarter Drop

Students may drop courses weeks three through seven during the current quarter after the Unrestricted Drop Period has ended through the Current Quarter Drop process. An annotation of RD (Registrar Drop) will appear on the student academic record.

3) Former Quarter Drop

Students may petition to drop courses for a former quarter using the Former Quarter Drop process. The Registrar will grant such a petition if in the Registrar’s judgment the student was unable to complete the course in question. Approved drops will be entered on the transcript with an annotation of RD (Registrar Drop).

4) Withdrawal Through Last Day of Class

A student may drop all courses through the last day of classes by withdrawing from the University for that quarter.

B. Unofficially Dropped Courses

Drops from a course not officially transacted with the Registrar’s Office are not official and result in a grade of 0.0 (E) for the course.

C. Summer Quarter

Proportional drop schedules will be publicized in the Time Schedule for Summer Quarter a and b terms.

D. Off-Calendar Courses
For DL courses and other courses that do not follow the quarter schedule, the drop deadline is two weeks prior to the end of the maximum term for completion of the course, as specified at the time of registration. All other provisions of Subsections 3.A—3.C apply.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
Class B Legislation  
Student Governance and Policies  
Scholastic Regulations  
Chapter 115, Section 1 (Course-Numbering System)

Background and Rationale

The Faculty Council on Academic Standards recommends amending Scholastic Regulations Chapter 115, Section 1 (Course-Numbering System) based on the following findings:

The University is a tri-campus system with three distinct curricula, but a single transcript. It is necessary to be able to define which courses are equivalent in content to others to provide students with definitive course mobility within the Tri-Campus system. This legislation codifies current informal practices into scholastic regulations. Encoding the requirement to re-evaluate course equivalency will keep data synchronized for ease of access and understanding.

1. **Course-Numbering System**

   University courses shall be numbered as follows:

   M. **Equivalent Courses**

   Equivalent courses are courses with the same core content that are offered independently by two or more offering units. Equivalent courses are considered duplicates for prerequisites, program requirements, when determining grade point averages, and repeated courses. Changes to an equivalent course will require re-evaluation of that course’s equivalence with other courses.


   Approved by:  
   Senate Executive Committee  
   November 16, 2020
Class C resolution regarding equity for caregivers at the University of Washington

Rationale

Equity is a central value at the University of Washington. This is exemplified by the Race and Equity Initiative that made a collective commitment to “combat the racism and inequities, both individual and institutional, that persist here and throughout our society” (Race and Equity at the UW, 2020). Even before the COVID-19 crisis, caregivers faced multiple workplace challenges, but the pandemic has exacerbated these hardships and created systemic imbalances that threaten UW’s commitment to equity. Through no fault of their own, many caregivers face an untenable choice: to honor their child/elder care responsibilities or their job responsibilities. In many households, women shoulder the majority of caregiving tasks and responsibilities. As a result, women and their careers may experience greater hardship from this consequential shift as our society moves to protect the health and well-being of our communities. Additionally troubling, people of color experience more devastating COVID-19 outcomes and these inequities will be even more stark. By not addressing these issues, we are creating a hostile environment toward caregivers - one where caregiver discrimination is baked into our policies and deepens existing inequities. Without support and systematic adjustments to productivity expectations, we are creating conditions for discrimination based on caregiving obligations, family health status (e.g., immune-compromised families who cannot safely bring in additional care), and wealth (since only those who have the means to pay for care can do so now).

Our institution actively recruited the best and the brightest. Without strong and immediate action, our institution could see the reversal of hard-fought gains in representation. All faculty at UW, no matter their gender, race, or caregiving status, deserve equitable access to support and accommodation to ensure people can stay in their careers, especially during this crisis. Equity requires us to re-examine how we define contribution and productivity, and how we distribute labor, seen and unseen. With meaningful commitment, UW may yet retain its best and brightest.

This Class C legislation proposes the following to help support those instructors (part-time, full-time, graduate students) and faculty influenced by the COVID pandemic:

1. **Adjusting performance expectations** for caregiver faculty in the short term until this crisis is over, and accounting for these differences in expectations in performance evaluations now and moving forward. Specifically, announce a Caregiver Adjustment Policy that advises all units to reduce performance expectations (teaching, research, and service) between 25%-75% - noting that the specific adjustment would be determined as a discussion between the unit leader and instructor. Personnel committees should be charged with creating unit specific models of these Caregiver Adjustments. Units should publicize this adjustment and adopt a simple process for colleagues to invoke the Caregiver Adjustment when materials are submitted for review and throughout the academic year so long as this crisis and its impacts persist. If a caregiver’s teaching responsibilities cannot be reduced (for example, the caregiver is the only person available to teach a class), then the unit leader should make large performance expectation adjustments to research and service areas to account for the caregiver’s teaching load. This adjustment cannot be used against caregivers now or during any future reviews, merit or promotion decisions. Further, teaching evaluations during this crisis should not be used for merit or performance evaluations – unless the individual faculty member makes the personal choice to include teaching evaluations in their performance reviews after viewing them. Also note that the effect of changing performance expectations should be assessed over time to ensure that inequity is not exacerbated by this recommendation (see Antecol, Bedard, & Stearns, 2018). Specifically, research indicates that the benefit of adding a year to the tenure clock for parents disproportionately benefits male faculty members and further exacerbates gender disparities. Unit leaders should ensure that equity is enhanced (and that inequity is not exacerbated) by this recommendation.
2. **Offer teaching relief and support to improve efficiencies in teaching.** Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Heads should reach out to professors and lecturers to assess their teaching and wellness needs at this time. Unit leaders should provide the following options to instructors during this crisis.

   a) **Teaching Relief.** Some individuals do not have the possibility to teach during this crisis due to caregiving, illness, or other dire circumstances. These individuals should be provided teaching relief (not be expected to teach) without experiencing negative consequences in their contract, status, or pay.

   b) **Flexibility in Teaching.** Unit leaders should encourage creative ways to accomplish teaching during this crisis. When multiple sections of the same course are offered, merge sections when possible if merging will reduce the workload and when instructors agree to do so. Another option is to offer flexibility in timing of the course if students are not engaged in synchronous activities. We also recommend that the time schedule states if the class contains synchronous activities or is only asynchronous, so that students and instructors have consistent expectations.

   c) **Provide additional support to those teaching.**

      i. **Pool of “stand-by” educators and technical support.** Individual educators are facing momentary crises (e.g., day care shutting down due to sickness) that impact their ability to teach on a given day or for multiple class sessions. To address this, each unit should a) create a climate of understanding and (at minimum) do not penalize or sanction faculty canceling synchronous class meetings, b) when possible create a system of stand-by backup educators and/or provide technology support to help faculty provide video content to students. Provide funding for these resources if needed. Backup videos or instructors are especially important for core classes. Recognizing that many primary educators are facing the same stressors and challenges, Chairs, Associate Deans, and others with reduced course loads could be an option or a willing peer stand-by educators if they have the expertise to teach the course. Units may also develop peer support models with a careful eye toward who steps into that work (monitoring ongoing inequities based on gender and race). Note that the individual instructor will make the determining choice for the specific backup video or instructor.

      ii. **Backup Care** – Expand and provide information for affordable backup care options for child and elder care. Most of our child (e.g., Bright Horizons Backup Care) and elder care resources are taxed at this time. We recommend resources like [UW child care connections](#) including a backup care option.

      iii. **Additional Assistance** - Offer additional assistance to faculty such as teaching assistants and graders. Unit leaders could consider working with the Graduate School and other entities on campus to provide and fund this additional assistance.

      iv. **Invest in resources and 5-minute video training on efficient grading.** Existing technology (such as Gradescope) allows grading to be accomplished in an efficient manner. UW should invest in these technologies and train faculty how to use them. Further, short video training sessions should be shared with faculty on how to engage in low-stakes writing and grading practices. Prioritize the creation of 5-minute tips videos (or share existing videos) and asynchronous resources that are rapidly digestible and accessible to faculty who have limited time to attend involved trainings.
3. **Remove Non-emergent Service Obligations.** During this time, all non-essential service activities should be suspended or canceled. Pause or defer all responsibilities of administrative roles when possible. Note that all service related to equity and inclusion, as COVID-19 directly impacts equity, is deemed essential at this time. Empower faculty to address which responsibilities can be delayed and determine new due dates. When decision-making cannot be delayed allow the instructor to appoint a substitute. Also, delay or cancel nonessential events and do not require participation for events that are not canceled. Allow faculty to determine their own level of participation in events without experiencing negative consequences.

4. **Reallocate a High Level Administrator’s time to Faculty Wellness and Career Development.**
   The consequences of this crisis on wellness, equity, and career development could endure a decade or more. Reallocating an existing administrator’s time to wellness and career development will allow the UW to have a high-level administrator to proactively monitor and address these challenges. Providing funding to support local monitoring and implementation will ensure each campus has clear leadership on this issue. All existing bodies charged with addressing equity and wellness across campuses should be engaged in this work, as well, and the administrator could focus efforts and provide updates to these groups (e.g., Diversity Councils, Offices of Equity and Inclusion, Well-being for Life and Learning Initiative).

   a) **Wellness.** UW requires a high-level administrator to proactively consider the wellness of all individuals on campus. This administrator should be responsible for convening related bodies (Resilience Lab, Well-being for Life and Learning, Counseling Centers) to share best practices and communicate and focus efforts, and appointing faculty advocates within units to work with caregivers. Faculty have experienced their own trauma during this crisis, as well as vicariously experienced the trauma of others. Many instructors are carrying this additional burden without reprieve. Burnout and turnover are possible consequences of this additional trauma, fatigue, and stress stemming from this crisis.

   b) **Career equity.** Many faculty face significant challenges during this crisis (e.g., those who are caregivers, those who conduct research or engage in work in diversity spaces, and those who have become ill or have cared for family members who are ill). Other faculty are not experiencing these same challenges and have remained productive. UW requires a high-level administrator to proactively address and help eliminate the inequities that will inevitably arise from these different experiences. As part of annual reporting, each unit is expected to provide evidence that they are identifying and making adjustments to support caregivers impacted by this crisis. In addition to administrators providing their record, UW should have an open call for individual faculty to submit letters speaking to the support they are receiving and adjustments made. These will be reviewed and aggregate anonymized summaries by campus will be made publicly available.

5. **Publicize Data to the UW Community showing statistics for salient outcomes** (e.g., pay, promotion, performance evaluations, teaching evaluations, service obligations) by caregiver status during the COVID crisis, and for other demographic groups who are disproportionately impacted during this crisis (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, and disability status). This will provide important information regarding if our equity goals are being translated into meaningful outcomes for affected faculty.
Class C resolution regarding equity for caregivers at the University of Washington

WHEREAS, research demonstrates that individuals have implicit biases or unconscious preferences based on demographic group membership (e.g., Greenwald, Poehlman, Uhlmann, & Banaji, 2009); and, these implicit biases lead to systematic outcome differences (e.g., Rudman & Ashmore (2007). As they are unconscious, these implicit biases are not likely to be apparent to the decision-maker and are not likely to be explicitly articulated to others. This creates a situation in which a decision-maker could inadvertently allocate compensation and other outcomes to employees based on protected demographic membership. Such outcome differences could create and exacerbate inequity for faculty. For example, Princeton University agreed to pay almost $1.2 million to settle an investigation from the U.S. Department of Labor that suggested that female full professors were paid less than their male equivalents (de León, 2020). The COVID-19 pandemic creates a situation in which these implicit biases could operate to further create systematic outcome differences based on demographic group membership; and

WHEREAS, the UW Campus Climate Assessment conducted in the Autumn of 2019 prior to the onset of COVID pandemic demonstrated men versus women faculty viewed the tenure/promotion process more positively and that childcare was a significant issue on campus. Specifically, the results indicated that men versus women faculty were more likely to agree that the standards for tenure were clear and that the standards for promotion/tenure were applied equally to faculty in their schools/divisions (Rankin & Associates Consulting, page 288-289). Further, the report showed that men versus women were more likely to agree that faculty who qualify for delaying their tenure clock felt empowered to do so. Only 25% of faculty respondents agreed that UW Seattle “provided adequate resources to help them manage work-life balance (e.g., child care, wellness services, elder care)” (Rankin & Associates Consulting, page 307); and, lack of support for child care was a theme that emerged from participants’ qualitative responses (page 316). These results suggest that prior to the COVID pandemic gender differences in the promotion process were perceived and that childcare support was a significant issue; and

WHEREAS, research suggests that including objective factors such as analyzing salient outcomes by demographic group membership can help to correct for decision errors due to implicit bias (Banaji, Bazerman, & Chugh, 2003). In addition, pay disparity based on demographic group membership decreases when organizations are required to disclose outcome disparities (Bennedsen, Simintzi, Tsoutsoura, & Wolfenzon, 2019); and

WHEREAS, victims of discrimination (or the experience of receiving lower outcomes based on group membership) not only receive lower outcomes, but discrimination also negatively affects self-esteem, life satisfaction, positive affect, anxiety, and depression (Schmitt & Branscombe, 2002; Schmitt, Branscombe, Kobrynowicz, & Owen, 2002; Schmitt et al., 2014). In addition, discrimination negatively affects employees’ sense of belonging (Brands & Fernandez-Mateo, 2017; Carvallo & Pelham, 2006; Good, Rattan, & Dweck, 2012). Thus, the experience of discrimination affects the individual employee’s well-being, his/her/their connection to the organization, and compensation; and

WHEREAS, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 affirms that pay discrimination based on sex is illegal. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 affirms that discrimination in terms of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin is illegal. Titles I and V of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 affirms that discrimination based on disability status is illegal; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the UW Faculty Senate strongly urges:

1. Unit leaders to provide meaningful redistribution of teaching and research expectation between 25% – 75% reduction in performance expectations for caregivers during the COVID crisis, and for other demographic groups who are disproportionately impacted during this crisis (e.g., race/ethnicity, gender, and disability status) - noting that the specific adjustment would be determined as a discussion between the unit leader and instructor in accordance with Section 24-32 of the Faculty Code, while striving to maintain a high quality student experience. In addition, the UW Faculty Senate strongly urges unit leaders to provide specific additional information regarding how they will support faculty who are caregivers during COVID 19 crisis.
2. The University to offer teaching relief, teaching flexibility and teaching resources for caregivers.

3. Unit leadership to remove non-emergent service obligations for caregivers. This includes deferring all non-essential service activities, delaying or canceling non-essential events and not requiring participation for events that are held during this crisis, and empowering individual faculty to make these choices.

4. Reallocation of an existing senior administrator’s time to wellness and career development.

5. The University to publicize data to the UW community showing salient outcomes (promotion, pay, performance evaluations, teaching evaluations) by COVID caregiver status, gender, race, ethnicity, disability status, and other demographic groups disproportionately influenced by the COVID crisis.

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
November 16, 2020
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Agenda
Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday, December 3, 2020, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

2. Faculty Senate Chair’s Remarks – Professor Robin Angotti.

   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 October 5, 2020, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the October 22, 2020, Faculty Senate minutes.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.

8. Announcements.

9. New Business
   a. Class A Legislation – Improving transparency in the promotion and tenure process – second consideration.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
      Action: Approve for faculty vote.
   c. Class A Legislation – Title Cleanup – first consideration.
      Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
      Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
   e. Class A Legislation – Clinical Appointment Lengths – first consideration.
      Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
      Action: Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
   g. Class B Legislation – Grades, Honors, and Scholarship.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   h. Class B Legislation – Withdrawals.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   i. Class B Legislation – Equivalent Courses.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   j. Class C Resolution – Equity in Caregiving.
      Action: Approve for distribution to the faculty.

10. Discussion Items.

11. Good of the Order.


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

NOTE: If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, December 10 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.