Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, March 29, 2021, 2:30 p.m.
Zoom

Absent: Keith Nitta, Kenneth Steinberg, Camille Hatwig, Aaron Yared
Guests: Cynthia Dougherty, Daniel Schwartz, Amanda Paye, Gautham Reddy, Helen Garrett, Margo Bergman

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

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

Without objection, Justin Lerner’s name was removed from the consent agenda.

A motion was made and seconded to add, after the first Class A legislation item, a new item for discussion concerning a motion to instruct Chris Laws to introduce at the next Faculty Senate meeting an amendment to the Class A legislation on SCPB membership in Exhibit J.

There was no discussion on the motion.

The motion was approved by the required two-thirds vote.

As amended, the agenda was approved. The change is reflected in the minutes below.

Angotti announced that Vice-Chair Chris Laws would not be able to attend by Zoom, and without objection the membership approved Past Chair Joseph Janes as temporary Chair of the meeting, should that become necessary.

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

Angotti announced that a continuation meeting might be necessary. She also said that she might call on Janes to take over as temporary Chair so she could take part in the discussion of some of the items in the agenda.

   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.

President Cauce said that there might be more non-teaching in-person activities in the Spring Quarter. She added that there has been a small COVID spike, but things are looking better overall and the University is looking forward to a more in-person Autumn.

5. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve the February 8, 2021, SEC minutes.
   b. Approve the February 25, 2021, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit E]
   d. Approve nomination for 2020-2021 Senate Executive Committee position. [Exhibit F]
   e. Approve Faculty Legislative Representative and Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative nominees for Faculty Senate Consideration. [Exhibit G]

The consent agenda was approved.
6. Announcements.

There were no announcements.

   a. Nomination of candidates for Secretary of the Faculty.  [Exhibit H]
      Cynthia Dougherty, Professor, School of Nursing. Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law.

On behalf of the Secretary of the Faculty nominating committee Janes moved the nomination of Cynthia Dougherty and Mike Townsend for terms beginning August 1, 2021. The motion was seconded.

There were no additional nominations.

   b. Secretary of the Faculty candidate presentations.

The nominees made their presentations.

   c. Proposal for an ad hoc Grievance Legislation Negotiation Committee.  [Exhibit I]
      **Action:** Appoint an ad hoc Grievance Legislation Negotiation Committee.

Angotti stepped down as Chair and was replaced temporarily by Janes.

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

Angotti spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit.

Discussion ensued. President Cauce had several specific concerns. She did not feel that the substance of the motion was adequately discussed beforehand with the administration. In addition, she questioned the extent to which the faculty supported the current grievance draft. Finally, she said that there were aspects of the grievance proposal that involved the power of the regents and hence were not within the authority of the administration to negotiate. President Cauce said she did not disagree with the idea of discussions that focused on various points of contention, and in a follow up colloquy with Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, she expressed support for the idea of taking this more formal proposal off-line for the present while some preliminary conversations took place on how to set up the next steps of the process.

A motion was made and seconded to withdraw.

There was no discussion.

The motion to withdraw was approved.

   d. Class A Legislation – Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Membership – second consideration.  [Exhibit J]
      Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy.
      **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

There was no discussion.

The motion passed.

   e. Class A Legislation – Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Membership
      **Action:** Direct Chris Laws, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, to propose at the next Faculty Senate meeting an amendment to Class A legislation on Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Membership.
A motion was made and seconded to direct Chris Laws, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, to propose at the next Faculty Senate meeting an amendment to the Class A legislation on Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Membership in Exhibit J as follows: change line 10 by replacing “fourteen” with “fifteen” and change line 15 by replacing “eight” with “nine.”

Maya Sonenberg spoke to the motion. She described concerns about SCPB having broad representation and explained that the intent of the amendment is to increase the membership numbers given the original proposal’s dedication of an at large seat to the School of Medicine. She added that she plans to suggest the SEC appoint a subcommittee to examine the general issue of SCPB membership.

There was no discussion.

The motion passed.

f. Class A Legislation – New Faculty Council – first consideration. [Exhibit K]
   Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning.
   Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services.
   **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

Angotti spoke to the motion, summarizing the material in the Exhibit.

During discussion, several points were made. Angotti said that the proposed council would not necessarily work in isolation but in conjunction with other committees, in collaboration with other councils and with the direction of the SEC, the new council would be able to take the lead on some issues to free up time in other councils. Chris Laws, Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate, noted that the legislation had been vetted with university IT people as well.

A motion was made and seconded to change lines 16,198, and 200 by replacing “Security, and Managing Information” with “, and Security”.

There was no discussion on the motion to amend.

The motion to amend was approved.

Discussion resumed on the main motion as amended. Laws said that the legislation had been discussed with Phil Reid. It was noted that Cheryl Cameron had not been consulted. In response to questions about the scope of the council description as it relates to hiring, merit, and promotion, Laws gave an example of the use of Interfolio.

There was no further discussion.

As amended, the main motion was approved.

At this point, the Chair was turned back to Angotti. Before doing so, Janes noted the recent passing of School of Information alumna Beverly Cleary, noted author and for whom an endowed professorship in the School is named. He also thanked President Cauce for her public recognition of Cleary’s work and contributions.

g. Class A Legislation – Faculty Council Title Change – first consideration. [Exhibit L]
   Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs.
   Faculty Council on Women in Academia.
   **Action:** Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

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

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

During discussion, it was noted that the name change would not be changing the work currently done by the councils, but it was acknowledged that perceptions of what is done might change.

There was no further discussion.

The motion was approved.

h. Class A Legislation – Housekeeping and the Faculty Code – first consideration. [Exhibit M]
   Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs.
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the legislation for submission 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 was approved.

i. Class B Legislation – Registrar Drop. [Exhibit N]
   Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
   Action: Approve for Faculty Senate consideration.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the legislation for submission 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 was approved.

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

A motion was made and seconded to approve the legislation for submission 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 was approved.

k. Approval of the April 15, 2021, Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit P]
   Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.
A motion was made and seconded to distribute the agenda to Faculty Senators.

There was no discussion.

The motion was approved.

A motion was made and seconded to reconsider in order to remove the item relating to the negotiating committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion was approved.

The main motion being once again before the Committee in the same position as it was before the vote, a new motion was made and seconded to amend the agenda by removing item 5c.

There was no discussion.

The motion was approved.

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

The main motion distribute the agenda as amended to Faculty Senators was approved.

8. Adjournment.

The meeting adjourned at 3:48 P.M.

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 Monday, April 5 at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom.
Spring has arrived, both a new season and a new quarter. There are only two Senate meetings left before the end of the academic year. Thus, this is the last meeting where Class A legislation (legislation that amends the faculty code) can be introduced for first consideration.

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

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

SEC and Senate meetings are open meetings. The process of faculty governance is transparent and available to anyone who wants to take the time to be involved. Links to the meetings of the SEC and Senate are published on the Senate website. In my remarks throughout the year, I have encouraged Senators to get involved in faculty councils where they might have a particular interest. That same advice holds true for any faculty, Senator or otherwise, who may want a greater understanding of how faculty governance works as well as how their voice might contribute during the earliest phases of debate and crafting legislation which are the best places to create change.

At the beginning of this academic year, in my remarks at the first meeting, I told the Senators of my hope to have a Senate that discusses and debates, rather than just agrees. To be strong, we need diversity of voices willing to speak. I have been pleasantly surprised by the willingness of this Senate to be vocal, engaged, and involved in ways I could never have imagined. Someone reminded me that, if all the legislation put forward easily passes with unanimous agreement, then we aren’t really doing our job. The debate in the Senate is one small part of the legislative process. This debate, though a small part of the process, is vital to fully vetting the legislation that comes before us. Debate and disagreement can be good, but we need to make sure that we treat our colleagues with respect – even when we fundamentally disagree with their position. We are all involved in shared governance to make UW a better place and we have to remember that our fellow Senators and Faculty Council members are making good faith efforts to accomplish that goal.
Please take the time to carefully consider the legislation that is before us at the meeting today and remember all of the hard work that has gone into it up to this point. Ask any questions you have and propose amendments if you think they are necessary, but remember to treat your colleagues with respect even if they do not agree with your position.

It has been a great year thus far and I look forward to what the SEC and the Senate will accomplish in their last two meetings of the academic year.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Mike Townsend, Associate Professor, School of Law

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

2. Secretary of the Faculty Position: The interviewing committee has deliberated and is sending names to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration.

3. Legislative Representative Positions: Nominations have closed, and the names of the nominees will be sent to the Senate Executive Committee for consideration.

4. Senate Elections: Senate elections are currently ongoing.

5. Committee on Committees: The Committee on Committees is seeking candidates for membership on various Faculty Councils and Committees for 2021-2022. Contact Joey Burgess (jmbg@uw.edu) for further information.

6. Annual Faculty Lecture: The nominating committee has finished deliberations and forwarded its recommendation to the President.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Joseph Janes, Associate Professor, Information School

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

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

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

In this report you’ll find the latest from Olympia – with updates on the budget and several policy bills of interest to higher ed – finishing off with some more general reflections.

**Budget Outlook Brightens**

In the early months of the pandemic, fears mounted that the public health crisis and the economic crisis it precipitated would in turn create a fiscal crisis for state and local government. Here in Washington, forecasts released in June projected 9% drops in revenue collection both for the current fiscal biennium, which ends June 30th, and for the next biennium extending to mid-2023. State agencies including UW were instructed to brace themselves for budget cuts. The merit increases that had been budgeted for the 2020/21 academic year were withheld. Our colleagues at other state universities faced furloughs on top of salary freezes. Unionized state employees accepted concessions in newly negotiated contracts.

With the release of the latest state revenue projections on March 17th, this episode of recent history now resembles a bad dream from which we have collectively awakened. What we thought might be a 9% drop in the current biennium is now projected to be an 0.8% drop. Revenue projections for the 2021-23 biennium are actually running ahead of where they were before the pandemic began. Put the two biennia together and the net revenue impact of the pandemic amounts to 0.05% -- one-twentieth of a percentage point. Rounding error.

These fiscal estimates will inform the 2021-23 legislative budget proposals about to emerge from the legislature. The Governor’s proposed budget for the biennium, released three months ago, incorporated some good news for UW but also called for a two-year salary freeze along with one-day-a-month furloughs for faculty. These concessions were proposed in the context of broad pay freezes or cuts for nearly all state employees. While as of this writing the legislative budgets have yet to be released, the word we’ve received from multiple sources is that at the very least furloughs are off the table.

Here at UW, the rosy news about the state budget has been coupled with positive developments on related fronts. Enrollments have held steady, allowing us to avoid a significant drop in tuition revenue. Auxiliary units – athletics, housing & food services – witnessed major hits to their revenue streams but had at least some financial reserves to cushion the blow. Federal stimulus money has helped in many ways, from offsetting the costs of uncompensated care provided by UW Medicine to bolstering financial
aid. The proceeds of the most recent Federal stimulus may help the university address its backlog of deferred maintenance.

If the state budget looks as good as it does, and the University has managed to weather the storm financially, could we push beyond the mere withdrawal of proposed furloughs and put a basic merit increase for faculty on the table? Failing a step-up in base pay, might we argue for a one-time bonus in the amount of 2020/21 merit increases foregone? There’s a sense on the legislative budget committees that faculty compensation should move in step with compensation for other state employees. This ethos persists even though the vast majority of funding for faculty compensation originates in tuition, grants, and contracts rather than state appropriation. So we will be watching the general conversation about employee compensation carefully and remind legislators that faculty were among the state employees who made concessions in the depths of the fiscal panic. If merit increases for 2021/22 remain too heavy a lift, prospects remain for a supplemental allocation in 2022/23, provided the fiscal picture does not worsen.

**Diversity Training & Climate Bills Move Forward**

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

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

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

Senator Randall also sponsored a bill (SB 5228) requiring health equity training in the MD curriculum. The binding provisions of this bill are redundant with accreditation requirements already in place for schools of medicine nationwide. The bill passed the Senate on a 31-17 vote and has cleared the House College & Workforce Development committee on a 7-6 party line vote.

**Faculty Regent Bill Stalls**

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

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

**Capital Gains Tax Squeaks By**

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

The Controversies of Words Unspoken

Several years ago I caught up with a former student who served in the office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction in South Carolina. At that time, there was a movement afoot across the country to implement a “Common Core” curriculum in K-12 schools nationwide, standardizing what had historically been state or local prerogatives. As you might imagine, this initiative inspired some degree of controversy. Then as now, not everyone agrees exactly what should be part of the required curriculum in primary and secondary education. Moreover, there are arguments to be made that at least some localization of the curriculum is a good thing.

My student had recently received a call from a state legislator who had asked a two-part question: “What is Common Core and how do I stop it?”

I thought of this moment upon reviewing a proposed amendment to Senate Bill 5227, offered by Senator Ericksen of Whatcom County. The amendment, which was rejected, would have stipulated that diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism trainings adopted for use with faculty, staff, and students “may not include critical race theory.”

Both inside and outside the academy, we have a practice of summarizing complicated subjects or approaches using a small number of words. Even relatively straightforward arguments or theses can be boiled down to a concise sound bite. In many cases, this reduction does not engender great controversy. The term “differential calculus,” for example, describes an approach detailed enough to fill a fairly large textbook. There may be some grey areas at the margins, as to whether certain topics should really be included under the umbrella of differential calculus, but these controversies don’t draw the attention of state legislatures.

One might imagine that the statement “Black lives matter” should be similarly uncontroversial. The logical antithesis of this statement would be “Black lives do not matter,” a statement that would, regrettably, find some adherents in the American public but only a relative few. Since the early 1970s, the General Social Survey has asked respondents whether this country spends too much, too little, or about the right amount of money on “improving the conditions of Blacks.” In 1973, 21% of respondents answered “too much.” In the most recent survey wave in 2018, that response rate had dropped by two-thirds, to 7%.

“Black lives matter” becomes a more controversial statement when individuals begin to fill in the spaces around the term. Some might look at that phrase and infer that it means “Black lives matter more than other lives,” or that the antithetical statement would be “Lives that are not Black lives do not matter.” Some associate the statement with an agenda they are wary of, such as defunding the police. And, like the South Carolina state legislator contemplating “Common Core,” some may pick up on the atmosphere of wariness in conversation and become skeptical of the statement even without putting much effort into understanding what the words mean.

From the other end of the political spectrum, consider the phrase “Make America Great Again.” To the opponents of Trumpism, the statement evinces nostalgia for an era before the mid-1960s, when Jim Crow laws enforced a stricter racial hierarchy and severe immigration restrictions kept the nation’s racial and ethnic composition stable.

Yet many who would denounce this intimation simultaneously invoke nostalgia for other aspects of mid-century America. It was a time, after all, when the salaries of CEOs were much closer to those of the average worker. A time when, adjusting for inflation, the minimum wage was worth more than it is today. A time when a blue-collar employee could expect a reasonable standard of living and amass some savings. And when public support for higher education was strong enough that world-class universities did not charge tuition. Would restoring these patterns not also, in a sense, make America great again?
When contemplating any of these short phrases, the controversy lies not so much with the part that is spoken but the part left unspoken. These interstices leave room for interpretation, and in our climate of political polarization interpretations are prone to diverge.

Bearing this in mind, it has been heartening to observe the legislative progress of what is now Engrossed Second Substitute House Bill 5227. One might expect a bill requiring diversity, equity, inclusion, and antiracism training to split legislators on partisan lines. All along the way, the bill has been controversial, attracting testimony both in favor and opposition. Legislators of both parties engaged in good faith with critics, skeptics, and one another. The fact that the bill is described as “Second Substitute” means that amendments were adopted in two separate committees. The fact that it is “Engrossed” means that more amendments were adopted on the Senate floor. Although the bill was introduced and sponsored by Democrats, Democrats supported three amendments introduced by their Republican colleagues. And in the final tally, six Republican senators – 30% of the caucus – voted in favor of the bill.

The story of E2SSB 5227 has not been fully written yet, so it may be premature to draw a moral. And with 70% of the minority party voting against the bill, it hardly stands out as a model of bipartisan harmony. But it would appear that genuine, honest efforts to engage in dialogue across political divides are not doomed to fail. The key to moving these conversations forward productively is filling in those blank spaces around the terms we use to summarize key concepts or objectives.
2020-2021 Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees

Student Reviewing Officers

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

Open Seat Nominations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
<th>Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering – 1 position</td>
<td>Dan Schwartz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2021-2022 Nominee for Faculty Legislative Representative

- Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance.

2021-2022 Nominees for Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative

- Justin Lerner, Assistant Teaching Professor, School of Social Work.
- Jonathan Medverd, Associate Professor, School of Medicine.
- JoAnn Taricani, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences.
Nominees for Secretary of the Faculty

Cynthia Dougherty

February 4, 2021

Dr. Chris Laws
Search Chair, Secretary of the Faculty Nominating Committee, University of Washington

Dear Search Committee Chair/Members:

I am applying for consideration for the position of Secretary of the Faculty at the University of Washington (UW). Enclosed is my CV that addresses qualifications for this position as well as information about my background and experience related to the position. I am a Professor and Vice Chair for Research and Education in the Department of Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Informatics (BNHI) in the School of Nursing, and an Adjunct Professor in the Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology in the School of Medicine. Additionally, I am a licensed and certified adult nurse practitioner at the VA Puget Sound Health Care System-Seattle, WA, Division of Cardiology. I am also a licensed and certified nurse practitioner in Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing.

I have been a faculty member at the UW since 1995. After finishing post-doctoral study, my first faculty position at the UW was that of Research Assistant Professor. I was funded early on a large R01 research grant, and at the same time I was also committed to clinical practice. I have worked in clinical practice in addition to my faculty role since doctoral study. I was promoted to Research Associate Professor, and then ‘crossed over’ to the tenure track faculty as an Associate Professor, moving onward to Professor. I have been in the Vice Chair role in my department (BNHI) since 2012. My research and clinical expertise are in cardiovascular disease, sudden cardiac arrest, nursing interventions, exercise and physical activity, psychosocial responses to heart disease, and end of life palliative care interventions. My research has been conducted within large and multi-disciplinary research teams. I have a consistent funding track record for the past 25 years, locally and nationally.

My UW experience and service that prepares me for this position

There are a number of experiences I have had in faculty governance, administration in BNHI and the UW, and in clinical practice, that I believe prepare me for this important role at the UW. In UW faculty governance, I have been a member, Vice-Chair, and Elect Chair of our School’s Faculty Council, was the Elect Faculty Council Chair in 2016-17, and was a member of the UW’s Adjudication Committee from 2017-2020. I participated on 2 adjudication panels (1 lasted more than 1 year and the other was cancelled shortly after being convened). I have also been an elected substitute Faculty Senator for 1 year when another faculty member could not finish the year, volunteered to be on the UW’s Research Committee this year (not participating because all meetings are on Wednesdays, my clinical practice day), and was part of the team who led the School of Nursing when our Dean left in 2011. I have first hand knowledge and experience using the Faculty Code to help make change in our School, helping others in our School interpret the Code and learn more about it, and working with faculty when our APT bylaws were not aligned with the Code. I believe strongly in the UW’s faculty governance structure, was on our faculty council when the faculty salary policy failed and when the faculty titles legislation passed. These have been memorable times for me personally in the UW’s strong faculty governance history. I am familiar with differences in promotion criteria between the School of Medicine and Arts and Sciences for example, and differences in the operations across the 3 UW campuses. I have favorite sections of the Code (24-33) that help me feel supported and empowered as a Professor at UW. The UW’s Faculty Code affords us a strong guide to govern our daily work, more so than other R1 universities in the nation. I believe I have significant experience in faculty governance and in personal deliberations related to UW’s Faculty Code, a strength I would bring to the role of Secretary of the Faculty.

In administration, I have been the Vice Chair for Research/Education in BNHI for 8+ years, having worked with the same Department Chair for more than 23 years. In this role, I advance the research and teaching missions of our School, assign all teaching for the academic year, mentor early career faculty for
successful attainment of tenure and promotion, broker disagreements among faculty, staff, and students, vet student complaints, support faculty and students who are not doing well, and collaborate with interdisciplinary colleagues across UW departments and other Universities. I have served on tri-campus curriculum committees, grant reviews, and accreditation boards involving both the Bothell and Tacoma School of Nursing campuses. I was the Chair of the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) Committee for 3 years when our School experienced a major budget short fall and undertook a major curriculum change. This required patience, persistence, and understanding when faculty with differing priorities (practice vs. research) often disagreed. I am aware of and respect, power structures that can exist between faculty, staff, and students, that make it easy or difficult to interact with transparency and honesty. I have also had the ability to participate in many UW faculty professional development offerings regarding faculty and student mental health, communication, burnout, addiction, and leadership. This training has afforded me the opportunity to learn of the concerns and processes of other Schools within the UW system. Thus, as Vice Chair for BNHI, I have had significant interactions with faculty, students, and staff to promote the highest impact research, ensure faculty success, create consensus on disagreements, and enhance important connections that create our ability to deliver excellence in teaching.

In clinical practice, I hold certification and licensure in advanced nursing practice both in Adult Health and Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing. Throughout my career, I have simultaneously held both academic and clinical positions, reflecting an abiding commitment to generate knowledge that directly influences health outcomes for patients living with advanced cardiac disease. As well, I practice within the Veteran’s Health Administration (VHA), where my population consists of vulnerable adults with multiple and complex social, economic, and mental health issues, who have served in wartime. In practice I have been a leader for telemedicine, started a new clinic on a shoestring budget, and been instrumental in developing policy around cardiac devices. In 2020, I was named a Clinical Practice Hero at the Seattle VA for contributions I have made in the care of patients with cardiovascular disease during the COVID-19 pandemic. I practice within an integrated biopsychosocial model of health, with a high level of diplomacy and emotional intelligence. I work well within interdisciplinary teams and possess strong conflict resolution skills. I have led 5 large research and practice teams that achieved all recruitment and clinical trial goals. I currently lead a large cardiovascular research group of early career faculty, post-doctoral fellows, PhD and DNP students, and Cardiology fellows where our focus is on discovery and translation of knowledge. My clinical practice experience with vulnerable and diverse populations and training and practice in Psychiatric Nursing, would be invaluable to the position of Secretary of the Faculty.

Working collaboratively to achieve objectives

The Secretary of the Faculty works collaboratively with highly quality and experienced faculty and staff. In the process of starting up and closing out research grants, in making teaching assignments using an applied budget model, in hiring new faculty and staff, and in managing important grant objectives, my philosophy is a people first, outcome driven, authentic approach to the work and tasks at hand. I have had significant prior experience in hiring, orienting, and working collaboratively with new faculty, staff, and research nurses. Between the years 2007-2016, I was simultaneously the PI of 3 large research grants, responsible for leading 3 separate and distinct interdisciplinary teams in meeting patient recruitment, intervention and safety goals. In the current pandemic with potentially all staff working remotely, I would strive to build cohesion, knowledge of one another’s strengths, preferred communication style, name and pronouns, while building on competencies for all to meet the goals of the office. Potentially, most work of the Secretary of the Faculty will occur remotely in all interactions at least temporarily. The staff who make up the Secretary’s team, hold foundational knowledge about the work required, while faculty leaders change out annually or more often. Because I have been teaching doctoral courses online, attending local and national meetings, and working remotely most of the last year, I am adept at using technologies important to staying connected. My style is to communicate frequently and often, especially when electronic formats convey only part of an important message. My prior experience in grant management, teaching, and Vice Chair in BNHI have prepared me for working successfully with small and large interdisciplinary teams of well qualified and diverse faculty and staff.

Other relevant experience

At the national level, I am the current national Chair of the Council on Cardiovascular and Stroke
Nursing (CVSN) of the American Heart Association (AHA). As CVSN Chair, I represent more than 2000 nurses in the AHA, and am responsible for advancing nursing science and practice to meet the AHA mission of creating longer and healthier lives for all. Locally, I am a Member and recent past Board Member of the Washington State Academy of Sciences, an organization dedicated to finding scientific unbiased solutions for WA state’s toughest environmental and social problems. Both of these experiences have required representing nursing within a large interdisciplinary non-profit organization as well as leading strategic planning and change in a state interdisciplinary science organization. With these experiences, I would bring strength to interacting with faculty from various campuses with differing views and cultures.

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

I acknowledge that our nation and the UW are responding to difficult issues in the pandemic and in societal change. I also acknowledge that others may not hold the same views on these issues as me. The UW leadership has a strong commitment to a diverse faculty, staff and student body. I have been engaged in discussions and trainings related to DEI principles, and support strategies for fostering DEI institutional structures, creation and monitoring of diversity metrics of faculty, staff, and students, and adopting best practices for ensuring the presence and success of a diverse faculty. My leadership style is proactive, engaging, honest, fair, and fully supportive of giving voice to diversity. I support open discourse, communication, and transparency. I support the freedom to explore multiple avenues of scholarship, research, and creative expression of ideas. I respect the dignity of others, acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and foster and defend intellectual curiosity and honesty. If selected as the Secretary of the Faculty, I would advocate for all faculty rights & processes in cooperation with administrative structures and personnel, and strive to find workable and satisfactory solutions to issues brought forward for consideration.

In summary, thank you for the opportunity to be considered for the important position of Secretary of the Faculty at the University of Washington. I would be honored and privileged to be of service to the Faculty at the UW as the next Secretary.

Sincerely,

Cynthia M. Dougherty ARNP, PhD. FAAN, FAHA.
Charles and Gerda Spence Endowed Professor in Nursing
Vice Chair Research/Education, Department of Biobehavioral Nursing and Health Informatics
University of Washington School of Nursing, Box 357266
Adjunct Professor, Department of Medicine, Division of Cardiology
E-mail: cindyd@uw.edu
Nominees for Secretary of the Faculty

Mike Townsend

To: Professor Chris Laws  
Re: Secretary of the Faculty Position  
Date: February 24, 2021

Professor Laws:

This letter is to express my interest in serving as Secretary of the Faculty of the University of Washington. I am finishing a five-year term as Secretary that began in the Summer of 2016, and I am applying for an additional appointment. I do this for several reasons. First, I have found the job to be highly stimulating because it has allowed me to work with a dazzling array of administrators, faculty, and staff. Second, there are some important pending legislative and policy initiatives with which I have been heavily involved and would like to see through and with respect to which I believe I have developed useful expertise.

One initiative is the ongoing effort to rework the Faculty Code’s dispute-resolution provisions to bring them into line with the current legal landscape and with modern notions of fairness, efficiency, accuracy, transparency, and accountability. Over the past few years, I have served as Co-Chair of the Dispute-Resolution Task Force with Professor Zoe Barsness, and we believe the project will extend to the end of the 2022-2023 academic year.

Another initiative involves the current reassessment of the tri-campus framework. This is something I have been involved with early on in its present incarnation, and although this project may well take more time, I would like to help set up an analytical framework going forward.

I understand the argument that there be some turnover in the role of Secretary. Balancing that argument with the reasons outlined above, I think a two-year extension would be reasonable. In this regard, I note that the Code specifies five-year terms as “normal,” but it does not prohibit terms of other lengths. I think the five-year idea is meant to ensure continuity and expertise, which is not an issue here. My current plan, which has been approved by the School of Law and the Provost’s Office, would be to take two years of temporary 25% leave, which would allow me to devote all my energies to the work as Secretary, which is viewed as 75% FTE.

Whatever the outcome of the selection process, it has been my privilege to serve in this role over the last five years and to work with an outstanding team in the Senate Office.

Thank you,  
Mike Townsend
Proposal for an *ad hoc* Grievance Legislation Negotiation Committee

**Background:**

In Autumn Quarter 2017, then Senate Chair and the Secretary of the Faculty appointed a Faculty Senate Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution with representation from faculty leadership and administrative leadership, as well as faculty and administrators at large, to undertake a project to improve the current systems for faculty discipline and dispute resolution. On May 14, 2020, the Faculty Senate approved a Class C Resolution regarding the design principles for two systems: one for addressing faculty disputes regarding administrative decisions (grievances) and one for addressing allegations of faculty misconduct.

The Class C Resolution charged the Drafting Committee of the Task Force to draft Class A Legislation for a formal grievance process, which the Drafting Committee has included in legislation to revise Chapter 27 of the Faculty Code. As the Drafting Committee has presented the draft to faculty leadership and administrative leadership, the committee received significant and contradictory feedback regarding several aspects of the system as designed and drafted.

Because the Drafting Committee has not been charged with the authority to negotiate or make substantive decisions regarding the system, the Chair of the Faculty Senate is requesting that an *ad hoc* “negotiating committee” be formed by the Senate Executive Committee for the purpose of conducting negotiations between appointees of faculty leadership and administrative leadership to reconcile the feedback and to reach a compromise on the identified substantive design elements described in the committee’s charge, below.

**Charge:**

The *ad hoc* negotiating committee for faculty grievances is charged with negotiating and reaching a compromise on the following identified substantive design elements:

- How to staff the Chair and Vice Chairs of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Pool (the current Faculty Adjudication Panel) and, in the grievance process, how to staff the role of the “Coordinator” and the scope of the Coordinator’s authority
- The standard that the grievance must satisfy to advance to Institutional Review after a Unit-level Review has been completed
- The composition of the Faculty Grievance Panel for conducting Institutional Reviews
- The authority of the Faculty Grievance Panel, including when its decisions become the final decision in the grievance process
  - The authority of the panel to provide a “remedy” in grievances relating to personnel decisions (tenure and/or promotion, merit and salary increase, non-renewal, and removal due to program elimination)
- The scope and authority of the President in a Discretionary Review

The committee is charged with meeting as frequently as necessary to complete its work by the end of Spring Quarter 2021 (June 11, 2021).

A facilitator will be appointed to facilitate the negotiations and to support work toward compromise. The facilitator will decide on the scope of the discussions and decisions to be made regarding the design elements, as outlined above. If other issues are raised, the facilitator will determine how to address them.

Once the committee has completed its work, the design elements will be provided to the Drafting Committee of the Task Force for the purpose of drafting legislation consistent with the design elements, with the expectation that the revised draft Class A Legislation will be forwarded through the legislative
process in Autumn Quarter 2021 (with the faculty and the President retaining their authority to make decisions regarding the legislation within the legislative process).

**Membership:**

Facilitator: Jacob Vigdor, Faculty Legislative Representative and Member of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations
Staff support: Amanda Paye, Compliance Analyst, Office of University Committees

The committee should be made up of no more than six individuals: three members selected by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and three members selected by the President. The members should be individuals who are knowledgeable about the design of the formal grievance process and the draft Class A Legislation and who are committed to effectively and efficiently working toward finding compromises within these design elements.

Robin Angotti  
Chair, UW Faculty Senate  
Professor, Engineering & Mathematics  
School of STEM, UW Bothell  
runerr@uw.edu
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 22

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

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

Background and Rationale

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

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

The Proposed Class A Legislation

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

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

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

C. The committee membership shall consist of:

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

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

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

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

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


Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
February 8, 2021

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
February 25, 2021
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 42

Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code: New Faculty Council

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

Background and Rationale

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

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

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

Proposed Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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


Section 42-32 Appointment of Faculty Councils

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 42-34 Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

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

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

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

Section 42-37  Faculty Council on Research

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


Section 42-38  Faculty Council on Student Affairs

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

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

Section 42-39  Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services

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

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

Section 42-41  Faculty Council on University Libraries

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

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

Section 42-44  Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement

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

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

Section 42-46  Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy

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

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

Section 42-47  Faculty Council on Women in Academia

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

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


Section 42-49 Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning

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


Section 42-50 Faculty Council on Information Technology, Security, and Managing Innovation

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

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Teaching and Learning
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 29

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

Background and Rationale

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

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

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

Proposed Changes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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


Section 42-32 Appointment of Faculty Councils

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Section 42-34 Faculty Council on Academic Standards

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

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

Section 42-36 Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

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

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

Section 42-37 Faculty Council on Research
The Faculty Council on Research shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters of
policy relating to research and scholarship.


Section 42-38 Faculty Council on Student Affairs
The Faculty Council on Student Affairs shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all matters
of policy relating to non-academic student affairs such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social
affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare.

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

Section 42-39 Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services
The Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services shall be responsible (as described in Section
42-33) for all matters of policy relating to University facilities and services such as building needs, space
utilization, supplies and equipment, administrative services, and parking and traffic problems.

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

Section 42-41 Faculty Council on University Libraries
The Faculty Council on University Libraries shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for all
matters of policy relating to libraries such as, but not limited to, collection development; services to
students, faculty, and others; the system of libraries, including branch libraries; space needs; and
budgetary requirements.

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

Section 42-44 Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement
The Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement shall be responsible (as described in Section 42-33) for
all matters of policy relating to faculty retirement, insurance and benefits.

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

Section 42-46 Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy shall be responsible for matters of academic and non-
academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington.

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

Section 42-47 Faculty Council on Women in Academia Gender, Equity, and Justice
The Faculty Council on Women in Academia Gender, Equity, and Justice shall be responsible (as
described in Section 42-33) for all matters of policy relating to the interests of women, gender, sexual
orientation, and gender identity.


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


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

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


Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Faculty Council on Women in Academia
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 29

Housekeeping and Temporary Amendments

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

Background and Rationale

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

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

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

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

What We Propose to Do

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

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

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

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

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

Section 29-31 Provisions Subject to Amendment

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

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

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

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

Section 29-34 Executive Committee and Senate Consideration of Amendments

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

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

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

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

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

The change in the next paragraph is meant to clarify the code’s intent and make it consistent with current practice: if the SEC’s alternate proposal is rejected, then the senate’s only option is an up-or-down vote on the original proposal. This should make it clear that “considering” the original proposal does not include amending it.
D. If the Executive Committee submits an alternate proposal under the provisions of Subsection B.2 of this section, the first question before the Senate shall be whether it approves or disapproves submission to the faculty of the alternate proposal. If the Senate rejects the alternate proposal, it shall then consider approve or disapprove the proposal originally referred by it to the Executive Committee.

Section 29-39 Housekeeping Changes to the Faculty Code

A. A housekeeping change is a permanent modification of the Faculty Code for one of the following purposes:

1. To correct inaccurately transcribed text of the Faculty Code, including amendments, or
2. To update names of officials or addresses.

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

Section 29-40 Temporary Amendments to the Faculty Code

A. A temporary amendment is a time-limited modification of the Faculty Code for one of the following purposes:

1. To meet a deadline to comply with federal, state, or local laws or regulations, or
2. To address a state of emergency declared by the governor.

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

C. Every temporary amendment must have an explicit expiration date. Ordinarily, the expiration date will be 60 days after the second Senate meeting following the Executive Committee’s action.

When a temporary amendment is enacted, the Executive Committee may set an earlier expiration date.

D. At the first Senate meeting following the Executive Committee’s approval of a temporary amendment, the Senate must take one of the following actions on the amendment by majority vote:

1. Affirm the temporary amendment with the original expiration date;
2. Repeal the temporary amendment; or
3. Modify the expiration date to a date no more than 180 days after the meeting.

E. At any subsequent meeting of the Senate while the temporary amendment is still in effect, the Senate may, by majority vote, repeal the temporary amendment or further modify its expiration date to a time no more than 180 days after the meeting.

F. To enact any other modification of a temporary amendment, move the expiration date beyond the limits specified in Subsections D and E above, or convert a temporary amendment to a permanent amendment, the procedures outlined in sections 29-32 through 29-38 must be followed.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 102, Registration

Background and Rationale

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

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

Student Governance and Policies

Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 102

Registration

5. Change of Registration

A. Online Academic Calendar

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

B. Registration Change Fee

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

C. Withdrawals

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

D. Courses Dropped Before the First 14 Days

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

E. Courses Dropped After the First 14 Days

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

F. Hardship Withdrawals Former Quarter Drop

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

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

H. Dropped Courses

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

I. Tuition and Fees for Dropped or Added Courses

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

J. Summer Quarter

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


Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Academic Standards
Class B Legislation
Student Governance and Policies
Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 110, Grades, Honors, and Scholarship

Background and Rationale

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

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

---

Student Governance and Policies

Scholastic Regulations
Chapter 110

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

5) The Grade RD

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

B. Grading Practices for Graduate Students

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

1) Minimum Grade Level

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

2) The Grade I

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

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

3) The Grade N

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

4) The Grade W RD

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

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

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

5) The Grade S/NS

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

6) The Grade CR/NC

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

7) Numerical Grade Requirement

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

8) Grade-Point Average

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

9) Petition for Modification of Grading Practice

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

C. Grading Practice for the School of Medicine

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

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

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

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

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

D. Grading Practice for the School of Law

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

1) Grade Significance

The significance of each grade is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Equivalent</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Percentage of Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than or equal to 10% (may be 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than or equal to 30% (minus % given A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Median grade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 50% (minus % given A and A-) and less than or equal to 60%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Discretionary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>% discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>% discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>This grade indicates that the level of performance is below that which on average is required for the award of the degree. % discretionary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>No credit. This grade indicates unsatisfactory performance and no credit is given for the course. % discretionary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But this significance is subject to the following conditions:

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

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

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

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

2) Academic Difficulty and Disqualification Rules

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

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

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

A student who has been disqualified as a J.D. candidate for unsatisfactory grades may petition the faculty for readmission.
3) Grade System Start Date

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

1) Anonymous Grading

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

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

2) Class Rank

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

The ranking is only for the following purposes:

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

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

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

Only students who fall within a percentile band will be notified of the percentile band in which they placed. Students who are ranked first through fifth in their class will be notified of an individual rank. Students below the percentile cut-off will not be ranked. Neither students' individual class rank nor the grade point average (GPA) cut-offs for the percentile bands described above will appear on students' transcript.

Under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), release of an individual student's placement within the defined GPA percentile bands by the law school requires the written permission of the student. To further preserve student privacy, additional ranking information, including the GPA percentile bands, will not be disclosed by the law school.

Class of 2020

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

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

4) **Law School Grading System**

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

a) The significance of each grade is as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage of Class</th>
<th>Numerical equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>At least 5% and less than or equal to 15%.</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>At least 20% minus (% given A) and less than or equal to 40% minus (% given A).</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>At least 50% minus (% given A or A-) and less than or equal to 75% minus (% given A or A-).</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>% Discretionary.*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>% Discretionary.*</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>% Discretionary. C or D grades are capped at a total of 5% for first-year courses.*</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>% Discretionary. This grade indicates that the level of performance is below that which on average is required for the award of the degree. C or D grades are capped at a total of 5% for first-year courses.*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>% Discretionary. No credit. This grade indicates unsatisfactory performance and no credit is given for the course.*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5) COVID-19 grading changes

Spring Quarter 2020

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

Winter Quarter 2020 limited grading change

In view of the evolving public health crisis, UW Law faculty voted to:
234  ● Reopen the period by which 2L, 3L, and graduate students can elect to receive Satisfactory/Not satisfactory credit for elective courses only.

236  ● Waive the eight credit-limit for Satisfactory/Not satisfactory credit for winter quarter 2020 only. Satisfactory/Not satisfactory elections for electives will not count against the eight-credit cap.

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

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

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

7) Information Faculty Must Provide to Students on Grading

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

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

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

After the professor has turned in final and end-quarter examination grades, the names of
students and grades will be available to the professor, but not the student numbers unless
those numbers are not to be used again in any course by the same students in a subsequent
quarter. Course grades should be calculated by the professor after examination grades have
been turned in. Course grades and final examination grades will be made available to
students by the Office of Student Services. A student's request to the professor for
components of the student's grade should be necessary only if the professor uses multiple
components of course grades other than final or end-quarter examinations.
8) Satisfactory Academic Progress
To be eligible for financial aid at the University of Washington students must maintain Satisfactory Academic Progress. The requirements for Satisfactory Academic Progress are that full-time J.D. students enroll in a minimum of 12 credits per quarter, and

a) Complete a minimum of 6 credits each quarter.

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

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

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

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

9) Academic Difficulty and Disqualification Rules

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

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

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

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

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

10) Readmission After Disqualification for Academic Failure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12) Repeating Courses

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

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

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

13) Deadline for Faculty to Turn in Grades

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

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

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

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

This policy shall be enforced through the following steps:
- At the last faculty meeting of each quarter, the Dean reminds the faculty of the grading deadlines, of the importance of grading and of the desirability of leaving word about how the faculty member can be contacted by Academic Services;

- On the day after the applicable grade deadline, Academic Services will announce the classes for which grades are not received, and, when available, the expected posting date;

- The Associate Dean for Academic Administration confers with faculty members who are late in turning in grades to bring them into compliance;

- If the Associate Dean for Academic Administration cannot arrive at a satisfactory resolution, he or she informs the Dean of the problem.

14) Change of Grade

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


E. Grading Practice for the School of Dentistry

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

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

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

1) Numerical grades having significance are:

4.0: Highest grade attainable, assigned for extraordinary high performance
2.8: Cumulative average necessary for good academic standing in the School of Dentistry and for graduation. Failure to achieve a 2.8 cumulative GPA at the end of each academic year shall usually lead to dismissal.

2.8: Lowest grade providing unconditional course credit toward graduation.

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

2) Grading Information

a) Grades 4.0 - 2.8
All grades awarded in this range denote satisfactory completion of coursework and provide unconditional course credit toward graduation.

**b) Credit/No Credit Grades**

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

**c) Incomplete Grades**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**3) N Grades**

N grades are limited to hyphenated courses and indicate satisfactory progress at the end of a quarter other than the terminal quarter of a hyphenated series.
At the end of the last quarter of a hyphenated series, a numerical grade or an I must be recorded. This terminal grade shall be the grade for each preceding quarter of the hyphenated sequence and shall replace N grades previously recorded on the University transcript.

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

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

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

An X (No Grade Now) appears on a student's transcript when the instructor has not yet assigned a grade for a particular course. This remains on a student's record until a grade is submitted. The X option only signifies that the instructor has not completed evaluating a student's performance and is not yet prepared to assign a final grade.

X grades do not affect the GPA, but they do affect student status and eligibility for some types of financial aid. As a result, instructors must make every effort to submit grades in a timely manner.

5) Withdrawal Grades

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

6) Proceeding to Clinical Care

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

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

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

Spring Quarter 2020

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

2020-2021 Academic Year

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

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.
   d. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative – Alexes Harris, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences.

4. President’s Remarks – Ana Mari Cauce.

5. Requests for Information.
   Summary of Executive Committee Actions and Upcoming Issues of March 29, 2021.
   a. Approval of the February 8, 2021, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approval of the February 25, 2021, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approval of an ad hoc Grievance Legislation Negotiation Committee.

6. Memorial Resolution.

7. Consent Agenda.
   a. Approve nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees.
   b. Approve nominations for 2020-21 Senate Executive Committee positions.
   c. Confirm Jacob Vigdor, Professor, Evans School of Public Policy and Governance, as 2021-2022 Faculty Legislative Representative.

8. Announcements.

   a. Confirmation of the Secretary of the Faculty.
   b. Nomination of Candidates for 2021-2022 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative.
      Justin Lerner, Assistant Teaching Professor, School of Social Work.
      Jonathan Medverd, Associate Professor, School of Medicine.
      JoAnn Taricani, Professor, College of Arts & Sciences.
   c. 2021-2022 Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative Candidate Presentations.
   d. Class A Legislation – Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting Membership – second consideration.
      **Action:** Approve for faculty vote.
   e. Class A Legislation – New Faculty Council – first consideration.
      **Action:** Initial review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
   f. Class A Legislation – Faculty Council Title Change – first consideration.
      **Action:** Initial Review of proposed revisions to the Faculty Code.
   g. Class A Legislation – Housekeeping and the Faculty Code – first consideration.
      **Action:** Initial review of proposed revisions to the faculty code.
   h. Class B Legislation – Registrar Drop.
      **Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
   i. Class B Legislation – Grading Policies.
      **Action:** Approve for distribution to the faculty.
10. Discussion Items.
   a. UW Investment Management Company – Environmental, Social, and Corporate Governance.

11. Good of the Order.


Prepared by:  Mike Townsend  
Secretary of the Faculty

Approved by:  Robin Angotti  
Faculty Senate

**NOTE:** If a continuation meeting is necessary to conduct unfinished or special business, it will be held on Thursday, April 22, at 2:30 p.m. via Zoom