

University of Washington
Report of the Adjudication Panel, 2015-2016

The Faculty Adjudication Panel was presented with three new petitions during the 2015-2016 academic year, two of which were resolved and one which is ongoing.

In one petition, a faculty member alleged discriminatory working conditions affecting racial minorities as well as those who openly opposed discriminatory conditions. After the receiving and considering the response, the chair concluded that the petition was timely and proper and that the petition needed to proceed as a comprehensive adjudication. A three-member adjudication panel was established and a hearing officer was appointed. The matter was later settled before the hearing panel rendered a decision.

In a second petition, a faculty member challenged the results of the merit review, alleging that the process failed to consider his complete record and that the amount of his merit increase constituted an injustice. After considering the response, the chair concluded that the matter was appropriate for a Brief Adjudication and appointed a hearing officer to review the matter. The hearing officer found against the petitioner. The petitioner requested review by a Brief Adjudication panel. A two-person brief adjudication panel was appointed and the matter as reviewed by the Adjudication Chair and the Brief Adjudication Panel. The Brief Adjudication Panel reversed the decision of the hearing officer. The respondents appealed the decision to the President. The President reversed the Brief Adjudication Panel's decision and found for the respondent. This decision was a final decision of the University and no request for reconsideration or clarification was filed. The time to request any further action has passed. Therefore, the President's decision stands.

In a third petition, the Provost brought a petition against a tenured professor to initiate an adjudication based upon allegations that the professor had: engaged in acts of *quid pro quo* sexual harassment; created a sexually hostile work environment; improperly used state property and resources for private benefit or gain; violated state ethics law; and violated internal unit policies governing professional conduct. The Provost requested that the faculty member be removed from his tenured position and dismissed from employment. After receiving and considering the response, the chair concluded that the matter was timely and proper and that the petition needed to proceed as a comprehensive adjudication. A hearing was appointed and, at the request of the petitioner, a five-member adjudication panel, rather than the default three-member panel, was appointed. At this time, this matter is ongoing.