

University of Washington

Report of the Adjudication Panel, 2012-13

The Adjudication Panel had a fairly busy year July 1, 2012-June 30, 2013. Five petitions were filed during this reporting period, although few of these were disposed of during the period.

In one petition, a faculty member alleged that he had been unfairly removed from a program position and had been deprived of professional opportunities as a result of this action. After the response was filed, the chair determined that the petition was timely and proper. The parties stipulated to having this petition heard by a hearing officer alone, waiving their rights to have a faculty panel, and a hearing officer was appointed. The hearing officer determined that the faculty member had not been unjustly treated and the faculty member apparently did not appeal this determination.

Another petition was filed in which a faculty member alleged that a disciplinary action taken by a dean was unfair. After the response was filed, the chair determined that the petition was timely and proper and appointed a panel to hear this as a comprehensive adjudication. The matter was still under consideration by that panel at the end of the reporting period.

A third petition was filed in which a faculty member alleged that another faculty member, a superior, had harassed the petitioner and had misappropriated the petitioner's ideas and data. After a response was filed, the chair determined that the petition lacked sufficient specificity to determine whether it was timely or proper, but that the petitioner had a right to amend the original petition. An amended petition was filed during this reporting period, but a response was pending at the end of this reporting period.

Another petition was filed by the Provost in which the administration sought a determination that a faculty member had violated university rules by fostering and promoting an inappropriate relationship with a student. After a response was filed, the chair determined that the Provost's petition was timely and proper and that a comprehensive adjudication was called for. A hearing officer was appointed. But this was an adjudication that the chair concluded involved a student who was a non-party participant of right under the faculty code, section 28-33.I. As such, it required students to be appointed to the panel under the faculty code – section 28-33.D.1. When the reporting period ended, the chair was awaiting identification of students eligible to be appointed to the panel, so a panel had not yet been appointed.

Finally, a fifth petition was filed during this reporting period alleging improprieties in a denial of promotion. When the reporting period ended, a response had not yet been received.

Respectfully Submitted by Adjudication Panel Chair

Thomas R. Andrews, Professor, Law