

**University of Washington**  
**Report of the Adjudication Panel, 2010-11**

The Adjudication Panel had a fairly quiet year July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011.

There were no petitions for adjudication filed during this reporting year. There were, however, several developments in petitions that had been filed in previous periods.

First, a petition filed at the very end of the previous reporting period alleged petitioner had not been properly considered for promotion and merit salary increases. This petition was dismissed by the acting Chair of the Adjudication panel during the current reporting period as improper. The acting Chair held that the petition was improper because the petitioner had been dismissed from the university under circumstances making the relief sought in the petition unavailable absent some further action by a court of law.

Second, a petition alleging procedural improprieties in a UCIRO investigation had been decided in the prior period partly in favor of the petitioner and had been partly dismissed. The petitioner had appealed the hearing panel's decision at the end of the prior period. The petitioner dismissed his appeal with prejudice in September 2010.

Third, a petition filed in the prior period had alleged faculty code violations in the denial of tenure. In the current reporting period, the hearing panel appointed to hear this matter ordered that the petitioner's promotion and tenure application be reconsidered by June 15. It also ordered the parties to report back to the panel on another aspect of the controversy by June 1. But at the request of the parties, the panel held these deadlines in abeyance so that the parties could pursue mediation. The hearing panel specified that the parties should report back by July 8, 2011 (beyond the end of the reporting period), as to whether the controversy had been resolved. As of the end of the reporting period, the controversy had not been resolved.

Fourth, a petition filed in 2007 which alleged improprieties in the university's failure to renew a faculty chair remained in controversy during the current reporting period, but there were developments. The petition had been decided by a hearing panel adversely to the petitioner in January 2008. The panel had concluded that the petitioner had failed to meet his burden of proving that the decision not to renew his chair had been based on improper considerations. The President had affirmed the hearing panel's decision and the petitioner had appealed this result in superior court, which dismissed his petition. The petitioner had then appealed to the court of appeals, which had issued a decision in September 2009 remanding the case for further proceedings. In April 2010, the superior court had remanded the matter to the university. The hearing panel held further proceedings during the current reporting period, in December 2010, and issued its determination in February 2011. After reconsidering the matter and hearing new evidence, the hearing panel once again concluded that the petitioner had failed to prove his case. The petitioner appealed to the President who affirmed the hearing panel decision in April. The petitioner has once again taken the matter to court and the matter was pending there at the end of the reporting period.

*Respectfully Submitted by Adjudication Panel Chair*  
*Thomas R. Andrews, Professor, Law*