

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
December 3, 2020
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.
Zoom

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Consent Agenda
 3. Review of the minutes from Oct 22, 2020
 4. Follow-up - suggested changes to Notice of Proposal curricular process – Guests: Scott Fallgren, Ann Huppert, Chair-FCAS, Menaka Abraham, Tina Miller, Grace Lasker
 5. Alternative Dispute Resolution and Faculty Grievances – Draft Class A Resolution – Guest: Zoe Barsness
 6. Faculty Code Changes: Guests: Mike Townsend,
 7. Good of the order
 8. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Consent Agenda

The consent agenda was approved.

3. Review of the minutes from Oct 22, 2020

The minutes from October 22, 2020 were approved as written.

4. Follow-up - suggested changes to Notice of Proposal curricular process – Guests: Scott Fallgren, Ann Huppert, Chair-FCAS, Menaka Abraham, Tina Miller, Grace Lasker

Tina Miller shared the latest draft of the new NOP process (Exhibit 1). They noted the new changes, including a reduced timeframe from 15 to 10 business days and involving advisors in the NOP phase.

The council made a motion to approve the changes. The motion was approved.

5. Alternative Dispute Resolution and Faculty Grievances – Draft Class A Resolution – Guest: Zoe Barsness

Zoe Barsness shared a presentation with the council on the revised Faculty Code Chapter 27 in Class A Legislation on ADR and faculty grievances (Exhibit 2). The changes to Chapter 27 will be moved through the senate first and Chapter 28 (faculty discipline) will be addressed later.

A member noted concern around the presidential discretionary review can be initiated without a recommendation by a grievant or panel and questioned if this could allow for “back alley lobbying”.

The current code includes discretionary review without being requested, usually in instances of alleged bias while the new code creates a system which emphasizes timeliness and transparency. The president’s decisions now must include reasoning if they do not reaffirm the review panel’s decision.

Another member requested for the resolution values of the taskforce to include anti-racism and questioned if this new model have enough safeguards to protect racial equity. Faculty of color often raise concerns that acts of racism happen at the university and occur in the faculty grievance process. Barsness noted the taskforce did discuss these issues. The grievance process is used to bring forth issues related to working conditions and employment. Some instances of work-related racism may be faculty misconduct and thus not used in this model. Cases of explicit or implicit racism are flagged and moved to faculty misconduct. The labor relations committee is charged by the faculty code and makes a report to the senate each year with collected data on grievances to make continuous improvements to the system.

There is no current system in place to give faculty a safe and comfortable way to discuss administrative decisions, but members would like to see a system which could track what the grievances are, where are they coming from, what their category is. Areas of systemic issues need to be addressed in the training and education of the individuals within the process.

The new role of faculty liaison provides complainants a peer focused approach with support and resources on the faculty grievance system.

A member asked if there was any thought on small units/departments which would be difficult to find someone not involved in the issue. Barsness noted any higher-level review will always involve the next ranking administrator. They emphasized this process assisting with faculty grievances does not currently exist and this legislation is a big culture change. All written responses are filed with the Secretary of the Faculty and follow throughout the entire grievance process.

A member highlighted the need to work with faculty across all campuses in an education campaign and recommended hearing from faculty who have experienced these issues to inform the process.

6. Faculty Code Changes: Guests: Mike Townsend

Mike Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty) joined the council to discuss the FCTCP charge regarding code changes.

The central issues were noted around changing the decision-making structure when editing the Chancellors as Deans in some places of the faculty code. FCTCP will form a subcommittee to find all instances of “deans” and “chancellors” in the code. Subcommittee members will examine the code for the straightforward editorial changes and the more difficult items which could disrupt the system. Such decisions also require chancellor and administrative approval. Chancellors are recognized in an executive order as having a significant role on their campuses.

Members will include Chair Montgomery, Turan Kayaoglu, and Jason Naranjo.

It was noted that UW Tacoma is beginning conversations regarding alignments issues when connecting to UW Seattle involving chancellor positions. UW Bothell is having similar but smaller scale discussions.

7. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes by Alexandra Portillo, xanport@uw.edu, council analyst

Present: **Faculty Governance Section 42-32 A:** Cinnamon Hillyard, Lawrence Goldman, Wes Lloyd, Lauren Montgomery (chair)
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Jason Naranjo, Chris Laws, Turan Kayaoglu, Annette Anderson, Suzen Parker, Larry Knopp, Clara Coyote
Faculty Code Section 21-61 C: Sharon Jones, Patricia Moy
Invited Guests: Ann Huppert, Zoe Barsness, Amanda Paye, Mike Townsend, Tina Miller

Absent: **Faculty Governance Section 42-32 A:** Antony Smith
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Jacob Vigdor, JoAnn Taricani
Faculty Code Section 21-61 C: Jill Purdy

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination_fctcp_proposed_changes

Exhibit 2 – 20-12-3 ADR and Grievance for FCTCP

Questions?