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
University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination

Updated October 22, 2020 TBD

Introduction

Executive Order IV, Policy Directory, Faculty Code and Governance, Chapter 13 Section 13-23.C: Legislative Authority of the Faculty (3 February 2004) requires the President to refer the following types of undergraduate program changes to the Faculty Senate for coordinated faculty review by all three campuses: undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, or other transcriptable programs, or substantive changes to the same, regardless of campus of origin. The purpose of this process is to enhance the quality of undergraduate course offerings through peer review, promote coordination and communication among the colleges, schools, and campuses, and to promote faculty collaboration that can lead to greater quality and optimal use of resources. This memo describes the process for carrying out the University Campuses Review Process. Please note, however, that no campus has the power or authority to veto a program or program change proposed by another campus. Finally, this review is designed to generate feedback at a point in time where the proposals are developed but not approved so that the originating campus can make full use of any feedback that is provided.

Process

Stage 0: Notice of Proposal
Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals
Stage II

Stage 0: Notice of Proposal

1. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. In order to facilitate coordination of substantive changes to their curriculum, a unit planning to offer a new undergraduate degree, major, minor, option, or other transcriptable credential or substantive change to any of these, should prepare a Notice of Proposal (NOP). If a unit is uncertain whether or not a change is substantive, they should contact the campus-specific curriculum review committee.
2. Once a unit has drafted an NOP, and had it approved by the appropriate administrators in its School or College, the document should be sent electronically to the University Curriculum Office. Staff will conduct a preliminary review to assure that appropriate information and approvals have been included. Once that review has been completed, the Curriculum Office will inform the appropriate campus academic program review committee that an NOP has been submitted.

3. The NOP will be posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days before it can be submitted to the campus-specific curriculum review process.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Curriculum Office shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) Office of the Provost, (3) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs, (4) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee, (5) the academic advisers of each campus, and (6) the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

5. If there are no significant comments to be resolved, or if they have been resolved, the unit may go forward with developing the proposal. A record of the NOP will be kept electronically that is password protected, including comments made during the early notice period.

6. Once a full proposal has been developed, the NOP will be included in the official university-wide full tri-campus review.

**Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals**

1. Following the university-wide NOP review and after a campus unit develops and approves a curricular offering, it should be forwarded to the appropriate academic program review committee for that campus.

2. The academic program review committee of each campus shall make an initial determination that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit academic program review. It shall also determine whether the proposed change meets the guidelines for tri-campus review. If a campus academic program review committee has questions about the applicability of the Tri-campus review process, they should consult the University Registrar.
   a. If the proposal meets this threshold, it shall be forwarded immediately to the University Curriculum Office. Materials to be forwarded to the University Curriculum Office must include, in electronic form:
      i. A completed university curriculum form Form 1503
      ii. The rationale for the proposal
   b. If the proposal is not complete, it shall be returned by the University Curriculum Office to the unit of origin for further development.
3. When the University Curriculum Office receives the completed program proposal, it will be immediately posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days.\(^2\)

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Curriculum Office shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs and (3) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

At the end of the comment period, the University Curriculum Office shall compile all comments made on the proposal and forward the comments to the Chair of the academic program review committee at the originating campus. That committee shall then consider all comments as part of their academic program review process, and shall provide a summary of responses to the comments received from all campuses.

Stage II

1. The originating campus academic program review committee will obtain final campus approvals on the final proposal.

2. When final campus approval has been received the proposal will be forwarded by the appropriate campus official to the University Curriculum Office.

3. The University Curriculum Office will forward the final proposal to the President for final action and transmittal to the appropriate dean/chancellor and Chair of the Faculty Senate. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

\(^2\)Substantive changes requiring an NOP include, but are not limited to:

a. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript, for example, new or changed degree titles, minors, or options, etc.

b. Changing admission type, for example, from minimum requirements to capacity constrained

c. Any change in a program on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses, for
example changing the format of a program to distance learning or fee-based offering.

d. Any change, at the discretion of the Office of the University Registrar, warranting tri-campus review

2 UW, Seattle: Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)
   UW, Bothell: General Faculty Organization
   UW, Tacoma: Faculty Assembly

3 The originating campus’ academic program review committee will review its own proposals, and should consider the following elements, using its own processes and criteria:

   • Fit with campus and university mission
   • Academic quality
   • Need
   • Effects on students
   • Effects on other programs
   • Feasibility/operational viability
   • Adherence to University and Campus policies

4 As stated in the Executive Order, tri-campus review is required for new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, or substantive changes to the same of a non-routine nature. This includes, but may not be limited to:

   a. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript, for example, new or changed degree titles, minors, or options, etc.
   b. Changes in pre-requisites that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students admitted to the major, minor, or option.
   c. Changes in graduation requirements that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students completing the major, minor, or option.
   d. Any change in a program on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses, for example changing the format of a program to distance learning or fee-based offering.

5 The Registrar may grant a 5-business day extension of this deadline to any individual who submits a written request to the Registrar prior to the end of the original comment period.
Overview of Class A Legislation of Chapter 27: ADR and Faculty Grievances

Faculty Senate Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
December 3, 2020
Project Overview

• Class C Resolution of models passed in Spring 2020
  • Grievances
  • Faculty Discipline

• Class A Legislation consistent with models in academic year 2020-2021
  • Alternative Dispute Resolution and Faculty Grievances
  • Corrective Action and Disciplinary Proceedings
Current Code

Chapter 27 - Administrative and Conciliatory Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences
- Administrative Proceedings
- Conciliation

Chapter 28 - Adjudicative Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences
- Faculty Grievances
- “Charges” of Faculty Misconduct

Class A Legislation

Chapter 27 – Alternative Dispute Resolution and Faculty Grievances
- Informal Resolution
- University Alternative Dispute Resolution
  - Ombud Office
  - Conciliation
- Faculty Grievances

Chapter 28 – Corrective Action and Disciplinary Proceedings
- Corrective Action
- Disciplinary Proceedings
Key Features of Faculty Grievances

• 2-step unit level process designed for early resolution and problem solving
  • With option to request institutional level review if not resolved

• Certain grievances advance directly to institutional level
  • Promotion and/or tenure
  • Merit and salary increases
  • Non-renewal of faculty appointment
  • Removal due to program elimination

• If not resolved, can request discretionary review by president
Discretionary Review by President

Institutional Review by three-person panel
• 2 faculty from Faculty Adjudication Panel
• 1 faculty administrator and/or panel

Step 1 Review
Faculty administrator (e.g. chair or assoc. dean) meets with grievant, followed by written response
Step 2 Review
Next-level faculty administrator (e.g. dean) meets with grievant, followed by written response

Satisfy standard for Institutional Review?
Yes
Institutional Review
by three-person panel
• 2 faculty from Faculty Adjudication Panel
• 1 faculty administrator

Discretionary Review by President

No
Outcome from Step 2 Review stands

Grievant, faculty administrator, and/or panel requests review?

Coordinator (currently Chair of the Faculty Adjudication Panel) decides with standard not intended to be more restrictive than current standard for adjudication

Faculty Grievances
Appendix A - Class C Resolution

Unit Level
Faculty member files grievance

Step 1 Review
Faculty administrator (e.g. chair or assoc. dean) meets with grievant, followed by written response

Grievant requests next step?

Faculty member contests administrative decision that affects terms or conditions of faculty appointment

Coordinator (currently Chair of the Faculty Adjudication Panel) decides whether the petition states a matter subject to grievance

If promotion, tenure, merit, etc., skip to Institutional Review with current code standard of limited review

Institutional Level

Time limits paused during alternative dispute resolution under Chapter 27

Exhibit 2
Questions?