Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from January 23, 2020
3. Report from the Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution—Guest: Zoe Barsness- 9:05 – 9:30am, link to video
4. Conversation on Promotion & Tenure and Academic HR: 9:30-10:30am
   Guests: Cheryl Cameron, VP Academic Personnel, Yonn Dierwechter- APT Chair UWT, Becca Price, CCPT Chair UWB, Dean Bob Stacey-A&S Seattle, Jack Lee – Chair, FCFA, Casey Bryne – UWT Director of Academic Personnel, Beth Beam – UWB Assist. VP Organizational Excellence & HR
5. Good of the order
6. Adjourn

1. Call to order

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

Chair Montgomery updated the council on an email sent to the Provost with recommendations from the council regarding the Chancellors at UW Tacoma and Bothell regularly meeting with the Provost and President. The Provost responded by saying that he would call a meeting of the Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, and the chair of the Board of Deans and Chancellors, Mia Tuan to discuss the issue.

2. Review of the minutes from January 23, 2020

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Report from the Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution—Guest: Zoe Barsness- 9:05 – 9:30am, link to video

Zoe Barsness, co-chair of the task force on faculty discipline and dispute resolution, gave an update on the process (Exhibit 1).

The disciplinary process for faculty has not been updated for 30 years. The task force has been meeting for over a year and this will be a major rewrite of the Faculty Code. An important component of the rewrite is to introduce intermediate steps before an adjudication is filed.

In response to questions, Barsness said that there may be an increase in the number of cases that go to the Ombuds office under the proposed model, which is a good thing. The Ombuds office is able to solve cases informally through conciliation.
Barsness also said that the proposed Faculty Liaison position would be a good resource for junior faculty or part-time faculty to help them navigate the process. There will be a form online to initiate step one of the proposed process and the Faculty Liaison will help faculty members fill out.

Department chairs will also undergo training on the new proposal to try and ensure that they are prepared for the updated process.

4. **Conversation on Promotion & Tenure and Academic HR:** 9:30-10:30am
   
   **Guests:** Cheryl Cameron, VP Academic Personnel, Yonn Dierwechter - APT Chair UWT, Becca Price, CCPT Chair UWB, Dean Bob Stacey - A&S Seattle, Jack Lee – Chair, FCFA, Casey Byrne – UWT Director of Academic Personnel, Beth Beam – UWB Assist. VP Organizational Excellence & HR

   Chair Montgomery gave an overview of the topic (Exhibit 2).

   The role of the Provost’s office in the promotion and tenure process is to be the final decision maker. Everything up to the level of the Provost is a recommendation and the Provost makes the final decision. This process means that there is an extra step for UW Tacoma and UW Bothell. The order of the steps can also be problematic – in UW Tacoma the process goes from the Dean to the Elected Faculty Council whereas on the Seattle campus it goes from the Elected Faculty Council to the Dean. UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have grown exponentially in recent years, so their processes may need to be reassessed.

   More detailed promotion and tenure criteria could be helpful. There is currently Class A legislation from the Faculty Council on Women in Academia to make promotion and tenure criteria in each unit publicly available. It would also be helpful to have criteria established to provide clear guidelines for promotion and tenure for the entire process.

   The need for change is not a settled issue on all campuses. There are some faculty who think the additional step is helpful as it provides more information and feedback. The council may need to gather data from a wider group of faculty to learn more about the issue. There are discussions every year about whether the review is procedural or substantive.

   The Campus Council on Promotion and Tenure (UW Bothell) and Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (UW Tacoma) committees do not always have the expertise to review cases. They may not be disciplinary experts or experts when it comes to teaching or research. The committees are also seeing an increase in the number of cases, but has the same timelines as in the past, which can be hard to meet.

   The council will continue to discuss this issue at future meetings.

5. **Good of the order**

   Nothing was stated.

6. **Adjourn**

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

---

*Minutes by Jordan Smith, jjsmith4@uw.edu, assistant to the chair*
Present: Faculty Governance Section 42-32 B: Lauren Montgomery (chair), Wes Lloyd, Lawrence Goldman, Keith Nitta, Robin Angotti, Sarah Hampson, Antony Smith, Cinnamon Hillyard
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Allen Wood, Suzan Parker, Annette Anderson
Faculty Code Section 21-61 C: Patricia Moy, Jill Purdy, Sharon Jones
Invited Guests: Bob Stacey, Casey Byrne, Jack Lee, Rebecca Price, Cheryl Cameron, Beth Beam, Amanda Paye, Zoe Barsness, Yonn Dierwechter

Absent: Faculty Governance Section 42-32 B: JoAnn Taricani, Joseph Tennis
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Sam Akeyo

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Proposed Grievance Model
Exhibit 2 – APT Issues
Executive Summary of Revisions to the Faculty Disciplinary Code and Process

1. Overview

In the fall of 2017, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, Thaisa Way, and Secretary of the Faculty, Mike Townsend, charged the Faculty Senate Task Force on the Faculty Disciplinary Code and Process to review and revise the faculty disciplinary process and related policies as reflected in the Faculty Code to align with legal labor standards, relevant federal and state research funding requirements, and additional standards as determined appropriate.

The motivation for this work was three-fold. First, with completion of the revised Student Code of Conduct in spring of 2017, it was clear that the Faculty Code and related processes should be made equally strong and clear to assure due process, timely resolution/redress, equitable treatment and fairness.

Second, as the Faculty Code and sections of the UW Policy Directory which pertain to the faculty disciplinary process had not been substantially reviewed for over two decades, Senate leadership in consultation with administrative leadership and other key faculty disciplinary system stakeholders, felt it was time to conduct a full review of the system and propose revisions to it as deemed appropriate. Our current system, which was once state of the art, no longer reflects or adequately leverages scholarly and practical advances in conflict management and dispute resolution or labor relations best practices. In addition, it does not sufficiently meet the demands imposed by changes that have occurred in our regulatory and governing contexts (e.g., federal research and Title IX compliance requirements, changes in the Washington Administrative Procedures Act and other controlling legal decisions). Our current system, which has experienced many tweaks in response to changes in that regulatory landscape over the last two or more decades, creaks along but does not serve us as well as we would like or should expect. Stakeholders across the system express significant levels of dissatisfaction.

Finally, as the diversity and complexity of our university faculty increases, including the current engagement of three robust campus communities, we must assure that our disciplinary, grievance and dispute resolution processes and code are reflective of the values and principles we hold yet better suited to address the complex landscape of our university.

2. Key provisions of the Faculty Code (administrative, conciliatory and adjudicative processes) need review and substantive updating, because of significant shortcomings in our current system.

Current System Shortcomings

- Employs one set of adjudicative processes to serve all problems, both disciplinary cases and grievances. Current processes are not tailored to the nature of the conflict, problem or dispute and all conflicts, problems and disputes—whether minor or major—are addressed the same way.

- Fails to encourage and facilitate early intervention at the lowest levels of conflict, problem or dispute intensity or severity, when these are more amenable to resolution and mitigation. Consequently, interpersonal conflicts and minor disciplinary issues or grievances tend to be suppressed or escalated, exacerbating conflicts, problems and disputes.
Relies on heavily protracted and legalistic processes that are difficult and costly—emotionally and financially—to navigate.

Highly adversarial. Rather than encouraging and supporting a problem-solving orientation first, our current system encourages parties tend to hunker down and entrench their positions in anticipation of legalistic battles they expect to engage down the road.

Time and resource intensive

Fosters inconsistency and inequity; outcomes vary across time, units and by decision maker

Complex and reliant on siloed systems
  o No clear connection with other policy provisions on discrimination and harassment, research misconduct, financial impropriety
  o Negatively impacts the alignment of appropriate processes and expertise required to support problem solving and accurate, appropriate means to address misconduct
  o Increases costs, reduces timeliness, diminishes further ease of navigability, negatively impacts accuracy, equity and fairness of outcomes

No systematic data collection so it’s hard to assess how the system is performing

Implications of current system shortcomings:

Processes/options not easily navigable, understood or implemented—faculty and administrators are not aware of options

Difficult to achieve closure; it’s not clear when appeals are exhausted

Limited ability to monitor and identify trends to inform continuous improvement and identify needed education, training, or policy changes

Does not adequately address the interests of the parties, increases costs, erodes community well-being and creates risk for the institution

3. Three committees – Faculty Disciplinary Steering Committee, Values & Principles Committee, Drafting Committee – were charged to:

To tackle this complex project, a tri-part committee structure was established that includes a Steering Committee, which oversees two work groups: Values and Principles and Legal and Regulations (i.e., the Drafting Committee).

Steering Committee Charge:

The Steering Committee is charged with overseeing the process of review and revision of the Faculty Code regarding the faculty disciplinary process and policies. This includes, but is not limited to: 1) an identification and articulation of the values and guiding principles that motivate our approach to faculty discipline, 2) the options available within the framework of labor law and policy requirements to inform our faculty disciplinary process, 3) the appropriate delegation of authority of the elements that comprise the faculty disciplinary code and related policies and 4) the design principles and process specifications for the proposed system. This committee will consider and approve all recommendations emerging from the two work groups. To emphasize, this committee will confirm that all appropriate parties have been consulted prior to the legislative and policy proposals being submitted for any final approval by faculty and/or administration. It will be responsible for the final proposal of the revised faculty disciplinary code and associated policies to the UW Faculty Senate and administrative leadership.
Values and Principles Work Group Charge:
The Values and Principles Work Group is charged to identify and clearly articulate the values and guiding principles that will serve as the foundational framework for the revised Faculty Code and related policies relevant to the faculty disciplinary process and policies. This effort will include, but not be limited to: 1) an inventory and assessment of current dispute resolution, disciplinary and adjudication processes and resources; 2) a review of disciplinary and adjudication models from other universities; 3) interviews with key thought leaders on all three campuses that will help inform the work group’s discussions and conclusions and 4) articulation of the design principles and process specifications for the proposed system. This work group will then respond to the Legal and Regulations Work Group draft faculty disciplinary code and policy to assure alignment with the values and principles framework. They will establish recommendations for all areas of the faculty disciplinary code and associated and relevant policies that are not pre-determined by labor law or other external regulations and will articulate the design principles and process specification for the proposed system. This work group will report to the Steering Committee and make the final recommendation to the Steering Committee for adopting a revised Faculty Code on disciplinary process and associated and relevant policies and practices.

Legal and Regulations Work Group (i.e. Drafting Committee) Charge:
The Legal and Regulations Work Group (i.e., Drafting Committee) is to develop a clear and complete legislative and administrative framework for the disciplinary and adjudication processes addressed in the Faculty Code and UW Policy Directory. The Legal and Regulations Work Group will identify all policies and practices that are relevant to the disciplinary process that do not require being in the Faculty Code but require delegation elsewhere. They will advise the Values and Principles Work Group on recommended decisions regarding proposed changes to the faculty disciplinary code and respond to feedback from external groups and individuals. They will meet as needed with the Steering Committee to explain the legislative and policy frameworks that are being proposed. The Legal and Regulations Work Group will determine the process for sharing draft legislation and policy with faculty and appropriate administrative personnel and leadership and subsequently guide the response to feedback.

See Appendix A for information on task force membership.

4. The committees developed a motivating values framework to guide their work (See Appendix B):
   - Principles for dispute resolution processes:
     - Clear, equitable, fair, transparent, ethical, timely
   - Principles for dispute outcomes:
     - Efficacy, accountability, accuracy, proportionality, education, alignment and consistency
   - Community values
     - Academic and intellectual freedom
     - Academic, research and professional integrity
     - Equity and inclusion
     - Ethical behavior, fairness and respect
     - Individual and community health and well-being
     - Accountability to each other and the community as a whole
     - Learning and continuous improvement
5. **Proposed system:**

Proposed system strives to create better alignment of process to disciplinary, conflict and dispute resolution needs.

*Development of design principles and process specifications:*
- Mapped current disciplinary, grievance and dispute resolution landscape at UW; identified stakeholder pain points, concerns and issues
- Reviewed peer practices and AAUP recommended best practices
- Sought input from relevant University stakeholders
- Assessed alignment with motivating values framework

*Proposed system approach*
- Leverages evidence-based research on organizational justice (distributive, procedural and interactional) and dispute resolution
- Reflects AAUP best practices
- References applicable federal and state legal frameworks
- Incorporates modern labor relations practices

*Introduction to three (new) buckets rather than current one*
- **Grievances**
  - Focus on problem solving: an individual’s problem becomes a problem for the institution, and as such must be addressed for good organizational functioning
  - Informal ADR processes available before and after grievance is filed
- **Corrective action and discipline**
  - Now separated from grievances
  - Expanded toolbox offers variety of tools (including opportunities for education and early intervention) for corrective action, instead of one blunt instrument (adjudication)
  - Notice and due process provisions – as required by the APA – are retained; new process to replace Chapter 25-71 (discipline)
- **Resolution of interpersonal conflict**
  - Conciliation
  - Mediation
  - Options for addressing interpersonal conflict when it verges on misconduct

6. **Conclusion and summary: tying these pieces together**

*How and why proposed new code language is an improvement … demonstrate how values and principles are visible in new processes*

*Proposed system benefits*
- Better aligns processes employed with the intensity and type of conflict, issue or problem being addressed
- Improves the use of resources and time
- Addresses issues at the appropriate level, reducing risks and minimizing costs associated with escalation and adversarial conflict
Effects a cultural shift to focus on problem solving first and whenever possible

Supports and guides efforts to intervene early, at the lowest levels of conflict or issue intensity and resolve—when possible—in a manner that addresses the parties’ interests yet preserves institutional and communal ability to hold faculty and decision makers accountable for their behavior and actions in ways that are proportional to the behaviors and actions in question

- Enhances consistency, equity and fairness of outcomes

7. **Timelines (See Presentation PDF)**
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Exhibit 1
Motivating Values for Faculty Disciplinary Code and Dispute Resolution Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY VALUES</th>
<th>DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROCESSES</th>
<th>DISPUTE OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process and outcomes aspire to promote and uphold our shared values, including values such as:</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic &amp; Intellectual Freedom</td>
<td>People know what to expect</td>
<td>Seek to achieve resolution at the lowest level of dispute intervention possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic, Research &amp; Professional Integrity</td>
<td>Processes are understandable and navigable</td>
<td>Strive to address all parties’ concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity &amp; Inclusion</td>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td>Alignment &amp; Consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior, Fairness &amp; Respect</td>
<td>Equal access to process for everyone</td>
<td>Outcomes are aligned/consistent with community values as well as the values of the appointing academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual &amp; Community Health &amp; Well-being</td>
<td>Processes and procedures are conducted in a consistent and uniform manner across time, disputes and institutional units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to Each Other &amp; the Community as a Whole</td>
<td>Processes are neutral/lack bias:</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Learning &amp; Improvement</td>
<td>o No person or group is singled out for discrimination or ill-treatment</td>
<td>Decision makers are responsible for exercising their roles with integrity, in a manner consistent with the faculty code and our community values and are responsible for the consequences associated with implementing decision outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Provide protections for all community members regardless of status or power (e.g. tenure/non-tenure track faculty, faculty of different rank, staff, students, etc.)</td>
<td>Community members are held responsible for their behaviors and outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Proportionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assures appropriate levels of due process</td>
<td>A range of disciplinary actions is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All appropriate parties are included in the process</td>
<td>Disciplinary action matches the presenting transgression and considers relevant history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parties are treated with dignity, courtesy, and respect</td>
<td>Appointment, promotion and merit outcomes match responsibilities and performance expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mechanisms are available for fixing mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevant information is shared with appropriate parties in a timely manner</td>
<td>Decisions are based on accurate and available information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making process and criteria are communicated; parties know:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o What is happening, when;</td>
<td>Educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The outcome received;</td>
<td>Decisions are shared to assure broad understanding of community values, expectations and norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Why decision outcome occurred</td>
<td>Opportunities for learning, reconciliation and grace are provided as appropriate (e.g., decision outcomes promote a culture that creates space for people to make honest mistakes and come back from them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek to address disputes at earliest point of intervention possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disputes are resolved as quickly as practicable given the nature of the dispute and dispute resolution procedure employed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 1
Proposed Grievance Model

Faculty Senate Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
February 20, 2020

CURRENT STATE

Discipline for misconduct
Grievance: faculty member disagrees with a decision by an administrator affecting terms or conditions of employment

Optional Conciliatory Proceedings

Brief or Comprehensive Adjudication

Interpersonal conflict
Contested administrative decisions

Interpersonal conflict

Faculty member disagrees with a decision, or has a problem and needs to engage the administration to solve it.

Other disputes between/among faculty members

Does not include allegations of misconduct or policy violation.

FUTURE STATE

Discipline

Faculty member's behavior is questioned and the University has the obligation to address it.

FUTURE STATE

Concerns about administrative decisions are addressed at an appropriate level with those who can solve the problem.

Multi-step process that encourages parties to engage in mutual problem solving with recourse to more formal resolution, if necessary.

FUTURE STATE
STEP ONE
Immediate review
Faculty administrator (e.g. chair or assoc. dean) meets with grievant, followed by written response

STEP TWO
Academic unit review
Next level faculty administrator (e.g. dean) meets with grievant, followed by written response

STEP THREE
Institutional review
Faculty Grievance Panel reviews record of grievance with option to hold a meeting with the parties, followed by a written response

Discretionary review
by President

Who are the Steps 1 and 2 respondents?
• If President, Provost, or Chancellor, skip to Step 3
• If promo, tenure, merit, etc. skip to Step 3
• Avoid Step 2 Respondent that is an administrator at a higher level than a Dean

Who attends Steps 1 and 2?
• Faculty Liaison may attend at the request of the faculty member
• Administrator may bring a resource, as needed, to focus on problem-solving (e.g. an "administrative liaison")

Optional: Faculty member requests informal discussion with faculty administrator

PROPOSED GRIEVANCE MODEL

Chair of the Faculty Grievance Panel decides whether to move to Step 3

Grievant requests next step?

Step 3 standard not intended to be more restrictive than current standard

Grievant, faculty administrator, or panel requests review?

TBD if/when opportunity for ADR ends

Voluntary alternative dispute resolution available

Who attends Step 3?
• Facilitated by Chair of the Faculty Grievance Panel

Types of issues: institutional impact or broad policy implications

Can delegate to Provost or Chancellor/Vice Chancellor

Questions?

TBD if/when opportunity for ADR ends
SUMMARY TIMELINE FOR CLASS C RESOLUTION AND CLASS A LEGISLATION

**Fall 2019 and prior**
- Models and concepts developed by Steering Committee, Values and Principles Committee

**Winter 2020**
- Presentation of models and concepts for Class C resolution to FCFA, FCTCP, CEFC, CUFC, BoDC and other vetting bodies

**Spring 2020**
- Faculty Senate and SEC review; Class C resolutions introduced
  - Design principles
  - Process specifications

**Summer 2020**
- Drafting committee: actual code language

**Fall 2020**
- Review of code language to ensure alignment with models and concepts; Class A legislation introduced

---

**PROCESS PARTNERS**
- Office of Academic Personnel
- Compliance Services
- University Ombud
- Office of Research Misconduct Proceedings
- School of Medicine Administration
- Internal Audit

---

**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

- Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
- Chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils
- Chairs of the University Faculty Councils
- Board of Deans & Chancellors
- Faculty Senate
- Executive Committee
- President
- Chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils
- Chairs of University Faculty Councils
- Board of Deans
- Chancellors

---

**Faculty vote**
Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Issues  
Arising from the Tri-campus Structure - 2019

From UW Bothell:

**A. Administrative Process for P&T:** The Provost’s Office gives deference to the individual campus decisions regarding P&T issues with the Provost’s Office only reviewing files for procedural issues and this review occurs jointly with the relevant Chancellor and VCAA. There will have to be initial approval and periodic checks to ensure campus guidelines align with UW Faculty Code.

From UW Tacoma:

**A. Academic Hiring:** The dynamic nature of the UW Tacoma campus means that faculty staffing needs can shift rapidly. The annual hiring plan system fails to recognize the time urgency and the non-seasonal nature of some faculty searches. UW Tacoma has been unable to launch searches prior to the conclusion of the academic year due to significant delays in granting approvals which results in a delayed hiring cycle where we lose out on promising hires. The UW approach to faculty hiring fails to recognize that Tacoma lacks a pool of doctoral students and qualified academics who can fulfill urgent curricular needs.

**B. Personnel decisions:** Decisions about personnel issues such as merit pay, faculty leave-of-absence and excess compensation are controlled in Seattle, while the impacts of these decisions are borne entirely in Tacoma, affecting staff and faculty whose positions are solely at the Tacoma campus. Policies made in Seattle do not appear to consider circumstances and impacts on the Tacoma campus. For non-student employees, UW Tacoma is required to conform to the minimum wage law for the City of Seattle rather than the City of Tacoma despite differences in the cost of living between locations. UW Tacoma has continually had positive financial outcomes, and should have more discretion over compensation in ways that are consistent with our budget.

**C. Promotion and Tenure Authority:** Faculty positions and the tenure of UW Tacoma faculty members rests solely in Tacoma, yet decisions about those appointments are made in Seattle. This creates a number of inequities and sources of dissatisfaction. Faculty at the Tacoma and Bothell campuses undergo an additional round of evaluation (at the campus level) that is not present at the Seattle campus. The timeliness of decisions has been a significant issue in recent years, with decisions not arriving until 4-5 months after they have been finalized on our campus. While adaptations have clearly been made by the Provost’s Office to recognize the increased emphasis on teaching at UW Tacoma, there appears to be little acknowledgement that the traditional signals of scholarly excellence (e.g., elite peer-reviewed publications) could be different and more varied for UW Tacoma faculty. Awareness and understanding of our specific mission and the alignment of our tenure and promotion criteria with that mission is strongest at the campus level. Unlike at a research-intensive campus, customary pathways for research program development are limited by the high teaching load and the lack of doctoral students and postdocs. UW Tacoma strives to be at the cutting edge of research that has real world impact, which may mean putting
research into practice quickly rather than waiting several years for a journal publication. Further, as the global movement for open access scholarship grows, our collective definition of what scholarly products signal academic excellence will have to change. UW Tacoma already has systems in place to ensure academic integrity and excellence among faculty, with a campus-wide elected faculty council responsible for reviewing all promotion cases, and it should be responsible for its own faculty quality. Greater autonomy for P&T at the local level would recognize that our research mission differs in substantive ways from that of the Seattle campus.