Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
2. Announcements
3. Review of the minutes from November 10, 2020
4. Task force on faculty code housekeeping changes (Townsend, Vigdor, Gregory)
5. First look at code changes for faculty ADR & grievance processes (attachments to come; Zoe Barsness & Amanda Paye, guests)
6. Good of the Order
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Announcements

Chair Lee mentioned the UW NETID issue for part-time lecturer is still in process to determine what policy choices or technical fixes need to be made. They also noted that all proposed FCFA legislation was passed unanimously by the SEC and will go to the Senate for final review.

3. Review of the minutes from November 10, 2020

The minutes from November 10, 2020 were approved as written.

4. Task force on faculty code housekeeping changes (Townsend, Vigdor, Gregory)

Mike Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty) gave an overview of the current issues in faculty code housekeeping. Initial review of the faculty code revealed the rules of housekeeping are housed in the introduction section of the code, which provides no authority to those rules. It was suggested to insert that section into Chapter 29.

Townsend noted the scope of housekeeping should generally fall into Class B legislation or Class C resolution. There was agreement among the taskforce that emergent items should be temporary, giving the Faculty Senate power to overrule.

These would be commonly categorized into 3 areas:

*Pure transcription errors:* There are individuals charged with copying the language passed by the faculty onto a webpage who may make transcription errors. The process of fixing those errors could be abbreviated and thus would not require senate action and could be permanent.
**True housekeeping**: These are determined to be typographical errors or office name changes. It would follow the same process as pure transcription errors.

**Emergent items**: This is defined as items which require immediate attention but are beyond simple grammatical or edit changes. There was discussion on the extent to which questions of compliance fit into the emergent items section.

A member noted that if there is a legal compliance issue, the SEC could act temporarily to change the code. However, this is a temporary fix to address it for up to 6 months and would eventually require Class A legislation.

It was noted that some legislatures allow clerks to handle simple transcription or housekeeping errors while others require full legislation adoption to address each item. UW has a process somewhere in-between.

Chair Lee requested the taskforce to propose draft code for the meeting in January for the council to review.

5. **First look at code changes for faculty ADR & grievance processes (attachments to come; Zoe Barsness & Amanda Paye, guests)**

Zoe Barsness shared a PowerPoint with the council (Exhibit 1).

The taskforce asked the council to review the proposed code and look for potential items faculty may oppose. They noted the annotations will not be in the final code. Barness and Mike Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty) conferred with council members on the practical matters of the grievance process.

A member noted their concern with an overly complicated process which may reduce faculty access to a fair grievance. Another council member mentioned this has been a decades long issue and this new code is highlighting the problems in such ways to publicly address the issues between faculty and administrators.

Other members stated their appreciation of this work and requested additional visual processes for faculty to review what can be grieved and how it would be handled. Barness plans to expand those identified in the conciliation group to include teaching professors and research professors, not just tenure-track faculty.

6. **Good of the Order**

Nothing was stated.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.
Minutes by Alexandra Portillo, xanport@uw.edu, council analyst

Present:  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Megan Callow, James Gregory, Aaron Katz, Jack Lee, Jacob Vigdor, Teresa Ward, Mary Pat Wenderoth, Karam Dana, Gregory Lund  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Miceal Vaughn, Xin Ying Hsu, Cass Hartnett, President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron  
Guests: Amanda Paye, Zoe Barsness, Mike Townsend

Absent:  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Jennette Kachmar

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 - 20-11-17 ADR and Grievance for FCFA
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 Faculty Affairs
November 24, 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
Faculty Grievances
Appendix A - Class C Resolution

Unit Level

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

Faculty Grievances

Faculty member files grievance

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

Time limits paused during alternative dispute resolution under Chapter 27

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