Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from February 25, 2020 (attachment)
3. Announcements
4. Procedure for promotions (attachment)
5. Presentation on the proposed new procedures for corrective action and discipline (Zoe Barsness and Amanda Paye)
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:01 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from March 3, 2020 (attachment)

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Announcements

Chair Lee updated the council know on the teaching professor proposal vote, which ends March 20.

He also let the council know that work is continuing to be done on the clinical faculty proposal.

4. Procedure for promotions (attachment)

Chair Lee introduced the proposed legislation and summarized the one question remaining, which is whether emeritus and/or faculty on leave should be eligible to vote on promotion (Exhibit 1). An argument against allowing them to vote is that there may be strategic reasons for going for promotion when other faculty in your unit are on leave. However, allowing emeritus or on leave faculty to vote would enlarge the eligible voting pool that can be drawn on in smaller units. The council voted not to allow emeritus and/or faculty on leave to vote on promotion.

The council then discussed whether or not subcommittee members who are not eligible voting faculty in the department should be allowed to be present for the departmental vote. The council decided that only eligible voting faculty in a candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may be present for the vote.

The council approved the Class A legislation.

5. Presentation on the proposed new procedures for corrective action and discipline (Zoe Barsness and Amanda Paye)
Chair Lee introduced Zoe Barsness, co-chair of the disciplinary task force, to discuss proposed new procedures for corrective action and discipline (Exhibit 2).

The proposed model will expand the range of sanctions to include a new category of moderate sanctions. The goal is to enhance the range of sanctions to better align with the seriousness of the misconduct. The Task Force would also like to increase the transparency and navigability of the disciplinary process for those going through it.

6. **Good of the order**

Nothing was stated.

7. **Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 12:36 p.m.

---

*Minutes by Jordan Smith, jjsmith4@uw.edu, assistant to the chair*

**Present:**

Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Jack Lee (chair), Jeremy Davis, James Gregory, Megan Callow, Tom Hazlet, Dan Jacoby, Jacob Vigdor, Teresa Ward, Mary Pat Wenderoth, Aaron Katz  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Cass Hartnett, Aileen Trilles, Miċeál Vaughan  
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron  
Guests: Mike Townsend, Zoe Barsness, Amanda Paye

**Absent:**

Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Dawn Lehman  
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Jennette Kachmar

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – Class A 24-54 without emeritus  
Exhibit 2 – Misconduct for FCFA
Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24-32.

Eligibility to deliberate and vote on a recommendation of promotion is limited to voting members of the faculty who are superior in academic rank and title to the person under consideration, subject to the limitations described in Section 21-32, Subsections C and D.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

Artists in residence shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

An initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion may be produced by a subcommittee. Such a subcommittee must consist of at least three eligible voting faculty members (where eligibility is defined in Subsection A above), and may include faculty drawn from other departments, schools, colleges, or campuses who have appropriate expertise. Members of the subcommittee shall be given the opportunity to review the candidate’s record, including external letters.

If there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the department (or undepartmentalized college or school), a subcommittee shall be formed as described above, and it shall include any
eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department or undepartmentalized college/school who are available to serve.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above), the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean’s designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee’s report and recommendation. The written summary shall identify the members of the subcommittee. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate’s response, if any, together with the committee’s report to the eligible voting faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college/school).

If there are three or more eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college/school), those eligible voting faculty members shall then meet to discuss the candidate’s record, and following the discussion they shall vote on the promotion question. If an initial report was produced by a subcommittee, members of the subcommittee who are not voting members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college/school) may be present for and participate in the discussion, but not the vote. The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate’s department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) shall then meet to discuss the candidate’s record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college/school), the recommendation of the subcommittee shall be used in lieu of a departmental vote.

If the candidate is a member of a departmentalized college or school and the faculty recommendation (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department) is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department), the chair shall transmit all
documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.
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Faculty member responds or appeals?

PROPOSED MODELS

Unit Level

No

Implement minor sanctions

Corrective Action

No

Sanctions include
- Up to one quarter suspension

Example
- Reprimand

CURRENT STATE

Unit Level

No

Implement sanction

No formal appeal option

Allegation of faculty misconduct

Serious?

Allegation of faculty misconduct

Serious or repeat misconduct?

Sanctions include

Example

Exhibit 2
CURRENT STATE

Institutional Level
- Implement moderate sanctions
  - Brief Proceeding, including option to appeal
  - Full Proceeding, including option to appeal

Institutional Level
- Implement major sanctions
  - Comprehensive Adjudication, including option to appeal

Sanctions include
- Up to dismissal

Examples of Moderate Sanctions
- Ineligible for prospective benefit for a stated period (e.g., appointment to administrative position, sabbatical)

Examples of Major Sanctions
- Suspension for a stated period
- Dismissal

PROPOSED MODELS

Allegation of faculty misconduct
- Serious? Yes
  - Implement sanction

Allegation of faculty misconduct
- Serious or repeat misconduct? Yes
  - Disciplinary Proceeding
PROPOSED MODELS

Allegation of faculty misconduct

Serious or repeat misconduct?

No

Implement minor sanctions

Corrective Action

Faculty member responds or appeals?

Yes

Proposed Models

- Enhanced range of sanctions better aligned with the seriousness of the misconduct
- Process aligned with the sanction that may be imposed
- Unit level process to support a change in a faculty member’s conduct
- Institutional level processes address more serious allegations of misconduct

Unit Level

Institutional Level

No

Brief Proceeding, including option to appeal

Implement moderate sanctions

Disciplinary Proceeding

Yes

Full Proceeding, including option to appeal

Implement major sanctions
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PROPOSED MODELS

Unit Level

Allegation of faculty misconduct

Faculty administrator requests meeting

Meeting w/ faculty administrator

Written outcome

Faculty member responds or appeals?

Next-level administrator reviews

Examples of Minor Sanctions

▪ Written Reprimand

Corrective Action

Informal coaching
Brief Disciplinary Proceeding

- Written notice to faculty member
- Investigation by investigator
- Written outcome by faculty administrator
- Faculty member appeals?
- Administrative review by faculty panel

Example of Moderate Sanctions:
- Ineligible for prospective benefit for a stated period (e.g., appointment to administrative position, sabbatical)
PROPOSED MODELS

Intake and assessment by faculty administrator

Serious or repeat misconduct?

- Written notice to faculty member
- Investigation by investigator
- Written outcome by faculty administrator
- Faculty member appeals?
- Administrative review by faculty panel

Reasons include if investigation to date indicates major sanctions may be warranted

Initiate full disciplinary proceeding?

- Hearing by faculty panel
- Written outcome by panel
- Party appeals?
- Administrative review by President

Brief Disciplinary Proceeding

> Disciplinary Proceeding Initiated

Examples of Major Sanctions
- Dismissal
- Suspension for a stated period

Example of Moderate Sanctions
- Ineligible for prospective benefit for a stated period (e.g., appointment to administrative position, sabbatical)

Examples of Moderate Sanctions
- Ineligible for prospective benefit for a stated period (e.g., appointment to administrative position, sabbatical)
**PROPOSED MODELS**

**Informal coaching**

- Intake and assessment by faculty administrator

- **No**

- **Yes**

  **Corrective Action**

  - Faculty administrator requests meeting
  - Meeting w/ faculty administrator
  - Written outcome
  - Faculty member responds or appeals?
  - Next-level administrator reviews

- **Brief Disciplinary Proceeding**

  - Written notice to faculty member
  - Investigation by investigator
  - Written outcome by faculty administrator
  - Faculty member appeals?

  - Initiate full disciplinary Proceeding?

  - Hearing by faculty panel
  - Written outcome by panel
  - Party appeals?
  - Administrative review by President

- **Full Disciplinary Proceeding**

  - Exhibit 2
Questions?