Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Welcome and introductions
3. Council orientation – Joey Burgess, Faculty Senate Office
4. Review of the minutes from June 5, 2018
5. Setting FCSA priorities 2018-19
6. Revising WACs/Student Conduct Code in relation to hazing – Elizabeth Lewis, Community Standards & Student Conduct
7. Student Medical Leave and Mandatory Leave development – Elizabeth Lewis, Community Standards & Student Conduct
8. Good of the order
9. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2) Welcome and introductions

New and returning members of the council introduced themselves. There were three new faculty members on the FCSA: Dean Heerwagen (Architecture), Selma Powell (Education), and Andrea Carroll (Chemistry). Heerwagen noted he formerly served on FCSA during the 1980’s.

3) Council orientation – Joey Burgess, Faculty Senate Office

Burgess gave a brief presentation on the form and function of the FCSA and the Faculty Senate using a PowerPoint (Exhibit 1).

4) Review of the minutes from June 5, 2018

The minutes from June 5th, 2018 were approved as written.

5) Setting FCSA priorities 2018-19

The council discussed its draft 2018-19 charge letter sent for review by faculty senate leadership (Exhibit 2). Laws noted the FCSA has been working closely with faculty and administrators around campus for several years regarding issues involving excusing student absences. He explained that one the council’s
formerly-affirmed goals relating to the topic was to remove the ability of faculty to demand medical excuse notes from students. It was noted the work will need to be deliberate and slow to properly ensure that feedback can be accommodated in the process of developing an adjoining policy. A member asked if the UW has a student academic attendance policy. It was noted it is currently not against policy for faculty members to grade on attendance.

Laws explained the second bullet within the charge letter is meant to encapsulate “everything else” the council is expected to be involved in during the academic year, including topics related to athletics, university student resources, development of student policies, ongoing international student initiatives, and UW fraternity and sorority life.

Laws asked members to consider issues that should be brought to the full council and contact him if any are identified.

6) Revising WACs/Student Conduct Code in relation to hazing – Elizabeth Lewis, Community Standards & Student Conduct

Elizabeth Lewis (Director, Community Standards & Student Conduct) and Anton Ward-Zanotto (Associate Director, Community Standards & Student Conduct) were present to discuss hazing at the UW. She used a PowerPoint as part of her presentation (Exhibit 3). She explained that the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 28.B.10.900 defines hazing, and explained that RCWs involve criminal penalty in Washington State. The RCW language states:

"Hazing" includes any method of initiation into a student organization or living group, or any pastime or amusement engaged in with respect to such an organization or living group that causes, or is likely to cause, bodily danger or physical harm, or serious mental or emotional harm, to any student or other person attending a public or private institution of higher education or other postsecondary educational institution in this state. "Hazing" does not include customary athletic events or other similar contests or competitions (RCW 28.B.10.900).

Lewis provided the current UW policy framework relating to hazing (Slide 3, Exhibit 3). Three policies reference/define hazing at the university: The General Code of Conduct (WAC 478-124-037), the Student Conduct Code (WAC 478-121-135), and Student Governance and Policy, Chapter 209 (7) (D) (11).

Lewis noted the General Conduct Code separates Hazing into two types: bodily danger and/or physical harm, or humiliation by ritual act and/or sleep deprivation. These are categorized colloquially as big (H) and little (h) “Hazing.” An example of little “h” is forcing new pledges in Greek houses to clean up after meals. It was noted the line between hazing and an organization’s “culture” is sometimes vague, but must be called out nonetheless.

Lewis highlighted the challenges with the current policy framework for addressing hazing at the UW (Slide 6, Exhibit 3):
The General Conduct Code does not provide a process for charging a student or organization with hazing.

The General Conduct Code allows for multiple responses for hazing which include probation for a period of time and loss of recognition for a period of time.

Multiple definitions of hazing could pose some concern of risk for the institution (Exhibit 3).

Lewis noted a plan has been formulated to address these challenges, which involves forming a Committee to engage in limited rulemaking to bring the General Conduct Code and the Student Conduct Code into alignment. Benefits of this work were highlighted (Slide 9, Exhibit 3).

It was noted FCSA would be further updated on the work surrounding hazing definitions in December, and likely asked to review and forward Class B legislation relating to this work in January.

Questions/discussion

It was noted the General Conduct Code was last changed in 1996. There is no known history/reasoning concerning the discrepancies among the policy documents in relation to hazing definitions.

It was recommended the HUB Director (Justin Camputaro) be asked to be involved in this work, which was agreed to. It was noted ROTC would be consulted, as well.

A member asked if large changes for the definition of hazing is expected as part of this work; the response was no. It was noted there are advantages to working through this topic with involvement on behalf of many representative groups: 1) reminding all the groups that hazing is against university and state policy, and 2) students can help the institution ensure the examples that are being used are real-world examples/based in modern student culture.

A member noted one of the biggest challenges in this work is the formerly-mentioned “little h versus the big H.” Some behaviors that were deemed permissible in the recent past are no longer deemed appropriate and/or legal. A member brought up social media, which saw its advent since the time the definitions were last revised.

A member asked what the relationship is between university policies on hazing and policies on harassment. Lewis noted the Student Conduct Code is very strong as far as addressing sexual harassment. This initiative is different as it focuses on individual versus group dynamics. Another member made note of the legal definition separation between harassment and hazing. A member encouraged the initiative to relate the hazing definition to harassment and contemplate the connection.

Laws recommended a faculty member of the FCSA be added to the committee to be formed to address this topic, which was agreed to. It was noted the committee schedule would be sent to members and a member identified.

7) Student Medical Leave and Mandatory Leave development – Elizabeth Lewis, Community Standards & Student Conduct
Lewis explained ongoing work (formerly discussed at length in the FCSA during 2017-18) surrounding mandatory leave and medical leave is nearly completed and a final policy draft is nearly finished. Lewis asked that members of the FCSA review the developed documentation when it is finalized, and noted it would be sent electronically to council membership.

**Medical leave**

It was noted it is not clear if the policy is to become part of a WAC, or a local policy to be adopted at the university. Lewis reminded the council that this work was initiated by recommendation of the JED Campus Program, which specifically pointed out the lack of undergraduate medical leave policy at the UW and the need for one to be developed and instituted.

Lewis reminded members this policy corresponds with students who need to take a quarter or more leave from the UW due to medical necessity. The language will allow students to come back to the UW after they have gone through that process, their departure to be formally communicated to the university, and the leave and return processes to be facilitated/supported by university personnel. It was noted the process will be managed by “Case Managers” within UW Student Life.

**Mandatory leave**

Lewis updated on the development of a mandatory leave policy, which is a similarly defined process to allow a student to take leave from the university (when necessitated) that involves a plan being in place for their return. It was noted the only “tool” the university currently has to address these cases is the Student Conduct Code, which as a result creates a student conduct record and is not ideal for students in related situations.

Lewis noted work on the initiative will be further shared in November, and there may be more clarity regarding the WAC versus local policy question at that time.

A member questioned what university office the Case Managers will reside under; the response was they will be under a Division of Student Life.

8) **Good of the order**

Johnson (president’s designee) explained housing costs in the university district was a former emphasis of the council during the last academic year. He recommended adding this to the item list of things to be addressed by the FCSA for the current year. Trilles agreed with the recommendation and explained she was formerly informed that the UW was conducting a largescale survey on student housing. Johnson recommended FCSA invite the UW Director of Housing to report on the survey and any related research. It was noted the data may inform the council’s decision to take further action.

9) **Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, assistant to the secretary of the faculty

Present: Faculty: Ann Culligan, Bruce Hevly, Chris Laws (chair), Christopher Campbell, Dean Heerwagen, Selma Powell, Andrea Carroll
Ex-officio reps: Aileen Trilles, Erin Conor, Afua Tiwaa
President’s designee: Lincoln Johnson
Guests: Elizabeth Lewis, Anton Ward-Zanotto

Absent: Faculty: N/A
Ex-officio reps: N/A

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – orientationtouniversityfacultycouncils.ppt
Exhibit 2 – fcsa_chargeletter_draft_2018-19
Exhibit 3 – hazing_wacalignment.ppt
Orientation to university faculty councils

JOEY BURGESS, UW FACULTY SENATE OFFICE
Welcome to the Faculty Senate

- George Sandison, Faculty Senate Chair
- Joe Janes, Faculty Senate Vice Chair
- Thaisa Way, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
- Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty
- JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative
- Chris Laws, Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative
- Jordan Smith, Assistant to the Chair
- Joey Burgess, Assistant to the Secretary
- Lauren Hatchett, Council Analyst
Faculty councils

- Address issues of the faculty as a whole for the general welfare of the university
- Standing committees appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and confirmed by the Faculty Senate
- Advise both the provost and the Senate Executive Committee on issues of faculty and university concerns

Roles include:
- Prepare legislation and resolutions to the Senate Executive Committee
- Submit reports to the senate chair
- Receive and make recommendations on behalf of university faculty
- Request information/assistance and appoints ad hoc committees to address university concerns
- Receive reports from university administrators and provides recommendations/feedback
- Represent faculty through service on university-wide committees
Faculty councils and subcommittees

- Academic standards
  - Admissions and programs (SCAP)
  - Admissions and graduations (SCAG)
  - Honors
  - UW Curriculum Committee (UWCC)
- Benefits and retirement
  - Family Leave
- Faculty affairs
- Multicultural affairs
- Research
  - Classified/restricted research
- Student affairs
- Teaching and Learning
  - Best Practices in Online/Hybrid Teaching and Learning Environments
  - Cataloging Assessment and Improvement of Teaching & Learning Across Colleges
  - Teaching and Learning Effectiveness for Part-Time Lecturers
  - Diversity- and Equity-Informed Pedagogies
- Tri-campus Policy
- University facilities and services
- University libraries
- Women in academia
Council membership

- Voting members of the university faculty (3-year terms)
  - Appointed by the Senate Executive Committee
- President’s designees (1-year terms)
  - Appointed by the president
- Ex officio members (1-year terms)
  - Associated Students of the University of Washington (ASUW)
  - Graduate and Professional Student Senate (GPSS)
  - Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW)
  - Professional Staff Organization (PSO)
Faculty council chairs

- Provide leadership of council activities and meetings
- Represent university faculty and their concerns to stakeholders across UW
- Work closely with Faculty Senate leadership to pass legislation/resolutions
- Work with other council chairs on issues that impact multiple stakeholder groups
- Serve as ex officio voting members of the Faculty Senate
Meetings

- Meetings last 1.5 hours
- Quorum is 50% of all voting members
- When quorum is met councils can take official actions (approve minutes/legislation/etc.)
- When quorum is not met councils can still meet, but not take official action on agenda items
- Ex-officio representatives vote on some councils, and do not vote on others
Google drive

- Used to host council meeting materials and facilitate council collaboration
- No securities on folders, all are accessible via a hyperlink sent in meeting announcements
Senate legislative process – class A

- “All changes to the Faculty Code”
- Begins with a faculty council
- Approved by the Senate Executive Committee (1\textsuperscript{st} round)
- Approved by the Senate (1\textsuperscript{st} round)
- Reviewed by the code cops and the president
- Approved by the Senate Executive Committee (2\textsuperscript{nd} round)
- Approved by the Senate (2\textsuperscript{nd} round)
- Approved by a full faculty vote
- Approved by the president
Senate legislative process – class A

- Professor of Practice
- Faculty Salary Policy
- Updates to the Faculty Code
- Academic Freedom and Responsibility
- Modifying Procedures and Promotions
Senate legislative process – class B

- “Legislation that is not class A”
- Begins with a faculty council
- Approved by the Senate Executive Committee
- Approved by the Senate
- Approved by the president
- Legislation is sent to the full faculty for feedback
- If less than 5% of voting members object, the legislation is approved
- If 5% or more object, the legislation returns to the senate to consider feedback
Senate legislative process – class B

- Updates to Scholastic Regulations Chapters 101-117
- Revisions to Student Conduct Code
- Revisions of Scholastic Regulations to create a diversity graduation requirement for undergraduates.
- Revisions related to Scholastic Regulations.
- Procedures related to Honorary Degrees.
Senate legislative process – class C

- Senate resolutions, not legislation
- Begins with a faculty council
- Approved by the Senate Executive Committee
- Approved by the Faculty Senate
- Announced to the entire voting faculty
- Non-binding; therefore used sparingly to support specific policy actions or garner awareness on exceptional issues

Alternatives to Class C’s:
- Collaborating with other councils
- Consulting with Senate Leadership to find the most effective way to address the issue
Senate legislative process – class C

- Resolution Concerning Transgender Coverage
- Resolution Concerning University of Washington International & English Language Programs Extension Lecturers
- Resolution Addressing Faculty Demographic Concerns
- Resolution Concerning Repairing Shared Governance and the Faculty Salary Policy
- Resolution Concerning the Provost Search Process
- Resolution Concerning the Faculty Fund for Library Excellence
Questions?
September 16, 2018

Christopher Laws
Chair, Faculty Council on Student Affairs

Dear Professor Laws,

The Faculty Council on Student Affairs is charged with “responsibility for all matters of policy relating to non-academic student affairs such as financial aid, housing, regulation of social affairs, eligibility rules, intercollegiate athletics, and general student welfare” (Faculty Code, Sec 42-38). Activities historically performed include addressing a prioritized list of student-related concerns, inquiries, and interests in council meetings, especially by way of inviting key administrators and stakeholders to provide supplementary information and to receive faculty and student feedback on the issues at-hand.

Our recommendation is that the council identify specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2018-19 academic year.

The Senate office did a background review to help identify goals for your council. This included review of minutes from last year’s meetings, review of discussions at Faculty Senate meetings, and selected outreach for topics. Recommended goals and / or topics for discussion include:

- Development of Medical Excuse Note Policy.
- Continue to monitor various Student Life-related ongoing initiatives and provide feedback.

After your first council meeting we will be available to discuss the goals your council identified. Thereafter, we will post your council’s goals on the Faculty Senate Website to communicate the important work you are doing on their behalf.

Sincerely,

George Sandison
Chair, Faculty Senate

/jmb
HAZING WAC ALIGNMENT
WASHINGTON STATE LAW

- Three RCWs regarding Hazing:
  - (RCW 28B.10.900) - Defines hazing
  - (RCW 28B.10.901) - Sets out the Penalty & establishes it as a crime (misdemeanor)
  - (RCW 28B.10.902) - Loss of right to state-funded grants & Scholarships for individuals; Loss of recognition of organizations.
CURRENT STATE

– Three policy documents exist at the University of Washington that define “hazing”, which collectively meet the obligations under RCW 28B.10.900-902. They include:
  – General Code of Conduct (WAC 478-124-037)
  – Student Conduct Code (WAC 478-121-135)
  – Student Governance and Policy, Chapter 209(7)(D)(11)
> WAC 478-124-037 Conduct on campus code—Hazing.
> All university organizations, associations and student living groups are prohibited from hazing.

> (1) Hazing includes:
> (a) Any method of initiation into a student organization or living group, or any pastime or amusement engaged in with respect to such an organization or living group that causes, or is likely to cause, bodily danger or physical harm, or serious mental or emotional harm to any student or other person attending the university; and

> (b) Conduct associated with initiation into a student organization or living group, or any pastime or amusement engaged in with respect to an organization or living group not amounting to a violation of (a) of this subsection, but including such conduct as humiliation by ritual act and sleep deprivation. Consent is no defense to hazing. Hazing does not include customary athletic events or other similar contests or competition.

> (2) Any university organization, association or student living group that knowingly permits hazing as defined in subsection (1)(a) of this section shall be deprived of official recognition or approval granted by the university. Any university organization, association or student living group that knowingly permits hazing as defined in subsection (1)(b) of this section shall be placed on probation for a period specified by the university.
> WAC 478-121-135 Hazing.
> Hazing includes any method of initiation into a student organization or living group, or any pastime or amusement engaged in with respect to such an organization or living group, that causes, or is likely to cause, bodily danger or physical harm, or serious mental or emotional harm, to any student or other person.
> Hazing activities may include, but are not limited to, encouraging or promoting the abuse of alcohol; striking another person whether by use of any object or any part of one's body; causing someone to experience excessive fatigue or physical and/or psychological shock; or causing someone to engage in degrading or humiliating games or activities that create a risk of serious mental, emotional, and/or physical harm. Consent of a victim or victims is not a defense to an allegation of hazing.
CHALLENGES WITH CURRENT WAC

> The General Conduct Code does not provide a process for charging a student or organization with hazing.

> The General Conduct Code allows for multiple responses for hazing for which include probation for a period of time and loss of recognition for a period of time.

> Multiple definitions of hazing could pose some concern of risk for the institution.
CHALLENGES CONTINUED

> These three documents lack consistency in defining hazing, creating confusion for students, organizations, and the University.

> The existing Student Conduct Code WAC may not individually meet the University obligations under RCW
RECOMMENDATIONS

> Engage in limited rulemaking to bring the General Conduct Code and the Student Conduct Code into alignment with each other and the RCWs regarding hazing.

> Announce rule making with the Rules Coordinator

> Form a committee with representatives from IFC, Panhellenic, NPHC, UGC as well as a representative from Athletics, ASUW, GPSS, faculty, OFSL and CSSC.
  - Anticipate that this group would meet no more than three times to finalize the work.
BENEFITS

> Proactive responsiveness to national attention on hazing

> Decreasing institutional risk through clarification of policy

> Expanding options for responses to hazing by organizations and the University

> Clarity for students understanding of hazing behaviors

> Increased opportunity for reporting by decreasing “chilling effect” of loss of recognition as only outcome to a hazing investigation for organizations