Meeting Synopsis:

1. **Call to order**
   
The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. **Review of the minutes from February 20, 2020**
   
The minutes were approved as written.

3. **Presentation of Models of Faculty Misconduct Processes – Guest: Zoe Barsness- 9:05 – 9:30am**
   
Zoe Barsness, co-chair of task force on faculty discipline and dispute resolution presented models of faculty misconduct processes (Exhibit 1).

The current model was described as a one-size solution based on deterrents and retribution. The new process would be designed for early intervention and changed behavior. The sanctions described will be at the university level – units will not have discretion in the Faculty Code to create their own.

4. **Continued Conversation on Promotion & Tenure and Academic HR: 9:30-10:30am**
   
Chair Montgomery presented the attached document on promotion and tenure (Exhibit 2).

UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have campus wide promotion and tenure committees. These committees are an additional layer of review compared to the process at UW Seattle.

The advantage of these committees is their unique overview of APT practices and standards across schools and the interdisciplinary viewpoint provided as well. It was noted that UW Bothell is largely happy with their review process for the above reason, but Tacoma is not as clear on these questions (#1 in Exhibit 2). The two campuses differ in the procedure for PT case reviews: at Bothell, the school Deans present each case to CCPT, and the CCPT chair meets with the Council of Deans and individually with
each Dean at the end of each year to promote improvement especially in terms of workload equity across campus. In Tacoma, cases are reviewed by APT as files and no direct communication with Deans occurs. Tacoma will convene a meeting of relevant faculty and administrators to talk about these issues and report back to FCTCP in the May 21 meeting.

It was determined that the issue re. APT criteria is not a tri-campus one and can be addressed by campuses independently.

While the Provost has final decision authority on all cases, it is important for all campus leaders to work together to improve transparency, clarity, and reduce anxiety for faculty. The Chair asked UW Bothell and UW Tacoma to continue talks for the next meeting.

5. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

6. Adjourn

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

Exhibit 1: 20-4-30 Misconduct for FCTCP.pdf
Exhibit 2: Questions for April 30 Meeting
Draft Models for Addressing Faculty Misconduct

Faculty Senate Task Force on Faculty Discipline and Dispute Resolution

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
April 30, 2020
CURRENT STATE – UNIT LEVEL

Chapter 25-71

- Inform and discuss w/ faculty member
- Sufficiently serious to warrant charges?
  - No
  - Implement sanction
  - No formal appeal option

Faculty member requests adjudication?

Sanctions include
- Up to one quarter suspension w/out pay

DRAFT MODEL – UNIT LEVEL

Administrative intake and assessment of allegation

- Appropriate to address at unit level?
  - Yes
  - Corrective Action
    - Example of Minor Sanction
      - Reprimand
    - Informal coaching and support
  - No

CURRENT STATE – INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

Faculty administrator receives allegations

Sufficiently serious to warrant charges?

Yes

Comprehensive Adjudication

Inform and discuss w/ faculty member
Formal investigation
Charges by Provost?
Hearing by faculty panel
Administrative review by president

DRAFT MODEL - INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

Administrative intake and assessment of allegation

Appropriate to address at unit level?

No

Brief Proceeding

Initiate full proceeding?

Reasons include if evidence indicates major sanctions may be warranted

Initiate full proceeding?

Examples of Moderate Sanctions
- Ineligible for prospective benefit for a stated period (e.g. not eligible for administrative appointment or sabbatical for a stated period)

Examples of Major Sanctions
- Suspension w/out pay
- Dismissal

Sanctions include
- More than a one-quarter suspension w/out pay
- Dismissal

Full Proceeding
Draft Model

- Enhanced range of sanctions better aligned with the seriousness of the misconduct
- Process aligned with potential sanction
- Transparency, clarity, and navigability improved
DRAFT MODEL

Corrective Action
- Faculty administrator schedules meeting
- Meeting w/ faculty administrator
- Written outcome by faculty administrator
- Faculty member responds or appeals?
  - Next-level administrator reviews
    - Retain
    - Amend
    - Withdraw

Brief Proceeding
- Written notice to faculty member
- Formal Investigation
- Written outcome by faculty administrator
- Faculty member appeals?
  - Administrative review by faculty panel
    - Affirm
    - Reverse
    - Amend
    - Alter sanction (<= moderate)
    - Remand to hearing panel

Full Proceeding
- Hearing by faculty panel
- Written outcome by panel
- Party appeals?
  - Administrative review by President
    - Affirm
    - Reverse
    - Amend
    - Alter sanction
    - Remand to hearing panel

Reasons include if evidence indicates major sanctions may be warranted

Administrative intake and assessment of allegation

Appropriate to address at unit level?

Yes

No

Exhibit 1
Questions for April 30 Meeting:

1) At Bothell and Tacoma there is currently an extra layer of APT review (with two review points in that layer - the campus P&T committee and the VCAA/Chancellor) relative to Seattle. Problems associated with this so far are:

- Is the extra step helpful or not?
- Is it a problem that the order of the steps is different (Tacoma APT cases go from Dean to EFC, whereas Seattle cases go from EFC to Dean).
- Is the size of Bothell and Tacoma faculties becoming too unwieldy for the campus level APT committees, both in terms of sheer numbers and also disciplinary expertise?
- Is the campus level review at Bothell and Tacoma procedural or substantive?

2) In February meeting it was suggested that APT criteria need more clear articulation. Should we have university wide APT guidelines? How should unit specific ones relate to them? What role might FCTCP play in this?

3) There is a lingering question about the final decision authority on APT that currently lies with the Provost. Is this a topic we want to pursue? What information do we need and/or who do we need to hear from to answer this question? What role can/should FCTCP play in such considerations?