

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy  
April 21, 2011  
9:00-10:30 a.m.  
36 Gerberding

## Meeting Synopsis

- 1) Approval of Feb. 24, 2011 Meeting Minutes
  - 2) Updates from the Chair
  - 3) Tri-Campus Review Committee Updates
  - 4) Review/responses/actions from Tri-campus presentations at the Faculty Senate Meeting
  - 5) Presentation/Discussion of Tri-campus issues related to the UW Student Conduct Code -- Guest: Elizabeth Higgins -- Director, Community Standards and Student Conduct)
  - 6) 2011-2012 FCTCP Planning Discussion
- 

## Call to Order

Council chair Bill Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

### 1) Approval of Feb. 24, 2011 Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved as written.

### 2) Updates from the Chair

Erdly noted two items:

- He sat in on interviews for the UW Tacoma chancellor search. Deborah Friedman has been hired, and will start July 1.
- Tri-campus issues were presented to the Faculty Senate by Zoe Barsness and Bruce Kochis, as well as Amira Davis, the ASUW-Bothell president. He believes it is the first time the two campuses have presented concurrently at the Senate.

### 3) Tri-Campus Review Committee Updates

There were no updates.

### 4) Review/responses/actions from Tri-campus presentations at the Faculty Senate Meeting

In response to the tri-campus presentations at the Faculty Senate meeting, the council held a discussion on various issues and next steps. Among the points raised were:

- The Seattle campus tends to be underrepresented on the council in terms of faculty.
- Some sort of pattern could be established wherein experienced faculty leaders take posts on the council.
- It is important to make sure that stakeholders are involved in policy conversations on high tuition/high aid financial models, differential tuition, etc. Moves that Seattle makes have implications for Tacoma and Bothell; likewise, moves each campus makes have an effect on the overall UW brand.

- There is still education left to do in terms of informing Seattle faculty what is going on at the branch campuses regarding quality, overlap, etc.
- There is a need to come up with an audit of issues and determine who should be at the table, and what councils/committees are involved on all three campuses.

## **5) Presentation/Discussion of Tri-campus issues related to the UW Student Conduct Code**

Elizabeth Higgins, Director, Community Standards and Student Conduct, and Julie Draper, Associate Director of Student Services, UW Tacoma, joined the council for a discussion of issues related to the Student Conduct Code, particularly as it relates to student discipline and cross enrollment. They handed out copies of the code (available online at <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/WAC/default.aspx?cite=478-120>.) Higgins provided a brief review of the code and discipline process: there are three different roles within the code that can take disciplinary action, including the Vice President/Vice Provost for Student Life, chancellors and the president, and the dean of a school or college or chancellors of a program. At Tacoma and Bothell, this role is delegated to Student Affairs.

Under the Student Conduct Code, there is a bifurcated system. The dean of a school or college can take action against a student for academic misconduct, but can't take action for other matters, which are usually referred to Student Life. The policy currently used is that the home campus of a student is responsible for taking disciplinary action for a student, even when that student is cross enrolled at another campus. For example, Tacoma would work with a professor at Seattle for a Tacoma student cross enrolled at Seattle. A Seattle student in the same class would be referred to the dean of the school or college. Even when dealing with behavioral outcomes, the process would be shared with the appropriate person at the home campus of the student. The campuses work hard to clearly communicate on and across campuses to use a progressive sanctioning model. Any sanctions applied to a student are enforced across the university.

Draper explained the appeal process. There is a university disciplinary committee made up of students and faculty on all three campuses. There is only one faculty appeal board for the whole university, with representatives from all three campuses. This appeal board is strictly comprised of faculty, and they meet to hear more serious cases or appeals. There has been a lot of work to ensure that the disciplinary committees are consistent, fair, and following the code in the same way.

In the ensuing discussion, the council discussed numbers of disciplinary cases, trends in discipline, and resources available for students. Council members expressed interest in receiving an annual report on the matter, as well as materials on early identification of problems and prevention methods.

## **6) 2011-2012 FCTCP Planning Discussion**

Erdly suggested that the council identify issues and articulate them at a level of depth and meaning that would get people involved in the conversation, summarizing the issues in an annual report. Among the topics briefly mentioned were online degrees, online learning, tuition and funding models, Tacoma and Bothell representation on university committees, and cloned courses.

## **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:40 a.m.

Minutes by Craig Bosman, Faculty Council Support Analyst. [cbosman@uw.edu](mailto:cbosman@uw.edu)

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Barsness (ex officio), Holland (ex officio), Forman  
**President's Designee:** Wadden, Rushing, Jeffords  
**Ex Officio:** Deardorff  
**Guests:** Elizabeth Higgins, Julie Draper

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Reusch, Collins, Endicott, Woods, Astley (ex officio)  
**Ex Officio:** Skyles, Leadley