**Project Overview (Rev. 4/15/20)**

**Background**

The Task Force was charged in Autumn Quarter 2017 by the then-chair of the Faculty Senate, Thaisa Way, the then-former chair, Zoe Barsness, and the Secretary of the Faculty, Mike Townsend, to comprehensively review and revise existing faculty disciplinary and dispute resolution processes.

The Task Force was created in response to several factors:

- **Stakeholder dissatisfaction with the current system**

  As the diversity and complexity of the University community and its faculty grow in size and complexity, faculty and administrators agree that the current system is not reflective of the values and principles that embody our work and learning environments.

- **Faculty discipline and dispute resolution processes have not been comprehensively reviewed and revised in more than 20 years**

  Faculty Senate leadership in consultation with administrative leadership and other key faculty stakeholders agreed it was time to conduct a full review of the system. Once state of the art, the current system no longer reflects or adequately leverages scholarly and practical advances in conflict management and dispute resolution, evidence-based research in organizational justice, or the evolution of best practices in the labor context. Although discrete revisions have been made in response to regulatory changes, it has not kept up with the demands of the rapidly evolving federal and state regulatory landscape, including under Title IX and federal research funding requirements.

- **Completion of significant revisions to the University’s Student Conduct Code in Spring 2017**

  The extensive revisions to the Student Conduct Code assure due process, facilitate timely resolution/redress of concerns, and provide for equitable treatment and fairness. It became clear to faculty involved in that project that the Faculty Code and related processes should undergo a similar revision to be made equally strong.

**Expected Benefits of the New System**

The expected benefits of the new system include:

- **Problem solving early at the lowest level of conflict will be prioritized so that more issues can be resolved in a manner that addresses the parties’ interests, yet preserves institutional and communal ability to hold faculty and decision makers accountable;**

- **Processes will be better aligned with the intensity and type of conflict, issue, or problem being addressed which will reduce the use of institutional and individual resources for lower level issues and preserve these resources for issues that potentially have serious consequences, complexity, or institutional impact;**

- **Addressing issues at the appropriate level reduces risks and costs associated with escalation and adversarial conflict; and**

- **Increased transparency of processes and decision making will promote consistency, equity, and fairness of outcomes.**