Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from May 31st, 2016
3. Welcome and introductions
4. Council orientation
5. ACIA Class C resolution (Frank Hodge)
6. Student Conduct Code revisions (Kara Blake, Ellen Taylor, Jill Lee, Amanda Paye)
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to order (00:00 - 1:50)

Laws called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from May 31st, 2016 (0:00 - 1:50)

The minutes from May 31st, 2016 were approved as written.

3) Welcome and introductions (01:50 - 10:08) (Exhibit 1)

Council members and guests introduced themselves. There was one new member present: Doug Brock, from the Department of Family Medicine, School of Medicine.

The council read over its 2016-2017 charge letter, forwarded by faculty senate leadership (Exhibit 1). Though it was noted there are three or four more items the council foresees addressing during the course of the year, the document itself provides a good summary of the council’s major expected activities in 2016-2017.

4) Council orientation (10:08 - 18:04) (Exhibit 2)

Burgess (CSA) gave a presentation to the council concerning its function and role within the wider faculty senate, and within the University of Washington. He used a PowerPoint during his presentation (Exhibit 2). There were no questions at the end of the presentation.

5) ACIA Class C resolution (Frank Hodge) (18:04 - 36:30) (Exhibit 3)

Frank Hodge (Professor, Accounting/Faculty Athletic Representative) was present to gain the endorsement of the FCSA for a Class C Resolution Concerning University of Washington Students (Exhibit 3).
Points made during discussion:

- During discussion it was agreed that, in addition to faculty members, coaches also need to value extracurricular academic opportunities student athletes undertake (e.g. study abroad opportunities and academic conferences).
- Revisions to the document were made in the final Be It Resolved clause expanding the resolution to apply to coaches, advisors, and other university personnel who work with students.

Hodge noted he would forward the revised Class C resolution to be reviewed by the Advisory Council on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) in their upcoming meeting. He noted he would return to the FCSA in its November meeting to report back and request the council’s endorsement for the revised version of the resolution.

Hodge was thanked for presenting, and left the meeting.

6) **Student Conduct Code revisions (Kara Blake, Ellen Taylor, Jill Lee, Amanda Paye)** (36:30-1:06:40) (Exhibits 4) (Exhibit 5) (Exhibit 6)

Jill Lee (Executive Director, Compliance Services), Amanda Paye (Deputy Title IX/ADA Coordinator, Compliance Services), Ellen Taylor (Assistant Vice-President, Student Life), Kara Blake (Project Manager, Compliance Services), and Elizabeth Lewis (Director, Community Standards & Student Conduct) were present to give an update to the council on the ongoing draft Phase II changes being made to the UW Student Conduct Code (SCC). The guests explained that Phase II revisions are more substantial than Phase I, and include reevaluating the entire student conduct process at the UW, both for non-Title IX and Title IX (sexual assault) student misconduct cases. They explained the draft changes have been designed to create a more efficient and linear process, better reflect trauma informed practices, enhance transparency and understanding, and better serve the diverse community of the UW. They reported that the new Student Conduct Code is expected to be implemented in September of 2017.

The guests gave the council a presentation on draft revisions that have been made thus far, and utilized several documents as attachments (Exhibit 4) (Exhibit 5) (Exhibit 6). They explained the council is asked in this meeting to review flow charts of the current and proposed processes.

Presentation points:

- The OCR (Office for Civil Rights) measures the “fact finding period,” including the duration of time it takes to complete initial fact finding in Title-IX student conduct cases as one metric of a university’s effectiveness in responding to Title IX student misconduct.
- The proposed student conduct process model moves all fact finding to the beginning of the conduct process. In addition, students are given more opportunities to respond during early stages of the process. This section of the code was revised to be made more sensitive to the needs of students.
- The revisions include the addition of an “Administrative Review,” which will take less time to complete than similar stages under the current model. The Administrative Review can be
requested on one or more of three grounds, and must be submitted in writing at which point
the review begins.

- It was noted one key difference between the proposed non-Title IX conduct process model and
  the Title IX conduct process model is the inclusion of “equitable rights of appeal as the accused,”
  which is not present in the non-Title IX model.
- Once a student conduct case begins, the conduct officer makes the determination of which
  misconduct process to use, and if a Title IX charge is levied, the respondent is immediately
  informed.
- The guests noted that UW students will be a part of the vetting process for the revised SCC all
  the way through the university approval process.

Points made during discussion:

- Setting separate faculty boards to arbitrate non-Title IX and Title-IX conduct cases was agreed to
  be a good idea by council members.
- It was agreed that the SCC must be revised in a way that makes it more digestible for students,
  and easier to understand.
- It was noted putting all fact finding up front in the process is a very good idea, as new evidence
  slows down student conduct case processes considerably.
- After a question, it was noted the act of Assault is a non-Title IX offense.
- The definition of “sexual assault” (Title IX) at the UW is gender neutral (not defined by genders
  of involved parties).
- A member asked if an Administrative Review can ever be automatically triggered in the revised
  student conduct process. It was noted the question has not yet been decided, and the guests
  were open to input from council members.

At the end of discussion, it was noted the guests would return to the FCSA in the November meeting to
seek the council’s endorsement for Class B legislation altering the UW Student Conduct Code. The
council thanked the guests for presenting and they left the meeting.

7) Good of the order (1:07:33 – 1:17:00)

The council’s 2016-2017 charge letter was revisited. Laws noted the council has reached out to the
ASUW Bothell and ASUW Tacoma students asking them to attend FCSA meetings via tele-conferencing.
He explained the council will continue address policy changes coming out UW’s Hall Health, potentially
in the final fall quarter meeting of the council.

Laws mentioned he is working on a Task Force relating to capacity-constrained majors and direct-admits
at the UW. Members agreed this to be a serious issue.

8) Adjourn (1:07:33 – 1:17:00)

The meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.
Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Chris laws (chair), Jasmine Bryant, Holly Barker, Christopher Campbell, Doug Brock
President’s designee: N/A
Ex-officio reps: N/A
Guests: Jill Lee, Amanda Paye, Kara Blake, Ellen Taylor, Elizabeth Lewis

Absent: Faculty: Mable Ezeonwu, Anthony Gill, Bruce Hevly,
Ex-officio reps: N/A

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – fcsa_councilchargeletter_2016-2017
Exhibit 2 – Orientation to University Faculty Councils_082216
Exhibit 3 – ACIA resolution spring 2016
Exhibit 4 – 16-9-20 prior Flow Chart
Exhibit 5 – 16-9-20 non-TIX Flow Chart
Exhibit 6 – 16-9-14 Final Process Flow Chart
September 16, 2016

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 3 specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2016-17 academic year in your first meeting.

The Senate office conducted 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:

- Phase II changes to the Student Conduct Code are in development, and Class B legislation from the FCSA will be required to cement changes to the policy document. Identify means to communicate changes in Student Conduct Code to students and faculty to facilitate education on the matter.
- Meet with each UW student body in an effort to understand and align efforts of the council and its student membership.
- Investigate and identify/make recommendations for addressing issues related to college affordability.
  - A Class C resolution on College Affordability has been in development by council members in consultation with the council’s ASUW ex-officio member. The council revised the document several times during the spring of 2016, but never approved a version of it to go to the SEC.

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,

Zoe Barsness
Faculty Senate Chair
Associate Professor of Business

/jmb
Orientation to university faculty councils

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

- Zoe Barsness, Faculty Senate Chair
- Thaisa Way, Faculty Senate Vice Chair
- Paul Hopkins, Chair, Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
- Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty
- JoAnn Taricani, Faculty Legislative Representative
- George Sandison, Deputy Faculty Legislative Representative
- Nancy Bradshaw, Assistant to the Chair
- Jordan Smith, Assistant to the Secretary
- Joey Burgess, Council Support 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
  - Honors
- Benefits and retirement
- Faculty affairs
- Multicultural affairs
- Research
  - Classified/restricted research
- Student affairs

- Teaching and learning
- Tri-campus policy
  - Tri-campus review
- 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
- Please raise your hand if your name is: (you are a voting member)
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 (1st round)
- Approved by the Senate (1st round)
- Reviewed by the code cops and the president
- Approved by the Senate Executive Committee (2nd round)
- Approved by the Senate (2nd round)
- Approved by a full faculty vote
- Approved by the president
Senate legislative process – class A

- Professor of Practice
- 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 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
WHEREAS, the University of Washington is a national leader in undergraduate education because of the intellectual and extracurricular activities we offer our students on and off campus; and

WHEREAS, at times our students have the opportunity to travel within and outside of the United States to attend various academic and competitive meetings; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED that in order to encourage these types of learning opportunities the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA) strongly encourage faculty to be supportive of students who are traveling for University of Washington-related business (e.g., foreign study programs, academic conferences, engineering team competitions, business school case competitions, and NCAA sporting events); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the ACIA suggest that faculty discuss with traveling students strategies to negotiate missed examinations or assignments; options for managing student absences could include allowing students to have proctored exams (by a UW employee) while traveling or to provide a make-up date scheduled upon the student’s return.

Submitted by:
Sponsor here.

Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA),
University of Washington
May 2, 2016
Fact Finding

Initial Order

Faculty Appeal Board or Title IX Panel

If appeal of suspension or dismissal (if no appeal, then administrative review)

If appeal, hearing and fact finding by panel that makes independent decision

Initial Order

President

Final Order

Exhibit 4

- Written notice of investigation
- Opportunity to participate and present information and witnesses

OCR 60-day Timeline

Faculty Council on Student Affairs

October 4, 2016
**Proposed non-Title IX Model**

**Fact Finding**

**Initial Order**

**Administrative Review UW-wide**

**OR**

- Admin Review UWS
- Admin Review UWB
- Admin Review UWT

**Final Order**

Notice and Opportunity to be Heard:
- Written notice of allegations
- To participate and present information and witnesses
- To review evidence presented by others
- To present questions for others
- To review written investigation report and comment

- Specific grounds for review:
  - To determine whether there was a procedural error that significantly affected the outcome of the investigation or sanctioning;
  - To consider newly discovered evidence, not reasonably available during the investigation, that could substantially impact the outcome; and/or
  - To determine whether the sanction(s) imposed were appropriate for the violation committed and were not excessively lenient or excessively severe.

- Internal process completed

Faculty Council on Student Affairs
October 4, 2016
Proposed Title IX Model

OCR 60-day Timeline

Fact Finding

Initial Order

Either party can accept or contest finding or sanction

Administrative Review

Final Order

- Notice and Opportunity to be Heard:
  - Written notice of allegations
  - To participate and present information and witnesses
  - To review evidence presented by others
  - To present questions for others
  - To review written investigation report and comment
  - Equitable rights for complainant

- Specific grounds for review:
  - To determine whether there was a procedural error that significantly affected the outcome of the investigation or sanctioning;
  - To consider newly discovered evidence, not reasonably available during the Investigation, that could substantially impact the outcome; and/or
  - To determine whether the sanction(s) imposed were appropriate for the violation committed and were not excessively lenient or excessively severe.

- Internal process completed
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October 4, 2016