Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to Order
2) Approval of the Agenda
3) Approval of the Minutes from March 3rd, 2015
4) Mental Health and ADA
5) Student Conduct Code
6) Good of the order
7) Adjourn

1) Call to Order

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

2) Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

3) Approval of the Minutes from March 3rd, 2015

The minutes from March 3rd, 2015, were approved as amended. A member requested that the minutes be altered to clarify that an opinion was not one of a certain group of faculty, but of their college.

4) Mental Health and ADA (Exhibit 1)

Bree Callahan (Director, Mental Health Resources for Students) was present to give some information on the state of mental health at the UW, and to explain the services that are available to students, faculty, and staff. She provided an informational handout with some statistics on the mental health of the student population, and instructions for utilizing Disability Resources for Students (DRS) (Exhibit 1).

Callahan explained that in recent years, on a nationwide scale, more students have been diagnosed with depression or anxiety-related disorders than in previous decades. She noted this overall influx is contributing to the amount of affected students campus-wide, which is concurrently increasing. Callahan explained that Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), social phobias, anxiety and personality disorders, and the autism spectrum all are treated by Disability Resources for Students (DRS). She explained that over the last five years, the number of students who were identified as having a psychological disorder increased 414% at the UW. During the 2013-2014 academic year, 1350 students were served by DRS - 80% of these were undergraduates - and of all the cases, 20% were related to psychological/emotional problems.
UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON
DISABILITY RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS

UW Legal Duty
To provide students with appropriate academic adjustments and auxiliary aids and services that are necessary to afford an individual with a disability an equal opportunity to participate in the school's program. (Dept. of Education Office for Civil Rights)

- Everyone has a role: Advisors, Programs, DRS, Faculty, Academic Departments, etc
- "Programs" referring to broader access of academic or support program in general.

Disability Resources for Students Information
The DRS office with students needing housing or academic (classroom related) accommodations, which are designed on a case by case basis and include evaluation of the disability and its impact within the education or living environment. DRS works with permanent disabilities as well as temporary health conditions.

Contact: 011 Mary Gates, Box 352808 uwdrs@uw.edu 206-543-8924 Website: disability.uw.edu

DRS Stats Summer 2013-Spring 2014
- 1350 served, 3.2% UW student population (nationally 12% avg on campus SWD)
- 85% non-visible disabilities, 15% visible disabilities
- 3.2 Avg GPA of DRS students, 261 graduates in 13-14
- 53%/47% freshman direct & Transfer split within DRS students
- 80% undergraduate, 20 % graduate/post bac/ professional schools
- 38% LD/ADD, 24% Chronic Health, 20% Psych/Emotional

DRS Students with Psychological Disabilities
- 414% increase over last 5 years: from 51 in 2008/09 to 262 in 2013/14
- Types of disabilities in this category: PTSD, Depression, Anxiety Disorders, Bi Polar, Personality Disorders, Autism Spectrum, etc.
- Common adjustments but all accommodations are determined based on the impact in the educational or housing environment: Disability Related Absences, flexible exams, note taking/copies of lecture materials/permission to record, reduced credit load, accessible instructional materials

DRS changes in last 2 years
New staff and new DRS Counselor model: Assignment by UW Colleges/Schools
Online accommodation management system: myDRS
- Student now sign up for DRS, submit documentation, request services and send Letter of Accommodation to faculty online
Counselor of Duty Hours: drop in format for quick questions or general inquiries
- MWF 11am-12pm, Tu/Th 1-2pm
Steps to an Accommodation
1. Student initiates contact with DRS to set up services
   a. Status as a student w/ a disability that requires academic accommodation confirmed
   b. DRS evaluates health care provider information & requested accommodations
2. DRS/Student engage in interactive process
   a. Academic accommodations/auxiliary aids designed
3. Student submits letter to faculty each quarter
4. Faculty implements accommodations in classroom

myDRS Features
The myDRS system is designed to streamline many of our former paper systems with the goal to provide more effective and efficient service to both students and faculty. The DRS staff view our role as working 50% for faculty and 50% for students as the facilitator of the academic accommodation process. Some of the services myDRS is streamlining include but are not limited to:
   • Alternative Testing: new electronic contract submission and test scheduling options
   • Peer Note Taking: electronic delivery of peer notes, and matching of students
   • Letters of Accommodations: capacity for students to tailor request(s) for accommodations based on the course environment, and submit electronically for easier reference and connections to other program elements (i.e. alternative testing)

myDRS Faculty Portal
Faculty (and course staff) can now log into a portal designed just them via the DRS home page disability.uw.edu. This version of myDRS designed for faculty to see information related to current classes for the quarter. Some things faculty can do in your portal:
   • Compete the DRS Testing Agreement & Upload Exams (if DRS is administering exams)
   • View notes being uploaded by course note takers
   • Review all Faculty Notification Letters for students in courses

Additional resources that we offer:
   • Faculty & Staff Resources page http://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/faculty-resources/
   • DRS Alternative Testing process/contact info for Faculty on our website: http://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/faculty-resources/alternative-testing-services/
   • Faculty Roles & Responsibilities in working with DRS Students: http://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/faculty-resources/services-for-faculty/
   • DRS suggested syllabus statement regarding services: http://depts.washington.edu/uwdrs/faculty-resources/syllabus-statement/
# Undergraduate Retention and Graduation Rates - with Disability Flags

## Cohort Retention and Graduation Rates by Cohort Year and No Breakdown

Filter the population presented and choose breakout options using the drop-down menus on the left.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakdown</th>
<th>Start Year</th>
<th>1St Yr Retention</th>
<th>2Yr Retention</th>
<th>3Yr Graduation</th>
<th>4Yr Graduation</th>
<th>5Yr Graduation</th>
<th>6Yr Graduation</th>
<th>7Yr Graduation</th>
<th>8Yr Graduation</th>
<th>9Yr Graduation</th>
<th>10Yr Graduation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Variation in Fall Cohort Retention and Graduation Rates by No Breakdown

- 1Yr Retention
- 2Yr Graduation
- 3Yr Graduation
- 4Yr Graduation

- All


- 5Yr Graduation
- 6Yr Graduation
- 7Yr Graduation
- 8Yr Graduation
- 9Yr Graduation
- 10Yr Graduation


- 4Yr Graduation

Callahan noted when her office meets with students to aid in management of their disabilities, they base the student’s accommodations around the academic impact the disability will have. Students may ask for accommodations for varying course types (e.g. online instruction).

A member asked if students are required to produce evidence from a doctor before receiving accommodation. Callahan noted that assessments of learning disabilities from clinics can cost up to $3000, making it difficult for students to receive documentation for their disability. Callahan noted DRS sometimes tries to subsidize these costs from campus friendly providers. She explained the cost varies based on the disability.

After question arose on the matter, Callahan explained that a student can self-report at any time in the academic quarter, and can receive approval for accommodation at any time in the quarter, as well. She explained that if an accommodation request is severely ill-timed, faculty may plead that the request is not reasonable – which happens fairly often. Callahan noted it is a risk area for her office if a student files a complaint, though this does not happen regularly. Suite added that retroactive accommodations are not granted.

Callahan clarified for members that test anxiety is not something DRS grants accommodations for; the UW counseling center works with test anxiety. Callahan did explain that many students often have other, more serious disabilities but simply refer to these as “test anxiety.”

Callahan noted there are guidelines for documentation of a number of disabilities available on the DRS website, which outline the ways in which students can seek accommodation for various disabilities. Callahan noted the guidelines are essentially standardized across many higher education institutions.

Gill expressed concerns over the web-based service “myDRS,” noting questions over the students’ responsibility in notifying their professor of their needs. Callahan explained she was tasked with systematizing the process for accommodations. She designed MyDRS, which allows students to log into their online portal where they may pick accommodations that are appropriate for their course and submit requests for them. Moreover, Callahan demonstrated how MYDRS can be used by professors. She explained the rhetoric behind the design was a desire to streamline the process and make it easier for faculty to do what they need to do to accommodate students with special needs. The portal was designed so professors would no longer need to retain emails pertaining to students’ special needs. The faculty portal allows professors to look at the students with special needs in their classes, and serves a number of functions. Callahan reported 40% of students did not speak to their professors over accommodation information one study found – though DRS does encourage students to speak to professors about their accommodations by visiting their office hours.

After discussion, it was noted faculty may refer students – by name - to DRS if they notice behavior that may be indicative of a mental health problem. Callahan also noted it may be beneficial for faculty to write a note about the availability of DRS services into their course syllabi. Callahan noted DRS is working on finding ways to have students disclose that they may have an issue sooner.

Badger commented that she is happy with the support and services available for students with disabilities.

Suite explained that in some cases faculty should consider contacting the Health and Wellness department in Student Life, as they aid students with a number of issues including suicide prevention, alcohol and drug abuse, and other general problems. Suite noted faculty may refer students to the department by name under FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act).
Callahan concluded by noting trends that show stress and anxiety in student-aged youth appear to be on the rise, of which the cause is relatively an area of speculation. Though, mental health problems are becoming less stigmatized than they have been in the past, and more students are feeling comfortable coming forward to report that they may need help.

The council thanked Callahan for presenting and she left.

5) Student Conduct Code

Elizabeth Lewis (Director, Community Standards & Student Conduct) was present to update the council on changes proposed for the Student Conduct Code (SCC). Lewis noted she met with the council in the fall over proposed Student Conduct Code changes, though, the proposed code language has been altered since that time. She explained she would detail the changes in this council meeting, and explain the rationale for those changes, as well.

Lewis explained the changes to the SCC the council reviewed in November 2014 have not all stuck – specifically, the informal hearing process has stayed relatively the same as it is in the existing Student Conduct Code, and will not be changed, as was considered in fall 2014.

She explained another change was in revising specific pieces of language to render the code more precise, which was urged by legal professionals after a reading.

Lewis noted another change is the number of faculty on the two conduct boards has been increased, and professional staff have been added to the conduct boards. She explained in the new draft, there will be one university conduct board, with six faculty and six professional staff, and panels of three members may conduct a hearing. Lewis noted increasing the number of individuals who are trained and able to do a hearing will be helpful in avoiding issues in the future.

Treser noted he would like to have the council read the document thoroughly and have Lewis return in the May FCSA meeting, where deeper consideration of the changes may take place.

Lewis explained that her office is conducting a catalyst survey for gleaning feedback which will close on April 21st. She noted the intention was to pass the Student Conduct Code through the FCSA, the SEC, and have it voted on in the Faculty Senate in the last meeting of the academic year in May. She explained she will be meeting with various other stakeholder groups including the GPSS (Graduate Professional Student Senate), ASUW, and constituents from Bothell and Tacoma. She explained the code needs to go to the Rules Coordinating Committee Olympia in July. Lewis noted there will be public hearings in October, and the code will go to the UW Boards of Regents in November for approval; it will be implemented in January 2016.

Lewis clarified that any repetitiveness between the campus conduct board and the university conduct board was intentional in the code. Suite added that the process is designed to be very streamlined and easy for students and others to understand.

Lewis explained that according to federal law in compliance with Title IX, the conduct procedure has been divided into two paths: purple, and green. On the purple side, the complainant has opportunities for an appeal process, as compliant with federal laws- this category responds to discriminatory harassment and sexual misconduct. The green side does not have those same rights, and generally applies to everything else.
Student Conduct Code Process Proposed

- Violations of the Code alleging Sexual Misconduct/Discriminatory Harassment
  - Conduct Officer
  - Informal Hearing
    - Not responsible
      - No appeal
      - No review
    - Responsible
      - Reprimand, disciplinary probation, suspension, dismissal, or restitution
        - Accused and/or Complainant Appeals
          - Formal Hearing before University Conduct Board
            - Accused and/or Complainant Appeals
              - Review (and possible reconsideration) by President or delegate
              - Notice of final decision

- Violations of the Code Not Alleging Sexual Misconduct/Discriminatory Harassment
  - Conduct Officer
  - Informal Hearing
    - Not responsible
      - No appeal
      - No review
    - Responsible
      - Reprimand, disciplinary probation, suspension, dismissal, or restitution
        - Accused Appeals
          - Formal Hearing before Campus Conduct Board (Seattle, Bothell, Tacoma)
            - Accused Appeals
              - Review (and possible reconsideration) by Provost, Chancellors Or delegate
              - Notice of final decision
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
STUDENT CONDUCT CODE REVIEW PROPOSED NEW CODE
WAC 478-120

The student conduct code is part of the Washington Administrative Code and provides guidance on the processes and procedures used to respond to student misconduct. The goal of the process is to help students to understand the University’s expectations and to respond in an educational manner to help students make more effective choices in the future while holding them accountable for their current choices. In working with the current conduct code, conduct officers across the University desired a document that provided more guidance for this work. A committee was formed to review the current conduct code.

Goals of the Committee
A tri-campus committee comprised of faculty, staff and students met to review the current Student Conduct Code WAC 478-120. The goals of the committee were three fold:

1) find a way to make the code easier to navigate for students, faculty and staff;
2) to review the Off Campus Code WAC 478-120-025 to see if it was meeting the needs of students and the institution and;
3) to consider if the implementation of a Medical Leave policy tied into the Student Conduct Code.

The committee arrived at the following conclusions:

- A comprehensive review of the code had not been undertaken since the 1990’s.
- There is a lack of specificity in the code regarding definitions.
- The current code has groups of violations together as one line item for example, WAC 478-120-020(3)(c) Specific instances of misconduct include, but are not limited to:
  o (c) Conduct on university premises constituting a sexual offense, whether forcible or nonforcible, such as rape, sexual assault, or sexual harassment;
- This grouping of violations presents challenges for federal reporting and for working with students as they are confused to what they are actually being charged with in the disciplinary process.
- The current structure of the code makes it difficult to find relevant information easily.
- The off campus code was not meeting the needs of students to respond to things such as stalking.
- A Medical Leave policy tied to the Student Conduct Code was not appropriate. The committee stopped working on that component.

Shifting Landscape of Compliance
The Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights published the Dear Colleague Letter of April 2011. This document outlined the Department of Education’s expectations of Colleges and Universities in pursuing Title IX violations, specifically sexual assault and sexual harassment. It provided significant guidance regarding steps schools, colleges and universities must take to address sex discrimination.

In March of 2013 as part of the Violence Against Women Act reauthorization the Campus SAvE Act was adopted to amend the Jeanne Clery Act. This requires the University to count in its annual security report instances of stalking, domestic violence, dating violence, and sexual assault. It also provides complainants with certain rights in the disciplinary process.

In April of 2014 the Department of Education’ Office of Civil Rights followed up with an extensive Q&A document to help clarify the Department’s expectations.
The Conduct Code Review committee has done extensive review of these significant guidance documents and changes to the law in its work of reviewing the Student Conduct Code.

The proposed draft meets the needs of the institution to be in compliance with these documents and laws.

**Changes in the Proposed Draft of the Student Conduct Code**

The committee accomplished its goals by:

1. Restructuring the code to include definitions and discreet disciplinary processes as separate WACs.
2. Unpacking and defining violations into discreet units to increase the awareness of the expectations of the University.
3. Reimagining jurisdiction to more accurately respond to student misconduct and to comply with federal requirements.
4. Creating a separate process for disciplinary harassment and sexual misconduct to be compliant with federal guidance regarding sexual harassment and sexual assault.
5. Creating a more streamlined process for students regarding appeals and reconsideration of orders.

1. **Restructuring the Student Conduct Code**

By breaking up the code into Parts and then individual WACs with in each section it will make the Code easier to navigate. Information should be easier to look up and cross reference. Some repetition in the Code is intentional as we anticipate that students will only read the sections that apply to them. Additionally by creating individual WACs this will allow for flexibility in modifying the Conduct Code in the future by being able to address discreet packets of information. Definitions are a new addition to the Conduct Code and aim at being able to quickly answer questions regarding certain concepts and provisions.

2. **Unpacking and defining violations of the Student Conduct Code.**

The current Code WAC 478-120-020 and WAC 478-120-025 list prohibited behaviors. The current code aims at separating some of those prohibited behaviors into their own sections. For example, the current code combines alcohol and drugs together as one charge. The proposed code separates those two items into discreet WAC’s. Moreover, the proposed code provides robust definitions or examples of prohibited behavior. Federal requirements for the Jeanne Clery Act require definitions of domestic violence, dating violence, stalking and sexual assault. Student feedback on the committee consistently pointed out that students want to know what the University expectations are in as explicit a term as possible. We have endeavored to balance that need with flexibility to respond to new behaviors in the future.

3. **Jurisdiction**

The current student conduct code is limited primarily to behaviors occurring on campus with some limited ability to take disciplinary action for off campus behaviors. The off campus portion of the current code allows the University to respond to three types of off campus behaviors: 1) matters in which a court of competent jurisdiction has found the student responsible of a crime; 2) matters involving a threat of physical harm or abuse or actual physical harm or abuse of a UW Faculty, Staff or Student; and 3) public nuisances issue in a limited geographical area north of 45th Street in Seattle. There are several issues with this section. It does not allow the university to respond to allegations of serious misconduct when the victim is not a UW Faculty, Staff or Student in a timely manner. For example, if a student was to allegedly engage in a serious physical assault off campus, and the victim was not a member of the UW community; the University would have to wait until the matter was resolved in the courts before taking any action. This could put the University community at risk. Additionally, students are reporting stalking, cyber harassment, and sexual harassment that is occurring off campus by other students. Showing that this behavior is causing physical harm is a high standard to prove and limits our ability to respond. Lastly, UW Bothell and Tacoma do not have a North of 45th Community.

The proposed code allows the University to take disciplinary action against a student when a University interest in affected. We do not anticipate responding to all behaviors that may be a violation of the code however when
there is a nexus between the University’s interest and the student’s behavior we will now have a mechanism for intervening. Additionally federal requirements regarding stalking, domestic violence, relationship violence and sexual assault have changed and the University must be able to respond to these incidents regardless of where they occur.

4. Separate Process for Sexual Misconduct and Discriminatory Harassment
In March 2013 President Obama signed into law the Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act which included amending the Jean Clery Act. This new component requires colleges and university to provide complainants in sexual misconduct matters with the same rights as the accused student in the process. These rights include being able to be accompanied to all proceedings by an advisor and/or attorney and the right to be informed of the outcomes of all disciplinary proceedings, the right to appeal any decision to the appropriate body. The proposed code lays out these processes in the clear language for all parties. Because of the increase of reports of these types and the requirement for specialized training in responding to these types of cases, we created a separate process for Sexual Misconduct and Discriminatory Harassment. This is a University level board with the President or their delegate as the reviewing officer. We recommend increasing the number of faculty and staff on this board to allow for flexibility in scheduling hearings and to reduce the burden on faculty and staff. We have reduced the number of people empaneled to hear a case to three to also provide flexibility. This new proposed code creates greater compliance with federal requirements.

5. Streamlined process
As a state agency we are subject to the Administrative Procedures Act which governs brief adjudicative procedures and formal adjudicative procedures. The proposed code allows for a more streamlined process and provides clarity as to the processes used at each level of the proceeding. The proposed code has revamped the Faculty Appeal Board and the University Disciplinary Committees. There will be one University Conduct Board that will hear cases of discriminatory harassment and sexual misconduct. Each campus will have its own Campus Conduct Board which will hear all other cases including academic misconduct and behavioral misconduct. The process flows in a more linear way in the proposed code.

Conclusion
The proposed Student Conduct Code provides specificity around processes and expectations of the University of Washington students. It allows the University to respond to misconduct which affects a University interest and brings the University into further compliance with federal requirements. The Code is structured in a way to make it easier to navigate and to streamline the process.

Next Steps
This is being shared with faculty senate, ASUW, GPSS, student stakeholders, and others to receive feedback. We are requesting that this be moved through the Faculty Senate for the May 2015 meeting. We are requesting that the ASUW and GPSS pass resolutions in support of the document by the end of May 2015. We will then proceed with the Rules Making Process with an anticipated public hearing in Autumn 2015 and move it to the Board of Regents shortly thereafter.

Your feedback is welcome. Please complete the Catalyst Survey by April 21st.
https://catalyst.uw.edu/webq/survey/higgie/266909

For more information please contact Elizabeth Lewis, Director of Community Standards and Student Conduct at 206-685-6194 or higgie@uw.edu.
6) Classrooms / Campus Facilities [FCUFS]

Rich Christie (Chair, Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services) was present to give information on several of FCUFS activities and updates.

Christie explained there are complaints that open classroom spaces are not available (and are severely overbooked) from 10:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. at UW Seattle. He noted that an outside contractor was hired by the university to assess its learning spaces and scheduling practices, and these were reported by the consultant to be chronically inefficient, and there is potential for restructuring. There are proposals for revising the classroom scheduling system in a number of ways, Christie noted. He explained that classroom capacity can also be increased, which was briefed to FCUFS in a winter meeting. It was noted both FCSA and FCUFS approve of the block scheduling option for a potential scheduling revision.

Christie noted there are three construction projects slotted for central campus. One is the Nano engineering building, wherein two classrooms will be added. The classes will be publicly available, but specially designed as the rooms include unique components to be used for research. Another project is a new Biology Greenhouse, which will replace the 65-year-old Botany Greenhouse – constructed alongside a new Life Sciences Complex.

Christie noted there are campus safety concerns that have come to FCUFS during winter quarter. The issue surrounds the lack of lockable doors in most classrooms on campus, and in the event that there may be an external threat (e.g. a shooter), the doors of these rooms are not able to be secured shut. Christie noted FCUFS will likely generate a resolution on the issue in the future, urging greater protections. He explained that included in some new construction of rooms are electronic door locks, which only police can unlock after having been activated during an emergency. These locks are expensive and currently only available in a small number of rooms, it was noted.

Christie noted as part of UW Housing and Food Services (HFS) ongoing efforts to redevelop all campus housing, they are now working on NW campus. The renovations will include some demolition of existing buildings, as these have reached the end of their life cycles. New buildings have been designed to support an increase in the campus population, Christie noted. Badger explained that the ASUW has been working closely with HFS over these renovations, and there were concerns over the loss of lower cost housing options for students. She explained they have implemented quad options, some smaller rooms, and other designs - to aid in supporting affordability for students. Treser explained that King County has a problem with housing affordability in general, though the university has a responsibility to offer lower cost housing options to students who are less financially supported.

Suite added that HFS has conducted redesigns based on the feedback. Among the changes, they are also including an entire wing of rooms that have community bathrooms. In an effort to avoid stigmas on “low cost” areas of campus, HFS is dispersing quads and community-use amenities equally.

Christie noted the FCUFS has generated a resolution that will be reviewed by the senate in its next meeting – the resolution is based in raising awareness for the need for better-supported childcare on campus (Exhibit 4). Christie reported that university administration has appointed a Director of Childcare, who will sit on FCUFS. Christie noted that the basic fact is that the UW and the surrounding neighborhoods are severely under-supplied with childcare. This problem has contributed to a retention issue for younger faculty with children. Christie explained the main issue is finding the money to fund
Class C Bulletin No. 542

Resolution Concerning Childcare

April 30, 2015

Class C Resolution adopted at the April 23, 2015, Faculty Senate Meeting

WHEREAS, the University of Washington has fallen behind its peer institutions in providing flexible on-site childcare; and

WHEREAS, the faculty recognizes the administration’s efforts to address this issue by appointing a full-time director for Childcare Development & Access; and

WHEREAS, the University of Washington continues “to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, promoting access, opportunity and justice for all.” (UW Diversity Mission Statement 2014).

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate endorses the administration’s appointment of a director and a permanent advisory committee on Childcare Development and Access; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that through the permanent advisory committee the Faculty Senate will continue working with the administration to develop a family friendly environment at the University of Washington by the following actions:

- Develop accessible, near / on-site university childcare centers.
- Support collaborations between new campus childcare centers, affording access for families and ensuring excellence and quality programs for those served.
- Provide leadership in the field of early education, family relationships, and early mental health, essential to developing a qualified and informed workforce in meeting the varied needs of our graduate and professional school students, faculty, and staff.
- Strengthen family relationships by providing support and educational services that are based on research and best-practice methodology.
- Create flexibility whenever possible to adjust and respond to the changing needs of campus families, the workforce, and our environment.
- Develop productive partnerships to facilitate access by the University of Washington community to a full range of childcare support.

Submitted by:
Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services
April 6, 2015

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
April 6, 2015

Approved by:
Faculty Senate
April 23, 2015
the capital cost of building a new space. The issue has been longstanding. Suite noted part of the problem is there are strict requirements for buildings which will be used for childcare, which are expensive to build and maintain. Christie noted FCUFS is determined to raise the profile of the issue, and to perhaps identify a possible donor.

Treser noted the Class C Resolution on Childcare was accepted by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) the day before this council meeting.

There was a vote to support the Resolution passed by FCUFS, which was passed unanimously.

Christie also noted parking rates had been discussed in the last FCUFS meeting, and the council found that the parking rates, which are slotted to increase in the next academic year, are justified.

There was question if the council deals with outdoor campus lighting. Christie explained this topic does fall under FCUFS purview to some degree, though nothing has been presented to the council this academic year.

7) Adjourn

Treser adjourned the meeting at 2:58 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Mabel Ezeonwu, Anthony Gill, Bruce Hevly, Chris laws, Sara Lopez, Jelena Svircev, Chuck Treser (chair)
Ex-officio representatives: Christine Tawatao, Hailey Badger, Martha Chan
President’s designee: Denzil Suite
Guests: Bree Callahan, Elizabeth Lewis

Absent: Faculty: Brian Fabien
Ex-officio representatives: Jewell Evenson

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – University of Washington Disability Resources for Students Information
Exhibit 2 – Student Conduct Code Flowchart
Exhibit 3 – Student Conduct Code Executive Summary
Exhibit 4 – Resolution on Childcare (FCUFS)