Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the agenda
3. Approval of minutes from 29 September 2015 meeting
4. FCSA Charge
5. Student Conduct Code
6. Subcommittee reports and discussion of subcommittee plans for the coming year
7. Tentative future agenda items
8. Adjournment

1) Call to order

Treser called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. Members of the council introduced themselves to fellow members.

2) Approval of the agenda

The agenda for the meeting was approved as written.

3) Approval of minutes from September 29th, 2015

The minutes from September 29th, 2015 were approved as written.

4) FCSA Charge

Treser presented the charge to the council (as established by the Faculty Code) and discussed the list of potential guests who might make presentations at meetings during the coming year.

Lopez raised the question of why and how these visitors are invited to address the council. She suggested that members put more advanced work into making the best use of these visits to advance the council’s business by setting its topics and questions to be dealt with before presentations are given.

Barker suggested other topics that might be placed on the agenda for the year and addressed by guests to the meetings. These included aspects of diversity on campus and retention rates for students from diverse backgrounds.
5) Student Conduct Code

Regarding the process of producing a new or amended Student Conduct Code (SCC), Treser reported that the updates to the current code discussed at the FCSA meeting of September 29th were passed without changes on behalf of the Faculty Senate. Treser explained that work remains to put the SCC into a final form, either with an entirely new set of measures to replace existing ones in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC), or with more extensive revisions to the current code. Treser explained of most direct concern to the council, particularly, is the appeals process involving a Faculty Appeals Board, as this has been a source of contention between the Board’s chairs and the professional staff charged with managing the processes involving students accused of misconduct. He noted a subcommittee of the council will assess the state of affairs with the goal of contributing to a successful code revision this year (see below).

6) Subcommittee reports and discussion of subcommittee plans for the coming year

In the absence of representatives from the ASUW, the GPSS, and the office of the Vice President for Student Life, reports from those entities which appeared as agenda items were not delivered to the council.

7) Tentative future agenda items

The council moved on to discuss the progress of subcommittees established last year, and to plan for questions on which to focus the efforts of subcommittees during the upcoming academic year. Gill reminded the council of the questions arising last year concerning testing accommodations administered by the Disability Resources for Students (DRS); this includes a shift from paper forms to an online system to certify students as requiring special testing conditions, in the context of quadrupling demand over five years prior to 2013. Bryant agreed that faculty could be taken by surprise when students made sudden demands for accommodation, and that it was not always clear that DRS had the capacity to deal with increasing numbers of students entitled to special testing arrangements. Treser remarked that the council might begin the process of developing a resolution for the Faculty Senate clarifying faculty and student responsibilities in these cases, and it would be a useful task to be undertaken. Lopez raised the question of whether this issue fell within the council’s purview or would be better taken up by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). Bryant suggested that the FCSA get feedback from students, perhaps via ASUW, concerning how clear the process seemed to them. Laws asked whether DRS could clarify for the council what changes have made and what effect they seem to be having. During general discussion, it was pointed out that several entities on campus are involved in similar processes: not just DRS, but also Hall Health and the Counseling Center.

A subcommittee to work on issues related to DRS and mental health was established. Members were noted as: Gill, Collins, Bryant and Ezeonwu.
Barker raised the question of the special case of athletes who had been injured in competition, and whether they received appropriate support (for example, in the aftermath of a concussion). Treser noted that there is a separate advisory committee on student athletics, and that it is university policy to provide financial aid for student-athletes to graduation even if they are unable to compete due to injury.

A general discussion took place concerning how many topics might be fruitfully pursued by the council, and how to organize the work of subcommittees outside of council meetings in order to make progress over the course of the year. A second subcommittee, to work on questions arising in the course of revisions to the SCC, was established. Membership was noted to be comprised of: Laws, Lopez, Hevly, and Campbell. Its first order of business will be to reach out to the chairs of the Faculty Appeals Board as well as the professional staff members involved in the code revisions.

Tran noted that a proposed Class C resolution came to the council last year for endorsement and submission to the Faculty Senate concerning the problem of student debt. It used last year’s ASUW report, “Meet Us in the Middle” as a foundation. Discussion and reference to last year’s minutes raised doubts about whether or not the council acted on the resolution. A third subcommittee, on student debt, was established. Membership was noted to be composed of: Tran and Barker. This subcommittee will follow up with ASUW and the Faculty Senate to establish the fate of this resolution since April, 2015, with a view to reviving it as necessary. It may take up other questions related to students’ economic security, for example: transition to work processes.

There was a general discussion of plans and procedures for each subcommittee. It was agreed that three subcommittees, and no more, would concentrate the efforts of the council’s members and prevent its agenda from becoming too diffuse over the course of the year. Thus potential subcommittees on intercollegiate athletics, facilities (particularly child-care facilities), and the “student experience” were set aside. With respect to questions surrounding the SCC, Bryant asked about how the faculty code related to informal procedures at the department or college level having to do with misconduct, and whether these had sufficient capacity to identify habitual cheaters.

Lopez suggested that, given interest in the topic, Barker might reach out to Intercollegiate Athletics to identify issues particularly relevant to student-athletes. Treser offered to forward information on this issue that he receives as chair.

The council then discussed the agenda for the coming year. Hevly expressed confusion over the question of how to plan for the most directly relevant presentations by visitors from the administration, given concerns expressed by Lopez early in the meeting on this issue (see above). Lopez suggested that, as an action item for each subcommittee, specific recommendations should be developed for speakers to be invited to the council’s meetings, and the topics to be addressed in these visits. This was generally agreed to.

8) Adjourn
Treser adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Minutes by Bruce Hevly - in consultation with Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Charles Treser (chair), Holly Barker, Jasmine Bryant, Christopher Campbell, Mabel Ezeonwu, Anthony Gill, Bruce Hevly, Chris Laws, Sara Lopez
Ex officio representatives: Kathleen Collins, Martha Tran
Guests: Josh Kavanagh

Absent: Faculty: N/A
Ex officio representatives: Dominick Juarez, Sophie Nop
President’s designee: Denzil Suite