University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Student Affairs  
December 12th, 2017  
1:30pm – 3:00pm  
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order  
2. Review of the minutes from November 14th, 2017  
3. Students and Athletic Programs – Frank Hodge, UW Faculty Athletics Representative  
4. Chair’s Report  
   a. Medical Leave Policy questions  
   b. Medical Excuse Note Policy update  
5. Good of the order  
6. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Laws called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from November 14th, 2017

The minutes from November 14th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Students and Athletic Programs – Frank Hodge, UW Faculty Athletics Representative

Frank Hodge (Professor, Accounting / UW Faculty Athletic Representative) was present to update the council on matters relating to UW student athletics and to present relevant facts and figures. He explained the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) position is a 50% appointment out of the President’s Office with internal university responsibilities and external national responsibilities (e.g. voting member of the NCAA and other national associations).

Laws explained a small group of FCSA members prepared a set of questions in preparation for Hodge’s joining the council (Exhibit 1). Hodge explained he reviewed the questions and is happy to discuss those topics with the council.

i. What work would you like to see the FCSA undertake to best support student-athletes? This question was identified as our *top priority* -- we want to do whatever we can to be of service, and we have incredible respect for the work that you do.

Hodge pointed out there are other university-level committees that have direct oversight over UW athletics, such as the Advisory Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (ACIA). He explained the body advises the President on matters pertaining to institutional control of athletic programs, academic and financial integrity of intercollegiate athletics, academic and personal well-being of student-athletes, and accountability of the athletic department to the values and mission of the institution.
Hodge mentioned a report is currently being developed on UW athletics that includes draft recommendations, and the council might consider playing a role in reviewing that report and prioritizing those recommendations from its own perspective. There was agreement by members the council would undertake the activity during the 2017-2018 year.

Hodge noted students traveling to games and missing classes is another pressing issue in student athletics; the PAC-12 is the only collegiate athletic conference in the nation that holds televised matches after 8:00 p.m. Students are instructed to be very open in their communications with instructors concerning time constraints and athletic obligations, however participation in class is a difficulty. Whereas exams can be made up relatively easily outside of class, classroom participation is difficult to account for. Hodge explained at some other institutions, FARs proctor exams for students while on the road. He noted a system is in place at the UW for students to participate wholly in athletics and academics simultaneously, but it takes willingness on the part of students and faculty to work around schedule constraints.

Laws recalled that the FCSA passed a Class C resolution through the Faculty Senate during 2016-2017 that stated UW faculty should support the needs of student athletes (and other students with extracurricular obligations) as they work to participate in both athletics and academics. He asked if more steps need to be taken to make additional progress on the issue. Hodge noted some universities have enacted policies mandating instructors accommodate to the extent possible any student with extracurricular events (causing them to miss class time). Laws explained FCSA might consider developing a similar policy through Class B legislation. Hodge noted he would provide policies from other institutions as an example if this pathway is chosen. It was noted the UW and its instructors do already provide support/accommodations for student athletes to a greater degree than many other universities where adversarial relationships exist.

II. Could you kindly provide some resources or links where we could obtain an overview about our student-athletes (gender, team, major, ethnicity, international status, walk-ons, graduation rates, etc.)? If you are focused on any patterns of improvement or concern in the current statistics we would appreciate hearing your thoughts. Do we keep statistics about participation in study abroad, internships, participation in research, number of student-athletes who pursue graduate studies?

Hodge noted there are 22 varsity sports and 650 student athletes at the UW. A current breakdown by gender shows UW’s athletic programs are made up of 56% male students and 44% female students. Hodge noted gender imbalance in athletics pertains to Title IX, a federal law requiring schools to offer equal athletic opportunities for women and men. He recalled a recent article in the Seattle Times (spring 2017) alleging that former UW Women’s Rowing Teams incorrectly reported roster numbers, and noted procedures have been revised to make it so a student athlete must participate with a team for 4 weeks to be officially counted on its roster.

He explained the current graduation rate for UW student athletes is 86%. The Football Team currently has a 3.10 cumulative GPA; the new coach has focused on academics, providing resources and support to students, prioritizing academic excellence, and creating “clubs” of students who attain certain GPAs. Hodge noted last spring, 17 of 22 athletic teams had an average of a 3.0 GPA or higher, and 376 athletes had GPAs higher than 3.0.
After a question, Hodge explained UW Men’s Basketball implemented a program for former student athletes who the UW left before earning a degree, and allows those students to return to the university to continue their educational career. So far, five former student athletes have used the program to resume study at the university.

A member asked what happens to students with athletics scholarships who sustain career-ending injuries. Hodge explained student athletes who become medically disqualified from participating in their sport still receive their original scholarship. A team doctor makes that decision, and there is oversight by a committee of which Hodge is a member. If a student leaves the sport by their own volition, they lose their scholarship. Hodge explained the last two years have seen more medical disqualifications based in mental health issues than in past years.

Hodge explained that in relation to extracurricular activities, several UW donors have provided funds for internship-type activities for student athletes in the past. He explained UW Athletics highly values the importance of student athletes engaging in internships, study abroad programs, or other activities that traditionally prepare students for life after leaving the institution. He explained UW onboarding of student athletes is generally very good, but there is always room for improvement in “offboarding” students. After a question, he noted only roughly 2-3% of college football and basketball players go on to play professionally. UW Athletics is working to advertise internship-style and study abroad programs to its student athletes earlier in their college careers.

There was some brief discussion of demographic trends relating to UW Men’s Basketball. It was noted fewer inner-city, low-income students are coming to the UW for basketball, as the amount of student athletes who come to the UW from expensive preparatory academies is increasing. This fact is reflected in the amount of student athletes admitted to the UW with “special admit” status, which has dropped severely in recent years. This year, for example, there is only one “special admit” student on the Football Team, whereas in past years, there might be as many as 20.

iii. What mechanisms exist on campus to elicit concerns from student-athletes? Are there any recent and/or persistent concerns raised by student-athletes or alumni regarding our athletic programs? Do you feel comfortable with the current processes in place designed to report and protect students from sexual harassment, or abusive coaching?

Hodge noted he feels students athletes have an acceptable level of resources available to them at the UW. He noted he also personally acts as a resource to student athletes.

There was some discussion of the use of “class checkers.” Hodge explained only two sports at the UW make use of class checkers: football and basketball. The class checkers are meant to teach life skills and to check to make sure student athletes are being attentive in class.

A member explained many of the improvements shared with the FCSA seem to stem from coaches. She asked about ways to institutionalize the methods used by successful coaches, so that their positive influences do not leave the UW when they leave. Hodge agreed and noted many players often play “for coaches” rather than “for schools.” He noted coaches are instrumental in establishing team “culture.”

The council ran out of time for discussion. Laws explained Hodge may return to FCSA after the holiday break to discuss the questions again and see if anything was missed.
4) Chair’s Report

Medical Leave Policy questions

Laws explained Ellen Taylor (Associate Vice-President, Student Life) has followed up on the recent discussion with the FCSA on development of an undergraduate Medical Leave Policy via forwarding additional information along with questions for the council to consider. A time-sensitive question asked council members to attempt to identify academic programs wherein implementation of a medical leave policy would be the most difficult and/or complex. Members were asked to consider the question and send feedback electronically.

Medical Excuse Note Policy update

Laws explained he and Mark Jenkins (Director, Health Sciences Administration) presented the idea of Medical Excuse Note Policy to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) in a recent meeting. FCAS was supportive of the idea, and encouraged collaboration between the two councils on the topic. Laws explained the final policy may either be housed under FCAS’ auspices, or enacted through Class B legislation. He explained a taskforce has been identified and charged to develop an initial draft of the policy to be reviewed by FCAS and the FCSA during 2017-2018. He reported he is chairing that taskforce, and it plans to begin meeting in January, 2018.

Definition of Good Standing

Laws explained in the last meeting, there was a brief discussion of the pending definition for “good standing” (for students), which is to be used for the purpose of defining the student population eligible to serve under the Student Conduct Code (SCC) in the role of “reviewing officer.” Laws noted the Advisory Council on the Student Conduct Code met recently and has again asked the FCSA to weigh in on defining student “good standing” and other related questions.

A document with proposed standards for consideration when defining “good standing” was shown (Exhibit 3).

After some discussion, the council endorsed use of standards #1, #2, and #4, as listed. In relation to question #3, a motion was made and approved, stating: the strong sense of the FCSA is that students should not be disqualified because of prior disciplinary history.”

Laws thanked the council for considering the questions.

5) Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

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

**Faculty:** Ann Culligan, Bruce Hevly, Chris Laws (chair), Jasmine Bryant, Holly Barker, Christopher Campbell  
**Ex-officio reps:** Aileen Trilles, Sumire Nakamura, Carolyn Martin, Navid Azodi, Warisha Soomru  
**President’s designee:** Lincoln Johnson  
**Guests:** Frank Hodge

**Absent:**

**Faculty:** Mabel Ezeonwu  
**Ex-officio reps:** Arwa Dubad

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – FCSA 121217 Athletics questions  
Exhibit 2 – 17-12-12 good standing proposal for FCSA
Faculty Council on Student Affairs

Chris Laws, Chair

The following are questions and concerns raised for consideration by the FCSA sub-committee on Student Athletics, and presented to Frank Hodge, UW Faculty Athletic Representative, in advance of his presentation to the council on December 12, 2017.

1) What work would you like to see the FCSA undertake to best support student-athletes? This question was identified as our *top priority* -- we want to do whatever we can to be of service, and we have incredible respect for the work that you do.

2) Could you kindly provide some resources or links where we could obtain an overview about our student-athletes (gender, team, major, ethnicity, international status, walk-ons, graduation rates, etc)? If you are focused on any patterns of improvement or concern in the current statistics we would appreciate hearing your thoughts. Do we keep statistics about participation in study abroad, internships, participation in research, number of student-athletes who pursue graduate studies?

3) What mechanisms exist on campus to elicit concerns from student-athletes? Are there any recent and/or persistent concerns raised by student-athletes or alumni regarding our athletic programs? Do you feel comfortable with the current processes in place designed to report and protect students from sexual harassment, or abusive coaching?

4) UW does a good job of helping faculty and staff better understand the athletic lives of student-athletes. Are there similar efforts underway to help coaches understand the academic lives of the students?

5) Outside of hours spent in the classroom, where and how do our student-athletes intersect with student populations on campus? How do the interactions for student-athletes differ from club athletes (assuming club athletes represent a true hybrid experience of being both a student and an athlete)?

6) What are your thoughts about the necessity of classroom checkers for football players? Do these classroom checkers hamper the development of the student-athletes' life skills? Do the classroom checkers foster stereotypes in the student body or with faculty about the self-motivation of football players to engage in academics?

7) Many teams seem to have graduate students in coaching capacities. Is there any data about the graduate assistants, and do we have any information about their academic experiences or the quality of the graduate students' academic experiences?

8) As UW moves away from students providing notes from doctors to excuse students from attendance or assignments, how does this impact student-athletes with injuries? What are the academic expectations and/or protocols for student-athletes with concussions?
Advisory Committee on Student Conduct

Date: For December 12, 2017, Advisory Committee Meeting

From: Amanda Paye, Review Coordinator

Proposal: Standard for Good Standing for Appointing Students as Reviewing Officers

The purpose of this proposal is to:

1. Develop a standard for “good standing” for students to be appointed as reviewing officers; and
2. Determine a standard for the review coordinator to monitor whether, once appointed, students have remained in good standing.

Background

Under the new policies, faculty and students may be appointed to a pool of available reviewing officers for completing administrative reviews; in other words, the University can appoint as many individuals into the pool as it chooses to, rather than having a fixed number of individuals appointed to boards and committees, as in the past.

For appointing students as reviewing officers, the policies state that:

... To be eligible to serve on a review panel, students must be full-time and in good standing with the University.

Section 10(B), Student Governance and Policies, Chapters 209.

This language was adopted from the prior code relating to appointing students as members of the University Disciplinary Committees. When the new policies were drafted, the decision was made to not state the standard for “good standing” in the policies, but to develop that standard at a later date.

To develop the proposal, I consulted with the conduct offices to evaluate the standard for “good standing” they utilized in appointing students to the UDCs. Additional consultation was done with the Title IX Investigation Office, although students would not be serving on review panels for proceedings under Chapter 210.

Once the standard is determined, it will be documented in the appointment letter for the student. That information can also be added to the reviewing officer webpage on the Student Conduct website (which is in development).

Standard(s) for Good Standing

Following are the proposed standards for consideration, with a description of the rationale. Any one or all of these standards could be adopted (or other standards not yet considered):

1. Academic Warning or Probation
   - The student is not currently on academic warning or academic probation, which are standards set by the University’s Scholastic Regulations for undergraduate students, by the Graduate School for graduate students, and by the professional schools for professional students.

   Rationale: When students are on academic probation, the focus for those students should be on improving their academic standing. Serving as reviewing officers may unnecessarily detract those students from their academics.

   AND/OR
2. Disciplinary Probation

☐ The student is not currently on disciplinary probation or suspension as a result of a finding of responsibility in a student conduct proceeding.

Rationale: If a student has been found responsible for misconduct, they should not be in the position to evaluate other students’ conduct while they are on disciplinary probation, including completing any conditions of probation.

AND/OR

3. Prior Disciplinary History

☐ The student has no prior disciplinary history in terms of being found responsible in a student conduct proceeding. A student who has been charged with prohibited conduct, but was not found responsible, would still be eligible to serve.

Note: The ACSC recommends creating workgroup to further evaluate whether/how prior disciplinary history may be utilized as a standard. This is a temporary recommendation until that workgroup can convene and make a recommendation.

OR

☐ If a student who has expressed interest in becoming a reviewing officer has a prior disciplinary history, or later, is found responsible for misconduct and completed the sanction, the review coordinator will consult with the appropriate conduct office to evaluate whether the prior disciplinary history may affect the student’s ability to serve in the reviewing officer role. Note: If this option is chosen as a standard, consider whether more work should be done to develop basic guidelines for this assessment.

Rationale: In the spirit of facilitating learning through the conduct process, a student who has been found responsible and has satisfied the disciplinary sanction may have valuable insight in reviewing matters involving other students. On the other hand, having a prior disciplinary history (or a prior disciplinary history of a certain type of misconduct) may impact the student’s ability to serve as a neutral and objective reviewing officer.

Proposed Standard for Monitoring Standing

Because there will be a pool of reviewing officers, it may not be necessary to “unappoint” a student if they no longer are in good standing, if that may only last for a period of time or can be rectified by the student. Instead, the review coordinator can inform them that they will not be selected for a panel until they have returned to good standing.

☐ Students will sign an acknowledgement that they will inform the review coordinator if circumstances change that they are no longer in good standing.

AND/OR

☐ When students express interest in serving as a reviewing officers, they will be asked to consent to the disclosure of information to the review coordinator relating to their academic standing and disciplinary history. The review coordinator will then complete that review, including contacting the conduct offices for information on the students’ disciplinary history. Once appointed, the review coordinator will be responsible for checking, on a quarterly basis, whether all students appointed as reviewing officers are in good standing.