Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from May 26th, 2016
3. Welcome and introductions
4. Student Conduct Code revisions (Kara Blake, Ellen Taylor, Jill Lee, Amanda Paye)
5. Council orientation (Burgess)
6. Chair’s report & council 2016-2017 charge letter
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Stein called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from May 26th, 2016

The minutes from May 26th, 2016 were approved as written.

3) Welcome and introductions

Members and guests of the council introduced themselves. There were two new faculty members on the council, Marcy Stein (Education, UW Tacoma), and Meghan Eagen-Torkko (UW Bothell, Nursing and Health Studies).

4) Student Conduct Code revisions (Kara Blake, Ellen Taylor, Jill Lee, Amanda Paye) (Exhibit 1)

Jill Lee (Executive Director, Compliance Services), Amanda Paye (Deputy Title IX/ADA Coordinator, Compliance Services), Ellen Taylor (Assistant Vice-President, Student Life), and Kara Blake (Project Manager, Compliance Services) 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. Before that time, Class B legislation will be required to approve the changes at the university level.

The guests showed an exhibit as part of their presentation (Exhibit 1).
Taylor gave some background on the draft revisions to the SCC, explaining the main complaint relating to the existing SCC is that the timeline for moving through the current conduct process is far too long. It was noted the time commitment under the new process is a much more reasonable for faculty, as well, which was another large critique of the existing policy. The guests explained that a companion governance policy will be forwarded in addition to the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) changes that must be cemented via Washington State rule-making.

Stein opened up discussion on the proposed changes to the SCC.

There was a question about students’ ability to have allegations of misconduct evaluated outside of the university. A guest explained that once a final decision is given at the university, the respondent does have the right to request judicial review in the court system.

Paye explained under the new SCC, each UW campus will have their own university disciplinary committee, and the chair of the disciplinary committee will be especially appointed from the campus where the alleged misconduct took place. The guests explained under the current process, students have had to come to the UW Seattle campus to attend hearings – a burden that has been removed under the new draft process.

It was noted the UW Title IX Office is specially charged to conduct fact finding, and members of that office will travel to the other campuses to carry out investigations if alleged misconduct occurs there.

After a question, Paye explained the faculty senate adjudication panel is separate from the student conduct process. However, UW faculty members do play a similar role in the student conduct process, though it is a different subset of faculty members. The guests explained there is no proposal that the faculty senate adjudication panel would ever cross over and be used for student conduct matters.

Stein explained having served on the adjudication panel, she believes there does need to be swathe of faculty that can be pulled from to populate campus university disciplinary committees (an existing change under the revised code).

The guests informed that students are being informed of the changes to the SCC, currently. They mentioned after a question that there will be an ongoing effort to inform students about the new process.

The guests thanked the council for their feedback.

5) Council orientation (Burgess)

Burgess (Council Support Analyst) gave an orientation to the council on its function and role within the faculty senate and within the wider university. During the presentation, Stein provided a brief orientation on the “tri-campus review” process, of which the FCTCP participates as a key player to ensure the process of tri-campus review is adhered to by all UW campuses. At the end of discussion, Stein asked for volunteers from the FCTCP to serve on the Tri-campus Review Subcommittee; Montgomery was added to subcommittee.
There was some discussion of an interest in altering or removing tri-campus review, given other checks and balances that have been added to the curriculum approval process since its inception. Stein noted the council would address the topic more comprehensively in a later meeting.

6) Chair’s report & council 2016-2017 charge letter (Exhibit 2)

The council reviewed its 2016-2017 charge letter forwarded by faculty senate leadership (Exhibit 2). It was noted reevaluating tri-campus review does appear within the council’s charge letter.

There was some discussion of separating campus transcripts, which is listed as an expected activity in 2016-2017 within the council’s charge letter. It was noted the topic ties into program accreditation and/or threats to accreditation. The council expressed an interest in having a member of the UW Registrar’s Office attend a future FCTCP meeting to discuss the notion of separate campus transcripts.

7) Good of the order

Stein noted FCTCP members have been asked to review two Executive Orders (EOs) – revised EO 64 (Faculty Salary Policy) and new EO 54 (Employee-Student Romantic Relationships and Conflicts of Interest) – as part of the 60-day comment period provided to the Faculty Senate. Stein explained the documents would be forwarded to the council directly after the meeting, and members should provide any comments before the comment period ends on November 28th (2016). She explained if feedback is given, it will be forwarded to the President’s Office by the Faculty Senate & Governance Office.

Stein explained a university-level taskforce has been convened co-chaired by current Faculty Senate chair, Zoe Barsness. Its title is the “Tri-campus Issues Task force.” She noted the FCTCP and the new taskforce will be consulting throughout the year to pair up efforts and vet each other’s ideas.

8) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Stein at 10:30 a.m.

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

Present: Faculty: Ehsan Feroz, Joseph Tennis, Marcy Stein (chair) Ex-officio reps: Brent Lagesse, Lauren Montgomery, George Sandison, Sarah Loeffler, Annette Anderson President’s designees: Patricia Moy, Turan Kayaoglu Guests: Ellen Taylor, Amanda Paye, Kara Blake, Jill Lee

Absent: Faculty: Meghan Eagen-Torkko, Kyle Crowder Ex-officio reps: Thaisa Way

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – SCC flowchart_fctcp_102716
Exhibit 2 – FCTCP charge letter_2016-2017
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September 16, 2016

Marcy Stein  
Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy

Dear Professor Stein:

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy is charged with responsibility “for matters of academic and non-academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington” (Faculty Code, Sec 42-46). Activities historically performed include conducting tri-campus review as part of the approval process for proposed curriculum changes, analyzing possibilities for synergy among UW campuses, and advising and informing key administrators from all three campuses on the issues and interests of the others.

Our recommendation is that the council identify 3 specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2016-17 academic year.

The Senate office did 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:

- Complete review of Masters/Grad degree approval process(es) begun 2015-2016; identify set of recommendations to assure that the following occurs:
  a. Early potential areas of competition/conflict of interest or collaboration across the three campuses is identified.
  b. Feedback to proposing units is provided much earlier in the degree development and approval process so that feedback can be more effectively leveraged in the design stage of new degree/program development.
  c. Development of multi-campus degree programs at undergraduate and graduate level is facilitated and adequately supported.
- Examine impact of Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB) on cross-school/college/campus program enrollment at the graduate level.
  a. Quantify pre-ABB cross-school/college/campus program enrollments
  b. Quantify current/post ABB cross-school/college/campus program enrollments
  c. Identify concerns or obstacles at the program, school, college or campus levels that are driving current enrollment trends.
  d. Identify effective practices or collaborations that currently exist between graduate programs that facilitate cross-school/college/campus program enrollment. (e.g., Evans school negotiations and agreements with other schools for internships and courses for their masters students).
  e. Make recommendations for best practices/policies that might be shared across school, colleges and campuses.
Separate campus transcripts
   a. Evaluate feasibility/benefits/challenges associated with adopting separate transcripts across the three campuses.
   b. Recommend implementation plan if separate transcripts are determined to be appropriate.
   c. Coordinate with FCAS.

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