Minutes
Senate Executive Committee Meeting
Monday, November 17, 2014, 2:30 p.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Present: President Young, Provost Cauce, O’Neill, Beauchamp, Lee, Hopkins, Stroup, Fong, Storti, Wood, Gharib, Shen, Astley, Resnick, McKinley, Janes, Rosenfeld, Wilkes, Killien, Taricani, Xiao, Popejoy
Absent: None
Guests: Chuck Treser, Elizabeth Lewis, Ellen Taylor, Pete Dukes, Frank Hodge, Aaron Vetter

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda.

Faculty Senate Chair Kate O’Neill called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Senate Chair’s Remarks – Kate O’Neill. [Exhibit A]

Chair O’Neill welcomed members and pointed them to her written report. O’Neill asked members to think critically about the future of the faculty, student experience, and how we will balance access and affordability with excellence and productivity at the UW.

   a. Report of the Secretary of the Faculty. [Exhibit B]
   b. Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting. [Exhibit C]
   c. Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative. [Exhibit D]
   d. Report of the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization. [Exhibit E]

JoAnn Taricani gave a brief update, noting that the first economic forecast is expected in December. Taricani heard promising news about the forecast but noted that any increase in revenue would likely be small in comparison to the overall budget deficit.

There were no questions about the reports.

4. President’s Remarks – Michael K. Young.

President Young began with an update about the upcoming legislative session. He mentioned that budgeting will be complicated by the passage of I-1351. Young said that leadership changes would likely occur prior to the session and could affect our relationship with certain committees. He had hoped for collaboration with the other universities but it appeared that the state’s institutions would not come together with a unified budget request as they did in previous years. He made it clear that the UW cannot rely on the state for adequate funding.

Young recently met with Mayor Ed Murray of Seattle to talk about more ways to collaborate. For example, the UWPD will be meeting with the Seattle PD to discuss safety in the University District and neighboring areas. Other areas for collaboration may include K-12 education.

Michael Rosenfeld asked about the redevelopment of properties under control of the UW, specifically the Metropolitan Tract. Young spoke to plans for redeveloping some properties, but noted that the UW would not see increased revenue for at least a couple years after the new buildings are finished.

It was announced that Jesse Jackson would be coming to the UW on December 2nd, 2014 as part of a speaking tour to advocate for increasing worker diversity in the high tech industry.
5. **Consent Agenda.**
   a. Approve the October 6, 2014, Senate Executive Committee minutes.
   b. Approve the October 23, 2014, Faculty Senate minutes.
   c. Approve Nominees for Faculty Councils and Committees. [Exhibit F]

The consent agenda was approved.

6. **Announcements.**

There were no announcements.

7. **Discussion:** Proposed changes to the Student Conduct Code. [Exhibit G]

Elizabeth Lewis, Director of Community Standards and Student Conduct, and Ellen Taylor, Associate Vice President for Student Life, attended to discuss potential changes to the Student Conduct Code. Elizabeth Lewis mentioned that these would be the first revisions since the mid ‘90s. Eric Godfrey, the former VP for Student Life, charged a committee to update the code in 2010. Since then, multiple mandates have come down from the Department of Justice and in other federal regulations that will require changes.

Lewis gave an overview of the major changes in the proposal. First, they proposed to split alcohol and drug violations and sexual harassment and rape into different categories. Second, they attempted to separate Title IX hearings from academic misconduct. Under the proposal, faculty members would continue to be present on these boards, with membership varying slightly from the former model. The most visible change in that regard would be that the University Disciplinary Committee and the Faculty Appeal Board would be folded in to one committee on each campus.

Lewis has been working with the Faculty Council on Student Affairs to draft language to be submitted to the Faculty Senate as Class B legislation. Other campus stakeholders will have input. Final approval will be made by the Board of Regents with an anticipated implementation of fall 2015.

Concerns about the distinction between violations of the SCC and violations of criminal and civil laws were raised. Lewis responded that the processes are meant to be separate and that the burden of proof in the internal process is a preponderance of evidence, whereas the criminal justice system requires a higher burden.

Kate O’Neil raised a concern about adequacy of staff support and recognition of the immense time commitment of faculty on these conduct boards.

8. **Discussion:** Input on the format for the Faculty Senate discussion on the faculty salary policy proposal.

Chair O’Neill asked members for input on the faculty salary policy proposal, specifically how forums and other opportunities for input should be conducted in the months leading up to the vote in order to foster an informed body of voters.

EFC chairs have been asked to forward feedback and faculty senators were asked to bring feedback from their units to the next Senate meeting. Open forums for the faculty are also being planned. SEC members provided suggestions about how to bring various perspectives into the discussion.

Provost Cauce expressed concern that under the current budget climate, faculty may be upset when they learn that the policy may not be implementable in the near future, which was a concern shared by some deans.

9. **Discussion:** Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative. [Exhibit H]

Pete Dukes attended his last meeting in the capacity as the FAR. His successor, Frank Hodge, was in attendance. Dukes summarized changes at the national, regional, and campus levels. At the national level, governance changes have resulted in conferences, in our case the Pac-12, taking over much of the
operations for how to treat student athletes. He believed this to be a positive change and noted that the PAC-12 was already moving towards 4 year scholarships, better medical care, and support after graduation and for athletes who return to graduate. One ongoing concern was conflicts with competitions and academic schedules.

Locally, Dukes was optimistic about changes occurring within ICA. Several coaching changes have resulted in positive changes for student athletes, specifically much higher average GPAs than their predecessors.

Sarah Stroup recommended more opportunities for studying abroad for students who are athletes, specifically creating more opportunities for trips during breaks. Dukes responded that some programs of the sort have been created.

10. Unfinished Business.

There was no unfinished business.


Approval of the December 4, 2014 Faculty Senate Agenda. [Exhibit I]

Action: Approve for distribution to Faculty Senators.

The agenda was approved.


The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Prepared by: Marcia Killien Approved by: Kate O’Neill
Marcia Killien Secretary of the Faculty
Kate O’Neill, Chair Faculty Senate
Report of the Faculty Senate Chair
Kate O’Neill, Professor, Law

Since my last report, Vice Chair Norm Beauchamp and I have been busy meeting with the President and the Provost, several other top administrators, the Board of Regents, and with student leaders. I have also met with many chairs of the senate’s faculty councils and committees, and I expect to have met with all in the near future. I want to take this opportunity to express particular thanks to our senate councils and committees and their chairs. They are the front line in gathering the data and doing the analysis of the myriad issues that concern the faculty at an institution of this size.

The issues include, to name a few: enrollment policy, managing access to majors, diversity, efficient use of classrooms, on-line and distant education, global education initiatives, commercialization policy, public/private partnerships for research, capital projects selection and funding, tri-campus governance, athletics & NCAA rules, revisions to the student conduct code, and of course the proposal for a new salary policy. We will hear more about the student conduct code revisions today.

In the end, all these issues can be grouped around three basic questions:

1. Who will be the future students at the UW and what will be the benefit to them, and to society, of their education and experiences here?

2. Who will be the faculty at the UW, and how can the institution efficiently and ethically enhance their opportunities for innovative teaching and discovery?

3. How can the UW continue to support high-quality teaching, research and service by its faculty and staff while providing affordable access and an excellent learning experience for a truly diverse population of undergraduate and graduate students?

While these questions are obvious, I think it will be helpful for the Senate and faculty at large to keep them in mind as we work with the administration to identify key priorities and set strategy on discrete issues.

It’s a cliché to say that UW faces challenges and we will have to be innovative to surmount them – but it’s true. I would like to see the faculty lead that innovation. To do that, we need to have clearer shared vision(s) and collective determination to pursue key goals with some specific strategies. On the faculty side, I think we have made a good start with excellent faculty councils, good information flow among the councils and with the administration. Next, we hope to engage the Senate in more active debate and to encourage senators to engage with their constituencies so as to inspire a campus-wide conversation about key priorities.

Today, we will be seeking the SEC’s counsel on how to begin that engagement on the issue of the proposed new salary policy. That policy is an effort to deal with one of those big questions – who will be the faculty and what will be their incentives and opportunities here? The fundamental question before the Senate and the faculty is: Will the proposed policy help the UW attract the best faculty and then motivate and retain them by rewarding their best efforts in a fair, transparent, and affordable manner?

The issues are numerous and complex and perhaps different for different units. I would like the Senate Executive Committee to advise on the process we should use to inspire a meaningful and productive debate across campus.

The senate leadership has tentatively decided on a process that runs along two tracks. First, the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs has given a basic thumbs-up to the principles behind the proposal and is now hard at work drafting code language. We think the FCFA should continue drafting.

Second, while the FCFA is working, we think the faculty as a whole should have multiple meaningful opportunities to study the proposal, assess its impact on each school and college, and debate its merits – to the extent that they have not already done so. The proposal represents a significant policy innovation.
with significant implications for units’ finances as well as their culture about hiring, peer evaluation, and retention policies. Funding the policy may ultimately affect tuition and class sizes as well as the relative sizes of tenure-track and non-tenure track faculties.

The Provost and President have indicated support for the proposal but they have also made it clear that they want any new salary policy to represent the faculty’s priorities. As advocates of shared governance, we completely concur.

Therefore, the senate leadership has concluded that it’s important for us to facilitate a campus-wide discussion so that we can all get a sense of whether the faculty is generally favorably inclined or opposed to the basic principles. If the sense of the faculty is generally favorable, but there are specific problems that we might fix now, we want to share those with FCFA before that Council presents its recommended code language to SEC – we anticipate in winter quarter.

We have the following plan to encourage faculties at the various colleges and schools to study the proposal and assess its impact. First, as you know, the proposal has already been posted with a discussion board under “current issues” on the senate Website. Second, Jack Lee presented the proposal’s basics to the Senate at the October meeting and a vibrant discussion took place. Third, senators were urged to discuss the proposal with their faculties and return to the Senate ready to express their colleagues’ views and concerns at the December meeting – and we plan to call on senators to report. The Senate agenda before you allocates a considerable amount of time at the next Senate meeting to a floor debate on the salary policy.

For the fourth step, we plan to discuss the proposal at a meeting with the chairs of each elected faculty council and will urge them to facilitate discussions between their deans and faculties. Fifth, we are planning a town hall meeting to which all faculty will be invited. The meeting will include a panel discussion where the pros and cons of the proposal will be aired, followed by a question and answer period. We hope to record and post the proceedings.

Sixth, we are considering conducting a straw poll of the faculty by email on whether and why individuals would vote to approve the proposal or not. If the straw poll reveals substantial support for the new policy, then the FCFA will submit its code language to the SEC. If this body approves, then the code changes will advance to the Senate and, if that body approves, on to the faculty at large and the President.

We look forward to feedback from the SEC on whether this seems like an appropriate method for engaging the faculty on this major proposal.
Report of the Secretary of the Faculty
Marcia Killien, Professor, Family and Child Nursing

1. The Vice Chair Nominating Committee is being formed and will soon be seeking nominations for next year’s vice chair. The ideal candidate would be an accomplished senior faculty member who has served in leadership roles within the University and who has the breadth of understanding to speak for the Faculty across the university.

   If you are interested or know someone who would be well qualified for the position, please contact the Nominating Committee, c/o Nancy Bradshaw in the Faculty Senate Office. The Nominating Committee expects to recommend candidates to the Senate Executive Committee at its January 12 meeting.

2. The Senate leadership will meet on 12/2/14 at 11:30 a.m. with chairs of the Faculty Councils/University Committees for coordination and information sharing. A similar meeting is scheduled for 11/17/14 at 11:30 a.m. to meet with the chairs of the Elected Faculty Councils (“college councils”) of the Schools, Colleges, and Campuses.
Report of the Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
Jack Lee, Professor, Mathematics

*The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting and Budget* meets weekly with the Provost, the Vice-Provost for Planning and Budgeting, and the head of the Board of Deans. SCPB is charged with consulting on all matters relating to the University budget and on a wide range of program and policy decisions.

Here are the topics that SCPB has discussed since my last report to the Senate:

**Self-Sustaining Program Conversion:** A new state law, SHB 1669, requires that the UW establish guidelines for self-sustaining program conversions. We have established an ad hoc subcommittee, consisting of Provost Cauce, Lisa Graumlich (Dean of the College of the Environment), Alice Popejoy (GPSS), Christina Xiao (ASUW), Dan Turner (Foster School), Dan Jacoby (UW Bothell), and Mark Haselkorn (Engineering). This committee will bring suggested guidelines to SCPB in winter quarter. (Note that the UW currently has placed a moratorium on conversion of existing programs to self-sustaining status; but we are required by law to establish guidelines in case the moratorium is ever lifted.)

**Admissions Report:** We received a report from Associate Vice Provost Phil Ballinger on incoming student demographics. We learned that both the Autumn 2014 applicant pool and the entering freshman class set size records. The number of incoming international freshmen declined a bit since last year, but remains large, and as in recent years the majority of international students are from China. The most requested majors were Business Administration, Biology, and Computer Science. For more detailed information about admissions statistics, see the *Enrollment Trends* page on the Office of Planning and Budgeting website.

**Enrollment Management:** Associate Vice Provost Ballinger also gave us a preliminary report of the activities of the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee established last year by President Young and Provost Cauce and chaired by Senior Vice Provost Jerry Baldasty. This council is charged with exploring options for managing undergraduate admissions and financial aid, including such issues as affordability, access, strategic use of financial aid, enrollment capacity, selectivity, diversity, and transfer enrollment.

**Internal Lending Program:** We received a report from Associate Vice President Christopher Malins of the UW Treasury Office about the Internal Lending Program. This is a program run by the Treasury Office that centralizes all of the university's external borrowing, and makes loans to internal units of the university at stabilized interest rates.

**Romance Languages RCEP:** The College of Arts and Sciences has proposed splitting the Department of Romance Languages into two separate departments: the Department of French and Italian Studies and Department of Spanish and Portuguese Studies. Currently, these are two functionally independent divisions within the department, so the separation would have little effect other than formalizing a split that has long been in place. SCPB recommended to the provost that the request be treated as a "limited RCEP."

**College of Arts and Sciences Report:** This year, SCPB is beginning a new program of meeting with deans and faculty and student leaders of each college, school, and campus on a rotating basis. Because more and more planning and budgeting decisions are being made at the college level (a process accelerated by the advent of Activity-Based Budgeting), SCPB decided it needs to have some more direct interaction with the leadership of college-level units in order to effectively carry out its charge. We will be meeting with leaders of all colleges, schools, and campuses on a rotating basis, starting with Arts and Sciences. We heard about the college's challenges in managing its changing student profile, as more and more students select STEM-related majors. We also heard about the college's shared governance process, which all agreed is robust and healthy.
**Legislative Update:** Outgoing Director of State Relations Margaret Shepherd gave us a report on the legislative outlook in Olympia, focusing on the challenges the state will be facing in trying to find enough revenue to adequately support the state’s universities while meeting the mandate of the McCleary decision (and, if it passes, Initiative 1351 on K-12 class size reduction).

**WWAMI:** The WWAMI Regional Medical Education Program has trained physicians since the 1970s to care for patients and communities throughout the states of Washington, Alaska, Montana and Idaho, with Wyoming joining in 1996. Until this year, Washington State University has been a partner with UW in the Spokane site for WWAMI, but now WSU has withdrawn from that partnership. We learned about the UW’s efforts to maintain state support for the UW-WWAMI program in Spokane, as well as planned efforts to expand its size. One of the most pressing immediate questions is whether the state will approve the UW’s request to transfer the jointly controlled assets of the Spokane-based program to the UW so it can continue to run UW-WWAMI.

Here are the topics we plan to discuss in future meetings during fall and winter quarters:

- Continuing Legislative updates
- State audit
- Proposed new faculty salary policy
- Learning spaces
- Pay it forward proposal
- ASUW report on student debt
- Faculty demographics
- Faculty salary survey
- Guidelines for lecture hiring
- Overview of the governor’s budget
- Provost reinvestment funds requests
- Report from the College of the Environment
- Administrative review of services and overhead rates
- Financial Aid
- Tuition setting process
- HR/payroll modernization
- Annual retention report
- Faculty recruitment & separations
- Global Innovation Project
- College of Engineering report
Report of the Faculty Legislative Representative
JoAnn Taricani, Associate Professor and Chair, Music History Program
olympia@uw.edu

Update as of November 12, 2014: There will be several significant updates by the second week of December regarding the state budget and possible policy implications. As of this second week in November, the news is about the results of the general election on November 4; the results are not yet final (they will be certified by the end of the month), but the outcomes are clear in several significant close races and issues.

The majority parties will remain the same in the State House of Representatives and Senate, with the Republican Party holding an actual majority in the coming session, in contrast to the majority it created and titled the Majority Coalition Caucus Senators in the past two sessions, with the migration of two Democrats. The House will remain Democratic, but with a more narrow majority of 51 or 52 votes instead of the 55 Democratic members of the House in the past two sessions. Much political commentary notes that this will require a higher level of consensus within the House Democratic caucus in order to hold the voting majority stable on floor votes (the final votes on legislative bills). The recent chair of the House Higher Education Committee, Representative Larry Seaquist, did not win his district seat again, so there will be new leadership in higher education in the House policy committee, to be determined by House leadership.

Not a surprise (except that it was expected to have a more robust majority) is the voters’ approval of Initiative 1351, mandating smaller class sizes in K-12 education. In addition to the McCleary ruling that mandates additional expenditure on K-12 education, this has the potential to add another significant cost to the large shortfall the state will face in writing a budget for 2015-17. The State Supreme Court has required the Legislature and Governor to write a budget by the end of April 2015 that takes the expenditures of the McCleary decision into account. But I-1351 may or may not be funded in the next budget; some aspects of it can be addressed within the McCleary decision, but there are many elements that will require additional funding. The Office of Financial Management, which advises the Governor, projects that $1.2 to $2 billion will need to be added to the carry forward state budget for 2015-17 for the McCleary decision; and the estimates for Initiative 1351 range from $2 billion to $4.5 billion over the next four years. A link to the various carry forward and additional expenditures (except for I-1351, which had not yet passed) has been prepared by OFM and can be found at:

https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/d9d211f70f56ec59ef742991a94f420846945a72ce249f653e1de53c5c9cc25c?inline=1

Over the next two months, the policy committees and chairmanships in the Legislature will be identified, the quarterly economic forecast will be provided on November 19, and the Governor’s two budgets will be issued in early December. All those events will provide us with a more clear view of the issues the state and our university will face in the legislative session that begins in January.
Report of the Chair of the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization (SCIPC)
Tueng Shen, Professor, Ophthalmology/Bioengineering

- **Status of Outside Work Form**: At its April 29, 2014, meeting the Special Committee on Intellectual Property and Commercialization approved a final draft of the Request for Approval of Outside Professional Work for Compensation (Form 1460). Details of the discussions are in the committee’s 2013-14 annual report at [http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/Annual-Report-2013-14-SCIPC_sa.pdf](http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/Annual-Report-2013-14-SCIPC_sa.pdf). The Office of Research, the Center for Commercialization, and the Intellectual Property Management Advisory Committee then reformatted the documents. The new format does not alter the wording of the assignment clause that SCIPC approved. OR and C4C are still working on implementing an electronic signature process and so the new format is not yet in use, but the older format does include the SCIPC-approved assignment clause.

- **Pre-packaged intellectual property (IP) clauses for sponsored research**: SCIPC members unanimously agreed to endorse/support the proposed pre-packaged IP clauses for sponsored research. Due to lengthy IP negotiation terms, the proposal was created as an efficient alternative to allow PI’s to negotiate with small companies for their intellectual properties. Details of this proposal are on the committee’s Website at [http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/scipcmin_052714.pdf](http://www.washington.edu/faculty/files/2014/06/scipcmin_052714.pdf).
2014 – 2015 Appointments to University and Senate Committees.

Faculty Council on Benefits and Retirement (Meets Mondays at 2:30)

- Brady Begin, ASUW, as an ex-officio member with vote for a term beginning September 16, 2014 and ending September 15, 2015.

Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (Meets Thursdays at 9:00)

- Eli McMeen, ASUW, as an ex-officio member without vote for a term beginning September 16, 2014 and ending September 15, 2015.
Proposed Changes to the University of Washington Student Conduct Code
Elizabeth Lewis, Director, Community Standards & Student Conduct
Julie Draper Davis, Associate Director, Community Standards and Student Conduct

In November 2010, then Vice President and Vice Provost for Student Life, Eric Godfrey, charged a committee to review the 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 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. Brian Fabien and Chuck Treser have been representatives on the committee and offered insightful comment.

The committee made up of faculty, staff and students from all three campuses met over a number of years to evaluate and review the current code. The committee arrived at the following conclusions:

- A comprehensive review had not been done of the code since the 1990’s.
- 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:
  - (c) Conduct on university premises constituting a sexual offense, whether forcible or nonforcible, such as rape, sexual assault, or sexual harassment;
- This grouping presents challenges for reporting and for working with students.
- The code needed to be structured differently in order to make things easier to find.
- The Off Campus Code was too restrictive and was making it difficult to respond to student issues we are federally required to respond to.
- A Medical Leave policy tied to the Student Conduct Code was not appropriate. The committee stopped working on that component.

Additionally, with the Dear Colleague Letter regarding Title IX of 2011 and changes to the Clery Act in this past year it became clear that the University needed to make changes in responding to Title IX violations.

A draft has been developed and presented to the Faculty Council on Student Affairs at the Nov 4 meeting. We are taking feedback and working with the large committee to receive feedback. Changes in the code are as follows:

1. Restructuring the code to include definitions and discreet functions as separate WACs.
2. Unpacking and defining violations into discreet units to increase the awareness of students of the expectations of the University.
3. Creating a separate Title IX Conduct Process to be compliant with federal guidance regarding sexual harassment and sexual assault.
4. Creating an Agreed Settlement process for responding to non-Title IX issues.
5. Creating a more streamlined process for students regarding appeals and reconsideration of orders.

Additionally, the new draft envisions faculty appointment to disciplinary committees would be in line with the Faculty Senate and Assemblies normal process for appointing faculty to committees. It further envisions specified term limits, but expands the pool of faculty to include non-voting faculty. This is important at Bothell and Tacoma which may have limited pools of faculty to draw from.

We will be working with the Faculty Council on Student Affairs to bring this forward to the Faculty Senate for a referendum approving the code. We will also be continuing the Rules Making Process with a desired date of implementation of Fall 2015.
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON STUDENT CONDUCT CODE WAC 478-120

WAC 478-130-010 AUTHORITY
WAC 478-130-020 PREAMBLE

ARTICLE I: DEFINITIONS
WAC 478-130-030 DEFINITIONS

ARTICLE II: STUDENT CONDUCT CODE AUTHORITY
WAC 478-130-040 JURISDICTION OF THE STUDENT CONDUCT CODE

ARTICLE IV: PROSCRIBED CONDUCT
WAC 478-120-050 STANDARDS OF CONDUCT
WAC 478-120-060 ABUSE OF OTHERS
WAC 478-120-070 ABUSE OF THE STUDENT CONDUCT PROCESS
WAC 478-120-080 ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT
WAC 478-120-090 ACTS OF DISHONESTY
WAC 478-120-100 AIDING, SOLICITATION AND ATTEMPT*
WAC 478-120-110 ALCOHOL
WAC 478-120-120 COMPUTER ABUSES
WAC 478-120-130 DISCRIMINATORY HARASSMENT
WAC 478-120-140 DISRUPTION OR OBSTRUCTION
WAC 478-120-150 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE*
WAC 478-120-160 DRUGS
WAC 478-120-170 FAILURE TO COMPLY
WAC 478-120-180 HARASSMENT
WAC 478-120-190 HAZING
WAC 478-120-200 INDECENT EXPOSURE*
WAC 478-120-210 POSSESSION OR USE OF FIREARMS, EXPLOSIVES, DANGEROUS CHEMICALS OR OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPONS
WAC 478-120-220 QUALITY OF LIFE
WAC 478-120-230 RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE*
WAC 478-120-240 RETALIATION*
WAC 478-120-250 SEXUAL EXPLOITATION*
WAC 478-120-260 SEXUAL HARASSMENT*
WAC 478-120-270 SEXUAL MISCONDUCT*
WAC 478-120-280 STALKING*
WAC 478-120-290 THEFT
WAC 478-120-300 UNAUTHORIZED KEYS, ENTRY OR USE
WAC 478-120-310 UNAUTHORIZED RECORDING
WAC 478-120-320 VANDALISM
WAC 478-120-330 VIOLATION OF DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

ARTICLE IV: STUDENT CONDUCT CODE PROCEDURES
WAC 478-120-340 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS
WAC 478-120-350 EVIDENCE
WAC 478-120-360 DISCOVERY
WAC 478-120-370 DELIVERY OF NOTICE
WAC 478-120-380 STANDARD OF REVIEW
WAC 478-120-390 SANCTIONS
WAC 478-120-400 RECONSIDERATION OF FINAL ORDERS
WAC 478-120-410 EMERGENCY AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT AND CHANCELLORS OF THE UNIVERSITY.
WAC 478-120-420 RECORDING AND MAINTANCE OF RECORDS

ARTICLE V: CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS
WAC 478-120-430 PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION
WAC 478-120-440 NOTICE OF INFORMAL DISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE
WAC 478-120-450 INFORMAL DISCIPLINARY CONFERENCE
WAC 478-120-460 CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD
WAC 478-120-470 INITIATING CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-480 CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD PRE-HARING PROCEDURES
WAC 478-120-490 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-500 CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS PROCESS
WAC 478-120-510 CONCLUSION OF THE CAMPUS CONDUCT BOARD HEARING

ARTICLE VI: TITLE IX CONDUCT PROCEEDINGS
WAC 478-120-520 PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION
WAC 478-120-530 NOTICE OF INITIAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING
WAC 478-120-540 INITIAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING
WAC 478-120-550 CONCLUSION OF INITIAL DISCIPLINARY HEARING
WAC 478-120-560 REQUEST FOR TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING
WAC 478-120-570 TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD
WAC 478-120-580 INITIATING TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-590 TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD PRE-HARING PROCEDURES
WAC 478-120-600 GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-610 WITNESSES IN THE TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING PROCESS
WAC 478-120-620 ROLE OF ADVISORS IN TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARINGS
WAC 478-120-630 TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING PROCESS
WAC 478-120-640 CONCLUSION OF THE TITLE IX CONDUCT BOARD HEARING
Summary Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative
Roland “Pete” Dukes, Professor, Accounting

As the Faculty Athletics Representative I encountered no major issues during the 2013-14 academic year. In general I believe the University of Washington intercollegiate athletics program is doing the right things and is in good shape. I continue to focus on some areas where I have modest concerns. But we are looking at a potential sea change in the way intercollegiate athletics are governed and the support provided to student athletes. The next year will see many changes.

New Governance Structure at NCAA and Pac-12 Levels

Huge changes are on the horizon for the governance of intercollegiate athletics at both the Pac-12 Conference level and at the national NCAA level. For years institutions have attempted to use resources generated within intercollegiate athletics to provide better support for student athletes. The areas in which these institutions wanted to improve the life of student athletes included underwriting the full cost of attending their institutions, provide guarantees of support for four years and even for completing their education if the student should leave the institution before completion, more complete medical support, and providing meals and food for student athletes when practice or competition times impede attending a normal meal time. These major or large institutions, including Washington, would support providing these benefits, but other institutions with fewer resources would vote them down.

This past year efforts were successful in creating the opportunity to have a new governing structure within the NCAA that will allow the five major conferences the autonomy to enact some of the support items mentioned above. In January 2015, at the NCAA national meetings in Washington, DC, the agenda includes setting up the governing body for this new subgroup and allow them to set their own rules with a prescribed set of areas. The new governing structure will for the first time include student athletes as voting members of the governing body.

The Pac-12 Conference and it institutions fully support the above summarized changes. Moreover, the Conference is changing its own governing body, the Pac-12 Council, to include student athletes as participating members. At this time the body includes Faculty Athletic Representatives, Athletic Directors, and Senior Women Administrators from each institution, with the FAR being the voting member from each institution. At a minimum I can envision the structure changing to include a student athlete from each institution.

Much remains to be done in implementing these governing changes, and then agreeing to what actions that the five conferences will undertake. But in my opinion these changes are necessary in order to right some of the grievances of student athletes at these very demanding institutions.

One issue that is in the middle these changes is the composition of the overriding governing body. Currently the plan is that it would be dominated by Athletic Directors, with additional members coming from FARs, Senior Women Administrators, Conference representatives, and of course student athletes. FARs in the Pac-12 and indeed across the country “lobbied” for greater participation in the leadership, but in the end most of us felt the changes were so important to move forward that we have acquiesced for the moment to the proposed structure. In any case this governing body reports to a Board of Directors composed of University Presidents which would have veto power, so at the highest level intercollegiate athletics is on the hands of the academe.

Pac-12 Changes

Consistent with the direction outlined above, the Pac-12 as a Conference is taking a leadership role in moving forward with this driving agenda behind these changes, that of better treatment of student athletes. Here is an excerpt from a Pac-12 news release in which it identifies actions the Conference is taking in support of student athletes.
PAC-12 STUDENT-ATHLETE REFORM PACKAGE

i. Guaranteeing four-year scholarships that can neither be reduced nor canceled provided the student-athlete remains in good standing and meets his/her terms of the agreement. Effective in 2015-16, all financial aid agreements offered to incoming student-athletes will be multi-year agreements for no less than four academic years.

ii. Financially supporting student-athletes who do not graduate in four years and return to school to complete their degrees. Effective 2016-17, if a student-athlete departs the institution in good standing and has completed a reasonable portion of their degree (50%), the student-athlete can return and receive the remaining terms of his/her four-year agreement at any time.

iii. Enhancing medical support for both current and former student-athletes. Effective in 2015-16, Conference schools will be required to provide documented and direct medical expenses to former student-athletes for a period of four years after separation from the team or institution.

iv. Liberalizing Transfer Rules within the Conference. The CEOs approved elimination of the financial aid penalty of the intra-conference transfer rule. Effective immediately, a student-athlete who transfers between Pac-12 institutions can receive an athletic scholarship from the second school without restriction, provided he or she is otherwise eligible to receive the aid.

v. Increasing student-athlete representation in Pac-12 governance. The CEOs supported including student-athletes in Council meetings and giving them a meaningful role in its deliberations. Final recommendations will be determined June 2015.

Concerns for the Future

Implementation of proposed changes is always a concern. Exactly how worthy objectives are pursued is very important. Hence, the details of implementation will be important for the FAR and other concerned academics to monitor and guide.

On another front, the debacle that is in the news at the University of North Carolina is very disturbing. There are at least two levels of concern for that institution. There is the concern about loss of institutional control of the quality of course offerings being made available to all students, and concern about the athletic department participation in furthering or at least taking advantage of the opportunity to enroll student athletes in less demanding courses. The events at UNC have caused us to re-examine our processes and controls to limit student athletes taking advantage of what I might term “easy course credit opportunities.” We have extensive monitoring in place at Washington to limit the opportunity for student athletes to complete multiple independent study courses. SAAS and I carefully monitor situations where there are large numbers of student athletes in sections of courses. This area will continue to be examined to ensure student athletes are not “gaming” the system or getting an unfair advantage. However, neither the FAR nor the Department of Athletics can define what constitutes acceptable content in a course. This is an area where it appears the University of North Carolina, at the institutional level, might have failed.

Student Athletes at Washington

Overall, I am generally pleased with the way our student athletes are being served by the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. Exit surveys of graduating students continue to show that our student athletes feel very positive about their educational experience and the support they received from ICA and the University. This past year the Department has, with permission from the NCAA, increased support in terms of meals provided to all student athletes. Another small but very popular benefit granted to our student athletes was providing parking for them close to the athletic facilities.

On the academic front, our student athletes compete with the best in the Conference. Our graduation rates and academic progress ranking are always in the top half of the Conference, and frequently in the top quartile.

That said, there are always concerns about academic performance of student athletes, and this is exacerbated when there are coaching changes. Coaching changes in men’s soccer, baseball, women’s basketball, women’s tennis and football will likely impact graduation rates if (when) players leave because
of the coaching change. We will experience these as players recruited years ago depart early and impact the computation of later graduation rates. We are experiencing some of that today in our data as players recruit by a former football coach (Willingham) dropped out years ago but were to graduate now, hence impact (lower) our current graduate statistics.
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