

Miceal/Susan,

This UWeek article seems basically sound and complete to me, but I do have a few comments. First, you repeat your point about thorough and careful consideration in the SEC so many times that I wonder whether you are trying to say something deeper ????? Stylistically I wouldn't say it so many times. Second, you may want to modify the part about composition of panels to make clear that it is not only when there are students or staff that we have five person panels: that occurs whenever there is a discrimination claim, e.g., unlawful discrimination complaint by a faculty against faculty or administration. Third, is it strictly true to say the vote of the faculty is final, or is that true only on the assumption that you have presidential approval before the fact (which you do say)? Fourth, when you introduce students/staff on panels, you also introduce nonparty participants in such a way that an uninitiated reader might think they are the same. I would try to clarify that victims will be given the right to participate as "nonparty participants of right". Fifth, I would try to indicate that it is also proposed to include minority group diversity on the panels where relevant. Finally, I would put in a plug for mediation/conciliation here, and always. Hope this is helpful. Tom.

On Mon, 1 Feb 1993, Miceal Vaughan wrote:

> Susan/Tom,

> Here is my promised draft of the UWeek article. I'd very much  
> appreciate any substantive corrections or stylistic improvement you might  
> make. I'm almost at the correct length for the column, so any substantive  
> additions will have to be balanced by similar reductions.

> Thanks.

Miceal

> DRAFT

> Revising Our Judicial System

> Late last week the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA)  
> completed its discussion of proposals to amend Chapter 28 of the Faculty  
> Code: Adjudicative Proceedings for the Resolution of Differences. This  
> chapter constitutes, essentially, our faculty judicial system, and its  
> revision should occur only after grave deliberation, serious debate, and  
> informed vote. The Council's issuing its proposal advances us to the next  
> stage in that process: consideration by the Senate Executive Committee.

> Following a 1991 Senate subcommittee's review and recommendations,  
> and further discussions during the summer of 1992 by a Joint Faculty/  
> Administration Task Force, the FCFA has produced a thorough and  
> substantive revision of this important chapter of our Code. The  
> motivation behind these various undertakings is two-fold: faculty and  
> administrative dissatisfaction with features of the current Code, and a  
> desire by all parties to bring our procedures into better compliance with  
> the principles underlying the State's new Administrative Procedures Act.

> The Council's proposed revision now moves onto the agenda of the  
> Senate Executive Committee, for initial discussion at its next meeting:  
> Monday, 8 February. This advances us to another stage of thoughtful  
> review and discussion which, if it is to effect any change in our Code,

Special Collections  
UW Faculty Senate Records  
Accession No. 99-138  
Box 2 Folder: "university week"

OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY ARCHIVIST  
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS DIVISION  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN  
NOT FOR REPRODUCTION WITHOUT  
PERMISSION OF THE ARCHIVIST

