

DEY

**MEMORANDUM**

---

---

N:\CLIENTS\20218\1\JOHNSON.MEM

**TO:** DALE JOHNSON

**FROM:** KAREN BOXX

**DATE:** MARCH 15, 1993

**RE:** FACULTY CODE REVISION PROJECT

**SUBJECT:** PROPOSAL REGARDING HEARING OFFICER

---

Attached is the memorandum that we circulated to the Council regarding the use of the hearing officer as the sole factfinder. As this was very early in the process, the focus was on efficiency. The Council had not yet begun to discuss the make-up of the panels except as a general concept. Therefore, the advantage of appearance of fairness is not brought up in the memo. However, I think the idea is useful to revive because it could remove the perception of faculty members "protecting their own" without adding students to the decisionmaking process.

Also, you may recall that the reference to Lloyd's statements that the Attorney General's office would be in a better position to represent faculty if we used this system was inaccurate.

*Special Collections  
UW President's Records  
Accession No. 05-006  
Box 4*

# MEMORANDUM

N:\CLIENTS\20218\1\COUNCMEM

**TO:** FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

**FROM:** DEAN DALE JOHNSON  
PROFESSOR BONNIE WORTHINGTON-ROBERTS  
LLOYD PETERSON  
PROFESSOR WILLIAM ANDERSEN  
KAREN E. BOXX

**DATE:** May 5, 1992

**RE:** FACULTY CODE ADJUDICATORY PROCEDURES REVISION

**SUBJECT:** ROLE OF FACULTY PANEL

The Advisory Committee and the Code Drafter have been meeting to finalize a draft of the revised adjudicatory procedures to submit to the Council for review. We have discussed a procedural structure that was not considered by the Council, but since this new structure appears to accomodate the dual concerns of efficiency and fairness more effectively than the previous proposals, we ask that the Council discuss it and give us comments.

Structure previously considered by the Council.

The previous discussions with the Council assumed that hearings would be conducted before a faculty panel that would be headed by a nonvoting hearings officer. The hearings officer would be an impartial person, not currently a faculty member, who had legal training. In cases involving students or staff, the panel would have representatives from those groups.

Proposed Structure.

The hearing would be conducted before the hearings officer alone, who would make a preliminary decision and submit the record and decision to the faculty panel for review. The faculty panel would review the entire record and

