How did the UW fail to adopt faculty dispute legislation reforms? Transforming Grievance and Discipline into Restorative Justice for UW Faculty

Under the guise of “housekeeping,” UW administrators amended the Faculty Code without involving official shared government structures. These 2017 changes to the Code were subsequently rolled back, as they had been adopted illegally. This revised legislation has been years in the making.

President Cauce has rejected the revised Class A legislation, offering minor changes by Executive Order and another prolonged revision process.

In both the current AND revised formulations, the Presidential veto power and lack of clarity on what constitutes “harm” leaves the process open to capricious abuse by leadership and administrators (faculty and non-faculty) of both disciplinary and grievance processes for retaliation and sanction of any faculty, without redress or repair, and no guarantee of shared governance.

UW-AAUP believes we need faculty code for dignified and fair dispute and conflict resolution. Our forum explores how other institutions have built effective frameworks for faculty dispute resolution, based on principles of equity, restorative and transformative justice.
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