

MINUTES

Date March 6, 2024

Time 1:00 – 1:45 pm PST

Quorum Reached

Attendees:

Regrets:

Recording: will only be available for 90 days

https://washington.zoom.us/rec/play/gxHZw0Drje8uPietfymaa4jbjNapjbTicOxWZn_qFcOUWmfy7NevsIUyltudxQ03aouBXu0tOs2TLREh.HDRH9i-B6y2eZ6xV?canPlayFromShare=true&from=share_recording_detail&continueMode=true&componentName=rec-play&originRequestUrl=https%3A%2F%2Fwashington.zoom.us%2Frec%2Fshare%2FuJd77dKSNym77w2XZQoLTG6-SS5zz1OyEfM0gkwltBxsaBgLhrUNC8jQWwklbto4.fSEOA0w5nyViSEL9

	ITEM	LEAD	TIME	ATTACHMENT	ACTION
1	MEPPC Work Update	Rhea	5 Min	N/A	Discussion
2	Meeting with Attorney General (Daniel Baker)	Jung	30 Min	N/A	Discussion
3	Next Steps	Jung	10 Min	N/A	Discussion

1. MEPPC Work Update

Discussion:

The committee addressed updates to the Meta Data Review, identifying shortcomings in the admissions policies. The respective governing bodies are scheduled to initiate updates in July.

A policy committee was formed by a group of students who have requested to participate in the MEPPC. The representative from this student-formed committee provided a list of policies they believe warrant review, voicing concerns that some of the language within these policies may be perceived as punitive.

1. Meeting With Attorney General

Discussion: The meeting commenced with introductory remarks followed by an inquiry session directed at the Assistant Attorney General.

The inquiries presented were as follows:

1. **Balance of Information in Policies:** We have observed that certain policies are overloaded with information, while others lack sufficient detail. How can we strike a balance to ensure the optimal amount of information is included for efficient policy utilization?
2. **Policy Procedures Inclusion:** Is it necessary for policies to encapsulate the Policy Procedures within the document itself, or could these be linked externally to enhance update flexibility? Additionally, what essential information must policies include?
3. **Information Hub Responsibility and Accountability:** Should the University of Washington School of Medicine (UW SOM) take responsibility for the content within information hubs, or could UW SOM face accountability for misinformation perceived by users of these hubs?
4. **Removal of Information from Handbook:** Is it permissible to extract detailed information from the handbook and maintain it exclusively on the webpage?
5. **Legal Definition of "Handbook":** Does a legal definition of "Handbook" exist?
6. **Policy Exceptions and Flexibility:** Our policies occasionally incorporate a clause suggesting that students may contact a specified senior administrative staff member for exceptions or under extenuating circumstances. Given the potential breadth of situations that could be considered exceptions or extenuating circumstances, is this approach advisable? What are your recommendations for enforcing policies while maintaining some degree of flexibility for exceptions?
7. **Possibility of Making Exceptions without an Explicit Clause:** In the absence of a specific exception clause within a policy, is it still feasible to make exceptions?

Response:

1. **Centralization of Documents:** Whether it is utilized within UWSOM, the designation is immaterial. It is advisable to centrally locate policies, procedures, and guidelines.
2. **Separation of Policy Procedures:** From a legal perspective, policy procedures can be legally separated. However, from a governance viewpoint, governing committees might seek to retain oversight over the updates to policy procedures.
3. **Legal Obligations Concerning Information Hubs:** There are no legal obligations tied to the content of information hubs. While the dissemination of accurate information is crucial, there exists no legal peril associated with inadvertently misinforming students on topics external to policy procedures. This principle applies equally to all information distributed through such hubs.
4. **Definition of "Handbook":** Legally, there is no prescribed definition of a "Handbook." It is within the school's purview to define the handbook's purpose.
5. **Handling Exceptions:** The challenge with providing a universal solution for exceptions is the potential creation of policy loopholes. For minor issues, directing students to a referral source for an appeal process can ensure appropriate decision-making. For decisions with significant student impact, an oversight committee should review appeals to establish

checks and balances. It is essential to have a mechanism for final decision-making, particularly in cases with substantial student impact or disciplinary issues. Direct requests for accommodation should be approached cautiously to prevent unequal treatment and bias, despite the intention to accommodate individual circumstances.

6. **Ad Hoc Exceptions:** Arbitrary exceptions should be avoided as they may introduce bias. Nonetheless, allowing for exceptions can prevent escalations and encourage the resolution of issues in less confrontational manners.

2. Next Steps

Discussion: Review notes from meeting with Assistant Attorney General and create next steps