

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 2006
36 GERBERDING HALL**

Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the November 6, 2006, meeting
2. Review workload and appointment procedures for the position of Secretary of the Faculty (introductory discussion)
3. Emergency preparedness issues (continued discussion)
4. University salary policy (follow-up)
5. Revisit RCEP rules (continued discussion)

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the November 6, 2006, meeting

Both the agenda for the day's meeting and the minutes of the November 6, 2006, meeting were approved as written.

2. Review workload and appointment procedures for the position of Secretary of the Faculty (introductory discussion)

Sjøvik reported that neither Lea Vaughn nor Donna Kerr were able to meet today with the Council, but both will be available to address the Council, one following the other, at the next meeting scheduled for December 11.

Today's discussion was initiated by Míceál Vaughan, who served five years as Secretary of the Faculty, after serving as Vice Chair and Chair of the Faculty Senate.

In taking the position of Secretary of the Faculty, one of Vaughan's main concerns was to continue his predecessor's work in providing a sounding board for faculty who were in need of counsel when confronted with challenges related to their academic careers. Vaughan sees this as a crucial part of the position, and if it were to be removed from the position description for the Secretary of the Faculty, he feels these duties should be clearly assigned to another position – perhaps a faculty ombudsman.

Another crucial part of his approach to the position was service to the Faculty Senate – including coordination of meetings, taking sole responsibility for drafting nuanced minutes of Senate meetings, and serving as advisor to the Senate Chair and Vice Chair as requested. The Secretary of the Faculty is also Secretary to the Faculty Senate, but that is only one element of the position.

His role with regard to the Faculty Councils included managing and coordinating issues assigned to the Councils and oversight of recorders who scheduled meetings, took minutes and provided staff support to each of the Councils. Some of those functions need to be restored since the recent reorganization of the office.

Under his watch, Vaughan oversaw the transition from a hard copy *University Handbook* (including *Faculty Code*) to a dynamic on-line version. This makes a substantial difference

for those involved in researching issues and drafting changes to the *Code* and other parts of the *Handbook*. Since then many more electronic changes have streamlined many Faculty Senate operations, including elections and information exchanges.

In response to a question concerning coordination of bylaws for colleges and schools, Vaughan replied that he had supported Donna Kerr's candidacy for the position because of her commitment to bringing the by-laws up to date and in compliance with the *Faculty Code*. Both he and his predecessor, John Bollard, had made some progress in gathering material on the by-laws that was currently available. Lea Vaughn also made some progress, but Kerr was committed to completing the process of making sure all colleges and schools had by-laws that reflected the reality of their governance structures and were in compliance with the *Code*.

In response to a question about how much time a Secretary of the Faculty spends on adjudication-related activities, Vaughan estimated that during his five years in that position he had probably encountered 30-40 extended, personal inquiries that involved faculty conflicts with other faculty colleagues or conflicts that involved administration. Very few of these led to formal adjudications, but most involved hours of counsel over extended periods of time. Some of the inquiries he received could be referred to the ombudsman and these were handled successfully outside of his office. Some of those referrals eventually returned to Vaughan's office, however, with the inquirer feeling that his or her needs were better served by someone more familiar with the issues related to the *Faculty Code*.

Vaughan suggested that much of the work of the Secretary of the Faculty has been (and could continue to be) done by a staff person. Budget allocations for the Office of Shared Governance also need to be considered.

One council member reported that he was surprised and disappointed that the advisory role of the Secretary of the Faculty is "traditional" rather than being clearly defined in the *Faculty Code*. He hoped that any re-consideration of the role of the Secretary of the Faculty will include a provision for advising faculty in need of counseling. It's possible that up to 2/3 of the position is currently taken up in voluntarily imposed duties.

Vaughan suggested that the counseling element of the position might be assigned to one of the attorneys in the AG's office in order to level the playing field with members of the administration, who have access to help from the AG's office. However, issues concerning walling off such a person and possible conflict of interest raised questions about the practicality of this option.

Any new position description needs to be reconciled with the Ombudsman's Office and Conciliation procedures that are chronically underused.

The Secretary of the Faculty and the Chair of the Faculty Senate generally work very closely. Their offices are side-by-side and the Secretary typically sits on the "kitchen cabinet" of the Chair. Like the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Secretary of the Faculty needs to be a seasoned faculty member to function effectively as a resource person and for the sake of continuity in the Faculty Senate Office.

As conversation continued it was clear that some clarification would be needed concerning Senate Chair Gail Stygall's request that this position be reviewed and revised on a very tight timeline. Careful and time-consuming research would be needed to complete this task in the manner it deserves. Consideration was then given to the possibility of separating the Chair's request into two possible changes with separate legislative actions. The first would be the manner in which the Secretary of the Faculty is chosen. The second would be a revised and updated position description.

The nomination and appointment procedure would be relatively straightforward and uncomplicated to draft. Attention will need to be given to the nomination process (the constitution of the nominating committee and who appoints it, whether nominations from the floor will be allowed, etc.) the election (by the faculty senate or by the faculty as a whole?), the term of the appointment (the traditional five years or a shorter, three-year term?), and recall procedures.

Although no vote was taken, Council discussion moved toward a nominating committee appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate, whose selection would be vetted by the Senate Executive Committee (thereby including full representation of the eight faculty voting groups), with election by the Faculty Senate (with nominations from the floor being allowed). The Secretary of the Faculty would serve at the pleasure of the Faculty Senate and could be removed given a motion signed by 10% (or some reasonable number) of the Senate membership.

Sjåvik volunteered to draft Class A legislation changing the *Faculty Code* in this regard. He will send it to Alan Kirtley for review and distribute copies for Council review at the next meeting on December 11. The assumption is that if provisions for appointment of the Secretary of the Faculty in the *Code* are changed by the end of the academic year, an election will be called immediately.

3. Emergency preparedness issues (continued discussion)

Discussion deferred due to lack of time.

4. University salary policy (follow-up)

FCFA representatives have been appointed to the special committee assigned to consider the current and alternative salary policies. The special committee has begun meeting and FCFA representatives will report back with progress being made.

5. Revisit RCEP rules (continued discussion)

Discussion deferred due to lack of time.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:02 p.m. *Minutes by Susan Folk, Office of Regional Affairs.*

Present: *Regular:* Rich Christie, Anthony Gill, Katherine Graubard, Jacob Hildebrandt, Alan Kirtley, Beth Kolko, Todd Scheuer, Jan Sjåvik, Míceál Vaughan
President's Designee: Cheryl Cameron

Absent: *Regular:* James Callis and Beth Kolko
Ex-officio: Bridget Doyle (excused) and Jennifer Patterson (excused)