Meeting Synopsis:
1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the January 8, 2007, meeting.
2. Review workload and appointment procedures for the position of Secretary of the Faculty (continued discussion).
3. Other business as time allows

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the January 8, 2007, meeting.
The meeting agenda was approved; the January 8, 2007, FCFA meeting minutes were approved as corrected.

2. Review workload and appointment procedures for the position of Secretary of the Faculty (continued discussion).
Chair Jan Sjåvik reported that Micheál Vaughan would not be able to attend the meeting and had sent an e-mail expressing his concerns about the proposed legislation drafted at the previous meeting. Copies of the e-mail were distributed. The Council first addressed the final point of Vaughan’s e-mail, agreeing by consensus to change the word “Chapter” in the last paragraph (E) of the current and proposed text to “Faculty Code.” Duties assigned to the Secretary of the Faculty are mentioned in a number of distinct chapters of the Code – not just in Chapter 22.

Vaughan’s primary concern raised a question about the election of the Secretary of the Faculty by the Faculty Senate instead of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). He felt it was not wise or necessary for the election to be conducted by the Senate since the Secretary’s duties extend well beyond his or her service as secretary to the Faculty Senate. He suggested that “it might be more appropriate to have the election take place in the Senate Executive Committee, where the balance between Faculty Councils and Faculty Senate Group Representatives is more equally divided, and where there might be a better chance that those present and voting will have some real understanding of the requirements of the position, and perhaps also of the personality of the candidates. It also would identify the position as one distinct in the character from the ‘political’ election of the Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate.”

Issues and questions raised included:
- The current draft requires vetting by the SEC before the Senate vote. Wouldn’t that be sufficient?
- If there were nominations from the floor they would not have been vetted by the SEC.
- The election could take place in the SEC with confirmation by the Senate.
- The Senate election could be defined in the Code as prohibiting nominations from the floor.
• The draft legislation from the previous month’s deliberations could be approved unchanged.

Alan Kirtley reported that he had discussed the legislation with his Law School colleague and former Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn. She feels that routine administrative work is so much part of the position, it is important that anyone considering this position, or considering the prospect of nominating a colleague, should clearly understand the nature of the work involved. Those on the SEC are far more likely to understand this than the general membership of the Senate. The prospect of “wildcat” nominations from the Senate floor for candidates who are not aware of the position description was a significant concern for Council members.

Kirtley suggested that one way to avoid the possibility of a wildcat Senate nomination would be to have the Secretary elected by the SEC and then confirmed by the Senate. Sjåvik supported the idea, feeling that it was crucial to involve the Senate at some level.

Discussion ensued about the threshold of the vote for confirmation, whether the name of the candidate should be published in the Senate agenda, whether tenure should be required, and what might happen if the Senate declined to confirm a candidate.

The final wording of the proposed legislation is as follows:

Section 22-56. The Secretary of the Faculty

A. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be a member of the faculty with tenure. The term of service shall normally be five years.

B. The Secretary of the Faculty shall be elected by a majority vote of the Senate Executive Committee and confirmed by a majority vote of the Senate. The Chair of the Senate shall publish the name of the individual elected by the Senate Executive Committee in the agenda of the Senate meeting in which confirmation is sought.

C. If the position of the Secretary of the Faculty falls vacant, a committee consisting of the Senate Chair, Vice-Chair and immediate past Senate Chair shall appoint a temporary Secretary of the Faculty, pending a prompt election and confirmation process for a permanent successor.

D. The Secretary of the Faculty shall keep the minutes and the records of the Senate.

E. The Secretary of the Faculty shall administer the Office of University Committees. He or she shall also maintain a file of council and committee rosters and provide the Executive Committee with lists of nominees for council and committee appointments.

F. The Secretary of the Faculty shall perform the additional duties prescribed in the Faculty Code.
Anthony Gill made a motion, seconded by Katherine Graubard, to approve the changes as drafted in the above text. The motion was approved by unanimous vote of the voting members present.

Further thought was given to including a provision for removal of the Secretary of the Faculty, but the Council felt that such a change should include provisions for the Chair and Vice Chair as well.

3. Other business as time allows
Time did not allow for further items of business.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Minutes by Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty, slfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-543-2637.

Present:

Regular: Christie, Gill, Graubard, Hildebrandt, Kirtley, Kolko, Scheuer and Sjåvik
President’s Designee: Cameron
Members of Representative Groups: Patterson, Shields and Doyle

Absent:

Regular: Callis, and Vaughan (excused)
Ex-officio: Cook