Chair Jan Sjåvik called the meeting to order at 10:32 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the October 16, 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 October 16, 2006, meeting

Both the agenda for the day’s meeting and the minutes of the October 16, 2006, meeting were approved as written.

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

Faculty Senate Chair Gail Stygall initiated this discussion by relaying the President’s recently expressed concern that the University of Washington was unique in his experience in the way it selects its Secretary of the Faculty. In all other universities where he has served, the Secretary of the Faculty has been elected by the Faculty. That, in addition to other issues that have come up over the past few months, prompted Stygall to ask the Council to revisit code language concerning the position with regard to:

- Process of selection
- Term of office
- Duties

It’s not clear that one person is capable of carrying out all the major expectations of the Secretary of the Faculty:

- Support of the Faculty Senate and Councils
- Oversight of adjudication procedures
- Oversight of college and school by-laws

Stygall asked the Council to consider whether the position should be split, and, if so, how to constitute each separate position. She distributed a handout that outlines the specific duties of the Secretary of the Faculty.

The Secretary of the Faculty has traditionally served a five-year term. Stygall asked the Council to consider if a two- or three-year term might be better. She noted that a three-year term would reflect the commitment made by the Faculty Senate Chair who serves three years as Vice Chair, Chair and then as Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.
She noted that there was some urgency to her request, and that in order to have Class A legislation in place for a vote by the end of the academic year, the first reading would need to take place at the February 13 Senate Executive Committee meeting.

Mícheál Vaughan cautioned that a code revision of this magnitude should be done carefully and thoroughly, without the pressure of deadlines.

The current Secretary of the Faculty came to her position with a commitment to addressing the status of by-laws in the Schools and Colleges – the one aspect of the position that had been largely un-touched (presumably because of a lack of time and/or resources) by at least the past three or four previous Secretaries. Since arriving in her office, she has made progress in determining the status of by-laws in each of the Schools and Colleges and in assisting those Schools and Colleges whose by-laws needed updating and revising. The concern, however, is that this progress has come at the expense of on-going support, particularly staff support, needed by the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Councils and the Adjudication Procedures.

The Secretary of the Faculty’s role in Adjudication Procedures is seen as a “point of entry” for faculty members who have encountered career-related problems at the UW. With his or her knowledge of the Faculty Code, the Secretary is in a good position to be able to counsel a faculty member on whether his or her complaint is adjudicable, or whether it might be better handled by the Ombudsman, through conciliation, or at the departmental level. If the Secretary and the faculty member determine that a formal adjudication is indicated, the case is filed and the Secretary turns the matter over to the Chair of the Adjudication Panel. The Chair of the Adjudication Panel selects a panel which then hears the case and acts as an impartial judge. The Council was in consensus over the question of whether the Chair of the Adjudication Panel could take over the “point of entry” duties currently handled by the Secretary of the Faculty. Doing so could be seen as a conflict of interest for the Chair, who may have to serve on the Panel assigned to someone who had come to him for personal advice at the beginning.

One alternative suggested was having a separate Ombudsman for Faculty (perhaps a Senate appointment) who could address issues concerning tenure and promotion (something the current Ombudsman is not equipped to handle). This person should have the stature of the current Secretary of the Faculty in order to assure sustained confidence of faculty in need of counsel. Another suggestion was to guide faculty toward mediation and the Conciliation Panel whenever possible. However, the Conciliation Panel has been used very little in recent years, perhaps because it lacks the “teeth” provided by Adjudication Procedures.

The Council discussed the need to consult with the following:

- Donna Kerr, current Secretary of the Faculty
- Lea Vaughn and Mícheál Vaughan, previous Secretaries of the Faculty
- Representatives of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (the Code Cops)
- Past Chair of the Adjudication Panel Tom Andrews
- Ombudsman
One Council member voiced discomfort with the Code’s indication that the “Secretary of the Faculty serves at the pleasure of the President.” An elected Secretary of the Faculty might avoid the appearance of conflict of interest if thorny issues are under consideration.

Chair Jan Sjåvik noted with appreciation the willingness of the President to relinquish the power of this appointment to the faculty.

Stygall offered to compile information on how these questions related to the Secretary of the Faculty are handled at our peer institutions.

3. Emergency preparedness issues (continued discussion)

At the previous meeting, the Council was asked to create a list of four priorities to be considered under each of the following four categories, as they relate to emergency preparedness:

- Human Resources
- Instructional Alternatives
- Continuance and Prioritization of Critical Research
- Outreach and Communications

Other Councils, including the Faculty Council on Instructional Quality and the Faculty Council on Research will be doing the same exercise. This information will be compiled and considered as the UW Office of Emergency Management updates and expands the University’s emergency response plan.

Míčeál Vaughan will prepare a compilation of citations from the University Handbook and the Faculty Code that addresses these issues.

Other issues discussed:

- How to define the boundary between service to the University and service to the broader community during an emergency situation.
- The possibility of an exchange agreement with other universities whereby faculty could continue research activities at remote locations on a temporary basis.
- Use of internet facilities for instruction when access to the internet may not be a realistic assumption.
- How external emergencies would relate to the University’s financial emergency plan.

4. University salary policy (follow-up)

Faculty Senate Chair Gail Stygall reported that SCPB has appointed their representatives to the Special Committee on Faculty Salary: Dan Luchtel, Ashely Emery and herself. Jan Sjåvik reported that the Council’s representatives on the Committee would be Míčeál Vaughan, Jack Hildebrandt and himself.

5. Revisit RCEP rules (continued discussion)

Discussion deferred due to lack of time.
The meeting was adjourned at 12 p.m. Minutes by Susan Folk, Office of Regional Affairs, slfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-221-4183.
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