

Faculty Senate Minutes December 2, 1996

Senators Present:

Beardsley, Haltom, Hummel-Berry, Kay, Kirchner, Lind, Matthews, Maxwell, Nagy, Potts, Robertson, Smith, Steiner.

Minutes:

The minutes of November 18, 1996 were approved.

Announcements:

There were no announcements.

Chair's Report:

1. Since the next scheduled meeting falls on January 20, 1996 (Martin Luther King Day), the meeting was changed to January 27, to accommodate the bylaws which require a meeting at least once a month.

2. The Chair read from a letter by Mott Greene reporting on the progress of a Faculty Club. The two most pertinent paragraphs are as follows:

"The plans for the Faculty Club that I announced in a meeting of the faculty last fall are moving ahead. I thought it might be useful for you and the members of the Senate to have access to the by-laws and articles of incorporation, and a list of the interim faculty trustees, as we go ahead and incorporate as a not-for-profit institution in Washington State and apply for non-profit status from the IRS. . . .

I also wanted at the outset of the proceedings to make it clear that this is a social endeavor and not a shell for some new shadow-organ of governance and organized opinion. If, however, at some point in the future, when the faculty club is bought or built, the faculty senate should wish occasionally to hold a post-meeting reception in the club's lounge, no one would be more pleased than I."

3. The Chair gave a follow-up report from her contact with John Finney on the possibility of setting aside a time for faculty meetings. She reported: A.) It would take an organized group, such as the Faculty Senate, to push for a common meeting time. B.) The least used time between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. is 5:00 p.m. C.) No one expressed interest in working further on this problem.

Continued Discussion Of Faculty Bylaws:

1. The first discussion centered on Article V, Section 3B. Unclear wording seemed to imply that the Faculty Advancement Committee meetings were open to faculty and students. It was widely agreed that the Faculty Advancement Committee was universally exempt from open meetings.

2. A lengthy discussion then centered on Article V, Section 5A and the question of what types of committee action should be kept confidential. It was agreed that the actions of the Internal Review Board, Professional Standards Committee, and Faculty Advancement Committees are exempted from review by the Faculty Senate (and therefore the faculty) when these three committees deal with confidential personnel matters.

A discussion, led by Matthews, suggested that only pertinent policy issues needed to be forwarded to the Faculty Senate, but it was agreed that it would be difficult to define "policy." Lind suggested that the Faculty Advancement Committee was already exempt since it is an elected, rather than standing committee. Kirchner stated that the practice already exempts more than the Faculty Advancement Committee and that a new wording should reflect the practice. Potts suggested that rather than exempting specific types of committees, specific decisions should be exempted. Potts suggested the wording, "confidential matters affecting individuals."

Steiner then questioned what the "official" minutes were. Matthews pointed out that a paper archival copy should be kept since the Web minutes could be subject to hacking. Kirchner agreed to discuss this problem with staff in the Office of the Associate Deans.

The discussion returned to the bylaws issue with Kirchner agreeing to work on the language of this section along the lines of the previous discussion, since the Senate seemed in agreement in concept.

The Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

The next meeting will be January 27 at 4:00 p.m. in the McCormick Room.

Respectfully submitted,

Marta Robertson