**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC)**

**Meeting Minutes**

Tuesday, 09/26/2023, 12:30 p.m. – 1:20 p.m.  
GWP 320/ Zoom

***Present:***  *Chair Huatong Sun, Vice Chair Anne Taufen, APCC Chair Julie Masura, APT Co-Chair Christine Stevens, APT Co-Chair Matthew Weinstein, Kurt Hatch, Monika Sobolewska, Jim West, Zhiquan (Andy) Shu, Barb Toews, Andrea Hill, Robin Evans-Agnew, Rupinder Jindal, Davon Woodard, Julia Eaton, Jenny Xiao, Alex Miller, Margaret Griesse, Ruben Casas, Erika Bailey.* ***Excused:*** *Past Chair Menaka Abraham,**Gary Viers, Mary Hanneman, Sushil Oswal* ***Guests:*** *Peter Selkin (Research Advisory Committee Chair 2023-24).* ***Program Coordinator:*** *Andrew Seibert*

1. **Land Acknowledgement, Consent to Agenda, Meeting Minutes, Permission to Record, Approval of Meeting Minutes from 04/24/2023**

The meeting was called to order at 12:30 p.m. Agenda was consented as presented. Permission to record the meeting was granted for minutes purposes only. The meeting minutes from May 8th were reviewed and approved as written.

1. **Welcome and Introductions**
   * New Executive Council Representatives 2023-24
     + Christine Stevens (APT Co-Chair)
     + Matthew Weinstein (APT Co-Chair)
     + Kurt Hatch, School of Education
     + Gary Viers, Milgard School of Business
     + Davon Woodard, School of Urban Studies
     + Sushil Oswal, School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences
   * Guest
     + Peter Selkin (Research Advisory Committee Chair 2023-24)
2. **Orientation/Refresher**
   * The Chair of Faculty Assembly reviewed the orientation packet sent as meeting materials prior to the meeting, which covered the topics of shared governance, Robert’s Rules of Order, and Open Public Meetings Act. Please see *Appendix A* for the documents that were shared.
   * Open Public Meetings Act Discussion
     + The Faculty Assembly Chair reviewed the 2018 OPMA guidelines and the proposal for Open Public Meetings Guidelines for Faculty Assembly Meetings document.
       - A motion was made and seconded to have an annual orientation at the first Executive Council meeting around the Open Public Meetings Act and Meeting etiquette.
       - A brief discussion ensued.
       - Without objection, the motion was amended to include the FA ground rule document that is publicly posted on the FA website.
       - Discussion resumed as the main motion as amended. The Program Coordinator restated the main motion as amended as follows: To have an annual orientation at the first Executive Council meeting around the Open Public Meetings Act, Meeting etiquette and the Faculty Assembly Ground Rules document.
       - After the discussion concluded, the main motion as amended passed.
         * *Vote****:*** *18 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions*

* **Faculty Assembly Ground Rules**
  + The Faculty Assembly Chair reviewed the Ground Rules document that was made in collaboration with the 2022-23 Faculty Assembly Leadership and approved by the Executive Council.

1. **Faculty Assembly’s Non-retaliation Policy Proposal**
   * The Faculty Assembly Chair discussed the proposal for a Faculty Assembly Non-retaliation policy. Background information was given in this meeting for a local proposal and information in the Tri-Campus on this matter.
2. **Adjournment**

* The meeting was adjourned at 1:24p.m.
  + Next meeting: October 13, 2023, GWP 320.

**Appendix A: EC Orientation**



**Executive Council**

**Orientation / Refresher 2023**

Dear Executive Council Colleagues and Faculty Leaders:

Welcome on board! Welcome back!

This orientation/refresher package covers the following topics:

* Shared governance
* Robert’s rules of order
* Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA)
* Ground rules for FA meetings

Please keep it in mind that some documents are used as conversation starters as we continue to develop the best practices for faculty governance at UWT—you are a key partner who is contributing to this collaborative decision-making process.

Looking forward to working with you this year!

Huatong Sun

Chair, Faculty Assembly

Professor, SIAS

Anne Taufen

Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly

Professor, SUS

**ADVICE** Exactly What Is ‘Shared Governance’?

*By Gary A. Olson*

JULY 23, 2009



BRIAN TAYLOR

At a recent conference of college administrators, several of us had an impromptu discussion over lunch about the meaning of “shared governance.” The consensus? That term is often invoked but much misunderstood by both faculty members and many administrators.

“Some of my faculty believe that shared governance literally means that a committee votes on some new plan or proposal and that’s it—it gets implemented,” said a seasoned department head. “There is no sense of sharing, of who is sharing what with whom.”

A dean chimed in that a faculty leader at her institution actually told her that shared governance means that professors, who are the “heart of the university,” delegate the governance of their universities to administrators, whose role is to provide a support network for the faculty. “He said, in all seriousness, that faculty have the primary role of governing the university and that administrators are appointed to spare them from the more distasteful managerial labor,” said the dean with incredulity.

That may be a more commonly held notion in academe than it at first appears. I know several faculty senators at one institution who regularly refer to faculty as “governance,” as in “You’re administration, and we’re governance.” That expression reveals a deep misunderstanding of the mechanism of shared governance—and presupposes an inherently adversarial relationship.

The phrase shared governance is so hackneyed that it is becoming what some linguists call an “empty” or “floating” signifier, a term so devoid of determinate meaning that it takes on whatever significance a particular speaker gives it at the moment. Once a term arrives at that point, it is essentially useless.

Shared governance is not a simple matter of committee consensus, or the faculty’s engaging administrators to take on the dirty work, or any number of other common misconceptions. Shared governance is much more complex; it is a delicate balance between faculty and staff participation in planning and decision-making proc-esses, on the one hand, and administrative accountability on the other.

The truth is that all legal authority in any university originates from one place and one place only: its governing board. Whether it is a private college created by a charter, or a public institution established by law or constitution, the legal right and obligation to exercise authority over an institution is vested in and flows from its board. Typically, the board then formally delegates authority over the day-to-day operation of the institution (often in an official

“memorandum of delegation”) to the president, who, in turn, may delegate authority over certain parts of university management to other university officials—for example, granting authority over academic personnel and programs to the provost as the chief academic officer, and so on.

Over time, the system of shared governance has evolved to include more and more representation in the decision-making process. The concept really came of age in the 1960s, when colleges began to liberalize many of their processes. In fact, an often-cited document on the subject, “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,” was issued jointly by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges in the mid-60s. That statement attempted to affirm the importance of shared governance and state some common principles.

The fact that the primary organization championing faculty concerns, the body devoted to preparing future academic administrators, and the association promoting best practices in serving on governing boards together endorsed the statement illustrates that university governance is a collaborative venture.

“Shared” governance has come to connote two complementary and sometimes overlapping concepts: giving various groups of people a share in key decision-making processes, often through elected representation; and allowing certain groups to exercise primary responsibility for specific areas of decision making.

To illustrate the first notion of how shared governance works, I’d like to revisit a 2007 column, [“But She Was Our Top Choice,”](http://chronicle.com.offcampus.lib.washington.edu/jobs/news/2007/04/2007041201c.htm) in which I discussed the search process for academic administrators and attempted to explain why hiring committees are commonly asked to forward an unranked list of “acceptable” candidates. I wrote that shared governance, especially in the context of a search for a senior administrator, means that professors, staff members, and sometimes students have an opportunity to participate in the process—unlike the bad old days when a university official often would hire whomever he (and it was invariably a male) wanted, without consulting anyone.

“Shared” means that everyone has a role: The search committee evaluates applications, selects a shortlist of candidates, conducts preliminary interviews, contacts references, chooses a group of finalists to invite to campus, solicits input about the candidates from appropriate stakeholders, and determines which of the finalists are acceptable. Then it’s up to the final decision maker, who is responsible for conducting background checks and entering into formal negotiations with the front-runner, and who is ultimately held responsible for the success (or failure) of the appointment.

“Shared” doesn’t mean that every constituency gets to participate at every stage. Nor does it mean that any constituency exercises complete control over the process. A search cannot be a simple matter of a popular vote because someone must remain accountable for the final decision, and committees cannot be held accountable. Someone has to exercise due diligence and contact the front-runner’s current and former supervisors to discover if there are any known skeletons that are likely to re-emerge. If I am the hiring authority and I appoint someone who embezzled money from a previous institution, I alone am responsible. No committee or group can be held responsible for such a lack of due diligence.

That’s a good example of shared governance as it daily plays out in manyareas of university decision making. No one person is arbitrarily making important decisions absent the advice of key constituents; nor is decision making simply a function of a group vote. The various stakeholders participate in well-defined parts of the process.

The second common, but overlapping, concept of shared governance is that certain constituencies are given primary responsibility over decision making in certain areas. A student senate, for example, might be given primary (but not total) responsibility for devising policies relevant to student governance. The most obvious example is that faculty members traditionally exercise primary responsibility over the curriculum. Because professors are the experts in their disciplines, they are the best equipped to determine degree requirements and all the intricacies of a complex university curriculum. That is fitting and proper.

But even in this second sense of shared governance—in which faculty members exercise a great deal of latitude over the curriculum—a committee vote is not the final word. In most universities, even curricular changes must be approved by an accountable officer: a dean or the university provost, and sometimes even the president. In still other institutions, the final approval rests with the board itself, as it does for many curricular decisions in my own university and state.

Clearly, when it comes to university governance, “shared” is a much more capacious concept than most people suspect. True shared governance attempts to balance maximum participation in decision making with clear accountability. That is a difficult balance to maintain, which may explain why the concept has become so fraught. Genuine shared governance gives voice (but not necessarily ultimate authority) to concerns common to all constituencies as well as to issues unique to specific groups.

The key to genuine shared governance is broad and unending communication. When various groups of people are kept in the loop and understand what developments are occurring within the university, and when they are invited to participate as true partners, the institution prospers. That, after all, is our common goal.

*We welcome your thoughts and questions about this article. Please email the editors or submit a letter for publication.*

1255 23rd Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

© 2023 The Chronicle of Higher Education

# Roberts Rules of Order – Simplified

**Guiding Principles**:

* Everyone has the right to participate in discussion if they wish, before anyone may speak a second time.
* Everyone has the right to know what is going on at all times. Only urgent matters may interrupt a speaker.
* Only one thing (motion) can be discussed at a time.

A **motion** is the topic under discussion (e.g., “I move that we add a coffee break to this meeting”). After being recognized by the president of the board, any member can introduce a motion when no other motion is on the table. A motion requires a second to be considered. If there is no second, the matter is not considered. Each motion must be disposed of (passed, defeated, tabled, referred to committee, or postponed indefinitely).

**How to do things**:

You want to bring up a new idea before the group.

After recognition by the president of the board, present your motion. A second is required for the motion to go to the floor for discussion, or consideration.

You want to change some of the wording in a motion under discussion.

After recognition by the president of the board, move to amend by

* adding words,
* striking words or
* striking and inserting words.

You like the idea of a motion being discussed, but you need to reword it beyond simple word changes.

Move to substitute your motion for the original motion. If it is seconded, discussion will continue on both motions and eventually the body will vote on which motion they prefer.

You want more study and/or investigation given to the idea being discussed.

Move to refer to a committee. Try to be specific as to the charge to the committee.

You want more time personally to study the proposal being discussed. Move to postpone to a definite time or date.

You are tired of the current discussion.

Move to limit debate to a set period of time or to a set number of speakers. Requires a 2/3rds vote.

You have heard enough discussion.

Move to close the debate. Also referred to as calling the question. This cuts off discussion and brings the assembly to a vote on the pending question only. Requires a 2/3rds vote.

You want to postpone a motion until some later time.

Move to table the motion. The motion may be taken from the table after 1 item of business has been conducted. If the motion is not taken from the table by the end of the next meeting, it is dead. To kill a motion at the time it is tabled requires a 2/3rds vote. A majority is required to table a motion without killing it.

You believe the discussion has drifted away from the agenda and want to bring it back.

“Call for orders of the day.”

You want to take a short break.

Move to recess for a set period of time.

You want to end the meeting. Move to adjourn.

You are unsure the president of the board announced the results of a vote correctly.

Without being recognized, call for a “division of the house." A roll call vote will then be taken.

You are confused about a procedure being used and want clarification.

Without recognition, call for "Point of Information" or "Point of Parliamentary Inquiry." The president of the board will ask you to state your question and will attempt to clarify the situation.

You have changed your mind about something that was voted on earlier in the meeting for which you were on the winning side.

Move to reconsider. If the majority agrees, the motion comes back on the floor as though the vote had not occurred.

You want to change an action voted on at an earlier meeting.

Move to rescind. If previous written notice is given, a simple majority is required. If no notice is given, a 2/3rds vote is required.

**Unanimous Consent**:

If a matter is considered relatively minor or opposition is not expected, a call for unanimous consent may be requested. If the request is made by others, the president of the board will repeat the request and then pause for objections. If none are heard, the motion passes.

• **You may INTERRUPT a speaker for these reasons only**:

* to get information about business –point of information to get information about rules– parliamentary inquiry
* if you can't hear, safety reasons, comfort, etc. –question of privilege o if you see a breach of the rules –point of order
* if you disagree with the president of the board’s ruling –appeal o if you disagree with a call for Unanimous Consent –object

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Quick Reference | |  |  |
|  | Must Be  Seconded | Open for  Discussion | Can be  Amended | Vote Count  Required to Pass | May Be  Reconsidered or Rescinded |
| Main Motion | √ | √ | √ | Majority | √ |
| Amend Motion | √ | √ |  | Majority | √ |
| Kill a Motion | √ |  |  | Majority | √ |
| Limit Debate | √ |  | √ | 2/3rds | √ |
| Close Discussion | √ |  |  | 2/3rds | √ |
| Recess | √ |  | √ | Majority |  |
| Adjourn (End meeting) | √ |  |  | Majority |  |
| Refer to Committee | √ | √ | √ | Majority | √ |
| Postpone to a later time | √ | √ | √ | Majority | √ |
| Table | √ |  |  | Majority |  |
| Postpone Indefinitely | √ | √ | √ | Majority | √ |

**Mastering meetings using Robert’s Rules**

# Essential Guidelines for Faculty Meetings



**© Department of Film and Media Studies at Hunter College, City University of New York, 2019.**

Follow these essential guidelines to take the pain out of your meetings, hold productive discussions, and serve your organization better.

**INTRODUCTION**

A faculty meeting is a gathering of employees who are addressing their organizational issues within the structure of their employment. These guidelines will help your discussion be fair and effective.

Note that in a faculty meeting, all discussion will be held and decisions made within the limits of your charter, bylaws, and labor agreements. It is critical:

■ to be familiar with your organization’s authority documents and how they apply to you; ■ to know which type of faculty members have the right to attend, to debate, and to vote; and ■ to be clear on the scope of your faculty’s authority for a decision. **BASICS**

A quorum must be present for business to be done. Usually a quorum means a majority (more than half ) of the voting faculty members holding positions.

The chair runs the meeting in the service of the faculty. The chair is not the “boss” but serves as a facilitator, helping the faculty to hold free and fair discussion and make good decisions.

www.jurassicparliament.co

[m](http://www.jurassicparliament.com/)

For large faculties, a motion is required before any discussion begins. For small faculties (up to about 12 people) it is fine to discuss issues before making a motion.

If a member makes a motion to amend the main motion, it is discussed and voted on before the main motion. After amending a motion, a vote must be taken on the main motion as amended.

After discussion, the chair calls for the vote and announces the result. The motion passes when a majority of those voting vote in favor, unless state law or your bylaws require a higher vote. This is different from the requirement for a quorum.

If someone “calls the question,” the chair must take a vote on whether to vote now or continue discussion. It takes a 2/3 vote to cut off discussion.

Telephonic participation, email voting and proxy voting pose special challenges. Be sure to operate within the limits of your authority documents and keep good records of any decisions made using these modes.

**DISCUSSION**

Faculty members must be courteous and respectful. They may not make inappropriate remarks such as personal remarks or insulting language. Discussion must be relevant to the issues at hand. One thing is discussed at a time.

All faculty members have equal rights, privileges and obligations. This means that discussion is not a conversation, but follows some important rules: ■ The chair recognizes speakers in turn.

■ No one may speak a second time until everyone who wishes to do so has spoken once. ■ Interrupting is not allowed.

If a faculty member breaks these rules, the chair may correct the member, or another faculty member may raise a Point of Order. The chair rules as to whether the point is correct, or not. The chair may also turn to the faculty first to decide whether a remark is appropriate or not.

A faculty member who disagrees with a ruling of the chair may appeal it. If another member seconds the appeal, the faculty decides.

The minority must be provided equal opportunity to debate, even if their views are unpopular. However, the decision of the majority voting at a properly called meeting is the decision of the faculty as a whole.

© Jurassic Parliament 2019. All rights reserved.

P.O. Box 77553, Seattle, WA 98177 tel 206.542.8422 | email *info@jurassicparliament.com* *www. jurassicparliament.com*

**OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW FOR UW ACADEMIC UNITS (2018)**

## FACULTY MEETINGS ARE PUBLIC MEETINGS

Faculty Meetings are subject to the Open Public Meetings Act unless they are being held specifically for recommendations on appointments, promotions or tenure. This includes committees or faculty councils if they are authorized to act on behalf of the faculty.

## OPEN GOVERNMENT TRAINING IS REQUIRED FOR ALL VOTING MEMBERS

Members of groups subject to the Open Public Meetings Act must complete open public meetings training no later than 90-days after the date the member assumes his or her duties, and not less than once every four years thereafter. Training is available through the Washington State Office of the Attorney General’s website on [Open Government Training.](http://www.atg.wa.gov/open-government-training) It is recommended that you document the training received per the Open Government Training website.

### ALL MEETINGS FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR MUST BE REGISTERED

UW’s Office of Public Records and Open Public Meetings handles this function. A list for the following calendar year should be submitted in October.

**MEETING AGENDAS MUST BE POSTED ONLINE AT LEAST 24 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING** Nothing in this section prohibits subsequent modifications to agendas nor invalidates any otherwise legal action taken at a meeting where the agenda was not posted in accordance with this section.

### VISITORS CAN ATTEND WITHOUT NOTICE AND CANNOT BE REQUIRED TO SIGN IN

A member of the public shall not be required, as a condition to attendance at a meeting of a governing body, to register his or her name and other information, to complete a questionnaire, or otherwise to fulfill any condition precedent to his or her attendance.

### MINUTES MUST BE TAKEN AT ALL MEETINGS AND BE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

The minutes of all regular and special meetings except executive sessions of such boards, commissions, agencies or authorities shall be promptly recorded and such records shall be open to public inspection.

### ACTIONS TAKEN IN VIOLATION OF THE LAW ARE NULL AND VOID

No governing body of a public agency shall adopt any ordinance, resolution, rule, regulation, order, or directive, except in a meeting open to the public and then only at a meeting, the date of which is fixed by law or rule, or at a meeting of which notice has been given according to the provisions of this chapter. Any action taken at meetings failing to comply with the provisions of this subsection shall be null and void.

## SECRET BALLOTS ARE PROHIBITED

No governing body of a public agency at any meeting required to be open to the public shall vote by secret ballot. Any vote taken in violation of this subsection shall be null and void, and shall be considered an "action" under this chapter.

## PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION APPLY TO FACULTY MEMBERS AS INDIVIDUALS

A member of a governing body who knowingly attends a meeting held in violation of the open public meetings act is personally subject to a civil penalty in the amount of $500 for the first offense and $1000 for subsequent offenses [RCW 42.30.120.](http://app.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=42.30.120) Violations of the OPMA can also result in lawsuits against the University.



Ground Rules for Faculty Assembly Meetings

*Suggest reading these rules at the start of the academic year for all standing committees and EC*

*Approved by the UWT Executive Council on September 26, 2022*

## *Behaviors Everyone Should Follow*

* Raise your hand before you speak. Say your name before speaking.
* Use professional language with no profanity.
* Use technologies of inclusion (microphones, notecards, name tags, etc.).
* When using slides, briefly describe the content of the slide, including the visual aids, rather than just pointing to the slide.
* Be conscious of body language and nonverbal responses.
* Once you have spoken, stop speaking so others may have an opportunity.

## *Principles We Believe In*

* Practice active listening.
* Speak from your own experience instead of generalizing (“I” instead of “they,” “we” and “you”) unless indicating what you share is a collective message from others.
* Be aware of the social and institutional positions that you bring to the discussion and make sure that these positions treat our diverse students, faculty, and staff inclusively and equitably.
* Avoid assuming the backgrounds, experiences, views, and identifications of other participants.
* We value deliberation and dissent, and we expect each member will treat others with dignity and respect even during heated debates.
* Discrimination of any kind is unacceptable and will be directly addressed by the meeting leader.

## *Protocols To Remember*

* Email communication among members of the Executive Committee should be undertaken with caution. An ongoing “group email” among Executive Council members discussing or deliberating substantive issues is in potential violation of the Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA). If a critical issue needs to be raised with the Executive Council, it should be done so by being placed on the official agenda.
* “Faculty council members shall be deemed to have vacated their seats when they have been absent from three council meetings in an academic year. Council members are considered absent only if they fail, prior to a meeting, to inform the chair of the faculty council or the faculty council analyst of their inability to attend.” Please inform Andrew and chair of your absence.
* When meetings are held in person, consider using zoom as a backup option only when you must (i.e., health reasons or a business trip), to facilitate engaged discussion and interaction.