

Corrected

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS**

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs met on **Tuesday, November 5, 1991** at 2:30 p.m. in the Faculty Club. Chair Charles Hirschman presided.

PRESENT: Professors Hirschman (Chair), Andrews, Benjamin, Brandt, Gale, Hopkins, and Martin; ex officio members Johnson, Olswang and Spratlen; guests Professors Jenifer Ehreth (for Professor Stein), Miceal Vaughan, Delphine Yung, and Karen Zagona.

ABSENT: Professor Ammerlahn,* ex officio members Helleloid,* McFeron,* and Stein.*

* Excused.

Minutes

The minutes of the October 22 meeting were approved as corrected.

Adjudication

Faculty Senate Vice Chair Miceal Vaughan requested a meeting with the Council to better understand the Council's objections to the proposal discussed at the October 22 meeting that a representative of the Attorney General's Office be assigned to prepare the first draft of the Code language on adjudication procedures. He said that it is his understanding that the report of the Task Force will be transmitted to FCFA before a decision is made on this question. He also said that it is his understanding President Gerberding has some uncertainties on this proposal.

Professor Vaughan expanded on the reasoning for the proposal. He said that the recommendations of the Task Force encompass significant changes, including the legal requirement that the Faculty Code language be made consistent with the State's Administrative Procedures Act. In an effort to expedite the drafting of the language, and with the hope that benefits would result, Professors Rose and Vaughan agreed to propose to President Gerberding that Senior Assistant Attorney General Peterson's offer to prepare the first draft be accepted. Among the anticipated benefits of such action are: (i) the AG will be familiar with the Faculty Code on adjudication matters, which has not always been apparent in previous cases; (ii) it is an opportunity for the faculty to establish a new relationship with the AG's office; (iii) revision of the adjudication procedures will be a lengthy process which could be expedited with the services of the AG's office. However, in this regard, Professor Vaughan noted that it is also possible that the AG's office might become bogged down in more critical work forcing work on the revisions to be slowed down.

Professor Vaughan said that since serving on the Task Force with Mr. Peterson he had very positive feelings about him. He said that his sense is that Mr. Peterson seems to be striking a line that is slightly more independent, i.e., not just representing the Administration.

Members discussed the question, making the following points:

- Adjudication is essential to the proper functioning of the Faculty Code. The faculty should be involved in the beginning of the revision process.
- Since the AG's office would be taking information generated by the joint faculty/administration Task Force, it might be wise to have the Task Force review the revisions to determine whether its intent and recommendations were followed.

Special Collections
UW President's Records
Accession No. 05-006, Box 4

