

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**

March 31st, 2015
11:00am – 12:30pm
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
 - 2) Approval of the Agenda
 - 3) Approval of the Minutes from March 10th, 2015
 - 4) RCEPs and Adjudication Introduction
 - 5) Continued Discussion on Salary Policy
 - 6) Good of the Order
 - 7) Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Janes at 11:00 a.m.

2) Approval of the Agenda

The agenda was approved as written.

3) Approval of the Minutes from March 10th, 2015

The minutes from March 10th, 2015 were approved as written.

4) RCEPs and Adjudication Introduction

Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty, regularly invited guest of FCFA) was present to speak to the council concerning possible revisions to the Faculty Code, in altering the language pertaining to Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures (RCEPs).

Background

Killien reported that during the 2013-2014 Academic Year, a large array of housekeeping changes were made in the Faculty Code. Though, one revision was left concerning Section 26-41 and RCEPs. Killien reported she has been consulting with stakeholder groups since that time. She noted she wanted to give the council a sense of what the issues are in this meeting, and to glean feedback as the language is tentatively revised. Killien noted that she and Cheryl Cameron (Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, president's designee) have worked together on the code language, and their suggested revisions are nearing completion.

Killien gave background into RCEPs for members and guests of the council. She explained there are two pathways for RCEPs, regularly referred to as “full” and “limited.” Killien explained a “program,” as referred to in the existing language, is defined as something distinct on a UW student’s transcript. Generally, “programs” are academic programs, or alternative academic structures. If the proposed action is to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate one or more “programs” within a single school, college, or campus, the RCEP is initiated by a Dean or Chancellor. If the proposed action is to reorganize, consolidate, or eliminate one or more schools or colleges or campuses, the RCEP is initiated by the Provost. The process involves the college’s council, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), and the faculty members of affected units.

Killien noted RCEPs became controversial during difficult financial times for the College of Arts & Sciences and other units, when some were struggling to maintain their budgets. The RCEP was born when it became understood that the process for reducing budgets required revisions. They were introduced to protect faculty and students from “horizontally” implemented budget cuts. RCEP processes include hearings and other formalities, and usually take longer than an academic quarter to be completed.

Killien noted her perspective is that units are avoiding “full” RCEPs because they are accompanied by what is seen as a cumbersome process. Consequently, this has resulted in programs no longer having funding, staff, or students - yet technically still existing.

Killien reported that a full RCEP has not been conducted at the UW in several years - the last time being when the College of the Environment was formed in the university. There have been a number of limited RCEPs, however.

Possible changes to be considered

Killien noted the changes she and Cameron are proposing are designed to make it so program terminations do not automatically require full RCEPs. They are not recommending any changes to the full RCEP procedure.

She noted the question for the council to consider is: are the protections, subsequent to this change, ample enough to safeguard against program elimination without due process? In other words, which curriculum changes require the lengthy full RCEP process, and which do not. She urged the council to ponder possible worst case scenarios.

Killien asked if the council was opposed to the proposed changes. There was an expressed desire for a greater student role within the process, and the ability for faculty to propose an RCEP.

Killien explained there is an issue, wherein if faculty in a department wish to eliminate a program, and their Dean says no, than the RCEP will not go through. She questioned the council if they wanted to strengthen the faculty role in governance and make it possible for faculty to present an RCEP; some members of the council expressed interest in this idea.

Killien noted that to strengthen the process, the proposal that comes to the SCPB for an RCEP should be accompanied by documentation that strengthens the argument behind why the RCEP is being brought forward.

Jack Lee (SCPB chair) noted the limited RCEP process can be seen as a more secret, less public affair. Reddy commented there are questions over how to incentivize departmentalization.

Lee noted he sees a big difference between eliminations that come from the administration, and those that come from the faculty. Johnson noted there is no relationship between the creation of programs, and elimination of programs. Killien noted the reason RCEPs are in the Faculty Code is because they may affect students and faculty.

Killien noted there has been strengthening of oversight involved with RCEPs after circumvention of shared governance had been perceived in the past.

Reddy noted the RCEP process should include hearings by SCPB for undergraduate students to explain their concerns, seeing as SCPB does not hold open meetings. Lee commented he would like this to happen at the college level, by requesting deans to hold open meetings.

Janes asked if the notion of “affected faculty” requires a process for defining who this term refers to. Killien noted those affected are defined through discussion at SCPB. Killien noted the affected faculty are generally seen as the faculty who are a part of the department offering the degree program. Janes noted one important aspect in the RCEP equation is the size of the programs in question.

Killien noted she would bring specific recommendations for changes to a future meeting, as the language revisions have not quite been finalized.

Lee suggested there is a contradiction in that SCPB does not hold open meetings, justified by the fact that they do not make policy, though, they do make policy decisions within RCEPs.

Landis expressed concern over the RCEP process within the graduate school. She noted the process for encouraging the use of RCEPs may be undermined.

Adjudications

Killien noted the changes to be made to adjudications are not yet ready for faculty review. However, she noted the changes would be based in increasing process efficiency. Janes noted these matters will likely not be discussed until fall 2015.

5) Continued Discussion on Salary Policy

Janes explained in the last FCFA meeting it was reported that there had been discussions, including different groups, in how best to move forward with the salary policy. Kate O’Neill (Faculty Senate chair) had noted she would like to create a subcommittee to aid in between-meeting drafting of the code

language, to bolster consistency. Janes noted the subcommittee members will be recruited soon, though not in this meeting. Lee noted O'Neill would like the subcommittee to be officially authorized by the council to make changes to the draft code language, which Janes noted he had no concerns over.

Reddy had a question concerning focus groups and if O'Neill had addressed the question. It was noted the idea would be addressed further by Janes.

Lee noted there was a meeting before the recent spring break, wherein various points of disagreement were gleaned, and a solution was found that suits most units' needs. He explained Interim President Cauce is not content with the amount of flexibility decided on in this meeting, for various reasons. Lee noted there will be another meeting with President Cauce soon, and he would like to glean information from the FCFA on this matter.

Johnson noted there were past grievances over preemptive raises being barred from certain schools by the administration. Lee explained if any college has the funds to do so, they may use the money for raises, in any way they deem fit, in consultation with their Elected Faculty Council (EFC) and other groups. Lee reported some individuals are upset about the 8% percent cap for raises.

Reddy expressed concern that departments will be politicized against each other based in incentives for raises. Particularly within the College of Arts and Sciences, he noted.

Lee explained the proposed code does not include any numbers. Numbers were purposely omitted because financial scenarios dictate these numbers, and Class A legislation should not be required for numerical changes within the code. Lee noted a potential danger of the flexibility proposal is that they can allocate amounts based on the need to be able to compensate "high-flying faculty." Killien noted the functionality of elected faculty councils varies. Janes noted there needs to be flexibility for the policy to pass. Janes noted he is concerned over units who believe the policy provides a "lifeline" for them.

Lee explained he would update the council as conversations evolve.

6) Good of the Order

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Janes at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Steve Buck, David Goldstein, Joseph Janes (chair), Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis, Chandan Reddy
Ex-Officio reps: N/A
Guests: Marcia Killien, Jack lee

Absent:

Faculty: Alissa Ackerman, Margaret Adam, Lea Vaughn

Ex-Officio reps: Judith Henchy, Elyse Janzen, Julian Rees,

President's designee: Cheryl Cameron