

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON FACULTY AFFAIRS
MONDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2007
36 GERBERDING HALL**

Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and the minutes of the October 1, 2007, meeting.
 2. Brief updates.
 3. Reorganization, Consolidation & Elimination of Programs (RCEP) discussion.
 4. Salary Policy (Dan Luchtel).
 5. Additional Business.
-

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the October 1, 2007, meeting.

The agenda was approved, and the minutes of the October 1, 2007, meeting were approved as corrected.

2. Brief updates.

Chair Sjøvik reported that he had been in touch with Professor Sarah Bryant-Bertail about the possibility of appointment to the Council. Although she had a conflict with today's meeting, she is willing and able to commit to a three year term with the Council. Sjøvik will also contact Christine Di Stefano in Political Science, and he urged Council members to continue talking with women colleagues who may be interested in participating in the Council, especially from Groups 5, 8, 9 and 10.

Sjøvik reported that with three "friendly amendments" proposed by members of the SEC, the Council's legislation, "Removal of Faculty Senate Officers and the Secretary of the Faculty" was approved and will appear on the October 25 Faculty Senate meeting agenda for a first reading. Only one of the amendments was substantial: It allowed for the one who is targeted for re-call to assign a colleague to speak in his or her behalf, rather than having to do so in person.

3. Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP) discussion.

The wide-ranging discussion of this issue – whether and how thoroughly to revise the current RCEP policy – touched primarily on two major issues:

- 1.) The expectation of confidentiality within the Program Identification Committee (PIC).

Confidentiality during the PIC process is an artificial construct and given changes in campus policies at the school and college level, probably neither advisable or applicable. The assumption in drafting the current RCEP procedures was that the Dean would independently commit to a decision to eliminate a program – then would discuss it with his or her college council. If, as is almost always the case now, the Dean’s decision evolved from discussions with college or school colleagues, then it can’t be assumed that the process would or could be confidential. It’s conceptually a different starting point. There are fewer instances now when there isn’t a functioning college council in place. Given movement in that direction over the past 10 years it’s probably time to move away from the concerns that led to the drafting of current RCEP procedures.

2.) The possibility of “streamlining” the process by combining the PIC and Review Committees into one function.

An argument for not combining the functions would be that each group has a distinct function: The PIC is a fact-finding group working at the local level; the Review Committee opens the discussion to anyone who is interested, within or outside of the program, gathering additional information that might be considered.

The PIC may function effectively as a “checks-and-balances” for the college or school council that may tend to roll with a Dean’s decision without careful attention to alternatives. On the other hand, the PIC may give backbone to a council decision to either support or contradict a Dean’s proposal.

Having members outside a school or college, the PIC would change the chemistry of a council discussion, particularly when department chairs and other administrative members of the council might skew a discussion.

An argument for combining the two functions would be that having public input at an earlier stage in the process might be very valuable.

Given the increasingly common openness of discussions concerning possible elimination of programs, it would be easier to have an open forum (which everyone felt was a very important part of the process) earlier on and possibly a part of what the PIC does.

Conclusion: Míceál Vaughan was asked to draft revisions of the first part of the procedures given the discussion above. He agreed on the condition that Jan Carline would take over the process when it got to the second part of the procedures.

4. Salary Policy (Dan Luchtel).

Jan Sjøvik opened the discussion by introducing Faculty Senate Chair Dan Luchtel and explaining that he had tried to articulate the concerns Dan had raised in a previous conversation, but had been unable at the last FCFA meeting to adequately answer the questions raised by Council members at the October 1 meeting.

Luchtel reviewed the discussions and actions concerning the Faculty Salary Policy during the last academic year. The year ended somewhat inconclusively with the Joint SCPB/FCFA Subcommittee's recommendation being tabled at the final SEC meeting of the 06-07 academic year. This was the result President Emmert's assurances that the current policy could remain in place and that he would work with individual Regents to re-assure them and perhaps come up with a more favorable solution than the Subcommittee's proposed revision.

Given the importance and the time-consuming nature of the issues under consideration by the FCFA this year, Luchtel stated that he was inclined to appoint another special committee that would report directly to the SEC and Senate through the SCPB. This committee might look at revisions that would include a provision for inflation as well as the 2% policy currently in place.

The Council concurred with this proposal and offered to assist in the review of any *Code* changes that might be a result of the work of the special committee.

5. Additional business.

Sjåvik renewed his request that Council members actively recruit more women colleagues as members of the Council.

A motion to adjourn was approved unanimously at 3:25 p.m.

*Minutes by Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty,
sfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-543-2637.*

Present:

Regular: Carline, Christie, Ricker, Scheuer, Sjåvik, Vaughan

President's Designee: Cameron

Ex Officio Representatives: Bazarnic, PSO

Guest: Luchtel, Chair, Faculty Senate

Absent:

Regular: Callis, Gill and Hildebrandt (all excused)

Ex Officio Members: Hahn (ASUW)

