

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Monday, November 26, 2007
36 Gerberding Hall**

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

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and the minutes of the November 14, 2007 meeting.
2. Status of new FCFA nominations.
3. Reorganization, Consolidation & Elimination of Programs (RCEP) discussion (continued)

1. Approval of agenda and minutes.

The agenda and the minutes of November 14, 2007 excluding the attachment were approved unanimously by the council.

2. Status of new FCFA nominations

Chair Jan Sjøvik began by updating the council on the status of three new council members: Sarah Bryant-Bertail, Sandra Phillips, and Christine Di Stefano. These names were approved in the SEC last week and are on the Senate agenda for the meeting this Thursday.

Sjøvik also updated the council on the status of the legislation the council worked on last spring (removal of the Secretary of the Faculty and the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate). The document was amended by the advisory committee and accepted by the SEC. It will be put before the Senate for approval for a second reading on Thursday, November 29, 2007, and then go to the faculty for a vote.

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

Míceál Vaughan distributed a new copy of the RCEP document with corrections made in red and blue (no significance assigned to either color).

Anomaly of Section C: The first concern raised was that section C deals with elimination of Colleges, Schools and Campuses (as opposed to “programs”). It was suggested that C should be a separate standing section. A council member also pointed out that section C has a different feeling to it and does not deal with the voting faculty but the entire university.

Order of Events in Section B: The next item of discussion was the chain of events in section B between step 6 and 7. The role of the Regents was unclear; do they just approve the decision of the president or do they need to call a vote? A council member asked that someone look into their authority, assuming that since they create programs they should also have authority to terminate them. The council decided that in step 7 the report should be sent to both the Provost and the President since the Provost is the one who sends the issue off to the review committee. The Provost should get a copy of the report along with the President, who will then make the final decision.

Preamble: A council member questioned whether or not this document would benefit from a preamble or some articulation that grounds this process as an information gathering procedure that will lead to an organizational decision. She pointed out that the intention for this process is not to terminate but to operate as a vehicle that will lead to the best organizational decision. The preamble wouldn't penalize those Deans who do not invoke this process but it would highlight the benefit for using it. A council member also brought up that this procedure speaks for the benefit of the faculty but not the benefit of the students. A preamble could also address how this procedure benefits the students.

Faculty Autonomy: A council member questioned what options a faculty member has when he or she becomes aware of reorganization. Is there any other option open besides invoking Section 26.41? The Council determined that one recourse for faculty, who, for whatever reason, would want RCEP procedures invoked, is to explore Adjudication Procedures.

Outside Review: A council member suggested that this document be reviewed by the Graduate School since it is considered subject to RCEP procedures. The Graduate School may not necessarily invoke the elaborate process described in B but they should use the abbreviated procedures in D. Other questions regarding Graduate Certificate programs and whether or not they fall under the program criteria were brought up, specifically whether or not certificates are voted on by the Regents. Another council member suggested that once the committee has a final draft of the document, it should be sent to the Board of Deans for final input before sending it to SEC for approval.

Standing RCEP Panel Considered: The Council discussed whether an RCEP Panel should be instituted along the same lines as the Adjudication Panel. The idea was dismissed, however, as there may be years when the Panel is never used – and because there would be particular needs for each RCEP case that may not be available from larger pool.

Conflict of Interest: A council member was concerned over the wording “conflict of interest.” He pointed out that the all parties involved will have an interest. Another council member pointed out that other words used in the document were sufficient enough and suggested striking that phrase and Vaughan agreed to rework the wording in 2b. The council also decided to add in a phrase about following the University’s commitment to the diversity of faculty, staff and students.

Vaughan agreed to take these adjustments into consideration and bring another draft to the next meeting.

A motion to adjourn was approved unanimously at 3:40 p.m.

Minutes by Amy Underkofler
Graduate Research Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty
amyunder@u.washington.edu

Present:

Regular: Carline, Christie, Hildebrandt, Scheuer, Sjøvik, Vaughan.
President’s Designee: Cameron

Absent:

Regular: Bryant-Bertail, Callis, Di Stefano, Gill, Phillips, Ricker
Ex Officio: Cook (ALUW), Hahn (ASUW), Bazarnic (PSO)