

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
Wednesday, May 7, 2008  
36 Gerberding Hall

Council Chair Jan Sjøvik called the meeting to order at 11:33 a.m.

**Meeting synopsis:**

1. Approval of agenda and the minutes of the previous meeting.
2. RCEP (continued discussion).

**1. Approval of agenda and minutes and announcements.**

The agenda and the minutes of the April 9, 2008, meeting were approved.

Sjøvik noted that Senate leadership had returned the FCFA draft of revisions to Chapter 27 (Conciliation Procedures), asking the Council to seek input from the Ombudsman, Secretary of the Faculty and Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy – and incorporate that input in a final draft for review of the Senate Executive Committee. The document has been duly distributed and input has been requested by the end of the quarter. Any further revisions based on that input will probably need to wait until the beginning of fall quarter.

**2. RCEP (continued discussion)**

After substantial discussion about how best to move forward with these revisions, the Council decided to split the project into two parts – taking the material in 26-41 first, since the Council has very nearly completed the proposed revision of that section. With relatively little work, proposed legislation changing 26-41 might be ready for SEC consideration by the first meeting of fall quarter. The material in 26-42 can then be the focus of the Council's work. That being settled, the Council decided to categorize the concerns compiled by Vice Provost Cameron from recent meetings with the Board of Deans and Chancellors and the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting into the following: issues to address; issues to defer; issues that have already been resolved and need no further action; and concerns that are not applicable to the revision. The following shows how each of the issues on the Provost's list of concern was categorized.

Address:

- Role of the Graduate Council when a graduate program is involved
- Movement of interdisciplinary programs should not trigger RCEP
- Definition of reorganization, consolidation, and elimination
- UWB and UWT have student organizations
- Review Graduate School Program Review Conflict of Interest Guidelines
- Consider renaming the overall Chapter (Financial Emergency and Procedures for Elimination of an Academic Program
  
- Moving degrees is a major movement
- Acknowledge that not all elected faculty bodies are called a “council” – faculty council/organization
- Clarification of elimination and consolidation as used in 26-42.A and B
- Clarify the distinction among reorganization, consolidation, and elimination

Defer:

- Certificate programs can be a track and transcribed
- Definition of campus to include UWB and UWT
- Composition of the External Faculty Committee as it relates to UWB and UWT

- Clarification of role of chancellor and/or dean in campus with both
- Verify the role of the HECB in removal of School or College
- Movement of a department to another school, if consensual, should involve a limited review
- The Review Committee report should be delivered to the SCPB and President (26-42 A.4)
- Should the SCPB vote on the proposed action (26-42 A.6)?
- Spell out the interplay with departments within schools/colleges – 26-42 B.1
- When would faculty learn of proposed reorganization or consolidation and opportunity to comment (26-42 B)?
- Should SCBP conduct a vote or provide a recommendation – 26-42 B.1b?
- Is a majority vote too much in 26-42 B.2?
- Is there a special case for expedited review when the units subject to review are all in agreement?
- Two stages make sense – internal and external – there is no parallel at the college/school level

Resolved/No Change:

- Distinction between a School lead by a Dean and a School lead by a Director
- Clarification with regard to who requests timeline extensions
- Section 26-42.A.6 includes recommendation to Board of Regents
- Define RCEP triggers
- How much dialogue (26-41.B.1) is required before the RCEP process is triggered
- What if SCPB does not concur with Provost in 26-42.A.1.
- Can there be a RCEP in the summer?

Not Applicable:

- Budget crunch – may need confidentiality and tight timelines.
- There is a presumption that college councils are in the loop
- A flow chart/timeline would be helpful
- A large number of reorganizations are anticipated at UWB

In addition, the Council addressed several related issues, including the role of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting at various stages in the process and whether 26-41-C should be shifted to 26-42. The Council decided to leave 26-41.C where it is, unchanged. Since that provision has not yet been used, the Council felt that it would address problems that come up when and if it is used. Finally, the Council found it difficult to avoid discussion about the relationship between their work on this revision and the impending establishment of a College of the Environment and how that might be driving their work on the revisions. Ultimately their focus returned to the work assigned – to revise and improve RCEP procedures. The Council plans to continue work on the revision through the last meeting of the quarter and through the summer.

###

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Minutes by Susan Folk  
 Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty  
[slfolk@u.washington.edu](mailto:slfolk@u.washington.edu)

Present:

Regular: Bryant-Bertail, Carline, Christie, Hildebrandt, Phillips, Ricker, Scheuer, Sjøvik, Vaughan  
 President's Designee: Cameron

Absent:

Regular: Callis, Di Stefano, Gill (all excused)  
 Ex Officio: Bazarnic (excused), Hahn, Cook