Council Chair Jan Sjåvik called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Meeting synopsis:
1. Approve the minutes of the previous meeting and the agenda of this meeting.
2. RCEP (referred back to the council by the SEC).
3. Other business (as time permits).

1. Approval of agenda and review of minutes from the December 15, 2008, FCFA meeting
   The agenda was approved. The minutes of the December 15th meeting were approved.

2. RCEP (as referred back to the council by the SEC).
   Chair Sjåvik began the meeting by informing the FCFA members that the Senate Executive Committee has referred
   the RCEP Legislation back to the Council. The SEC would like the FCFA to offer an opinion with regard to what
   was presented, identified now as Section 26-41.D.1 (the old C.1), listed below:

   If the Provost and a majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting
   concur that a budget reduction, or a reallocation of resources, or a realignment of academic
   priorities should be achieved by the elimination of a particular college or school in its entirety, or
   by its reorganization or consolidation with another college or school, the Provost shall invite
   request that the Chair of the Faculty Senate to appoint a Review Committee, constituted as
   described in B.4 above, of five faculty.

   The main point of the issue at hand is inconsistency. Sjåvik noted that this section of the RCEP procedures requires
   that a majority of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) approve the proposal before the Provost
   can move forward with the RCEP process. In order to gain a better perspective, Chair Sjåvik and President’s
   Designee Cheryl Cameron offered arguments for and against the option so that the Council could form an opinion
   and offer it to the SEC at the next meeting.

   Cheryl Cameron spoke in favor of changing this portion of the procedures to be more consistent with other sections
   by stating that the Provost, in consultation with the SCPB, will determine that the elimination of a particular college
   or school might be appropriate. She pointed out that this is the only place in the code that the vote can stop the
   process from being initiated. Cameron felt the process exists to advise and assist those making the decisions during
   an RCEP. She felt that the intention should be to move the RCEP forward but not to be able to preclude it from
   doing so. Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty advised the Council that she met with members of the Advisory
   Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations to investigate the matter. She wanted to verify with them that in
   drafting the original legislation that this wording was intentional, rather than being an oversight. The Advisory
   Committee informed Killien that the original form of the code with regard to the RCEP process of a college or
   school was indeed deliberate. She stated that the feeling was that because of the magnitude of elimination of an
   entire college or school, the mandate for a majority vote was intended.

   Chair Sjåvik presented his argument for maintaining the current provision as is. He stated that he finds it
   intellectually challenging that faculty should be in a position of power to veto a matter that has been put forward
   from the Provost. Conservatively, he felt that since there is no history of any problems with the code in its current
   form, then there should be no reason to make any changes to it. Some members of the Council noted that the
   changes would be made to mirror other areas of the RCEP. Others mentioned that no one has run an RCEP through
   this particular section and for this Council to try to change that goes beyond the charge given to the FCFA about one
   year ago. Sjåvik also felt that those involved in drafting the original document did a good job and perhaps it is this
   Council’s job to keep the original document intact. He noted that SEC has merely asked the FCFA for its opinion,
   and not for any amendments.

   After much discussion, a motion was made to leave Section 26-41.D.1 (the old C.1) in its current form, with the
   requirement that a majority of the SCPB and the Provost must concur before moving forward in RCEP of a College
   or School. The motion passed with 9 votes in favor and 2 abstentions.

   Some other minor changes were discussed which would not have any substantive impact to the RCEP process.
   These were mostly consisting of oversights and grammatical errors. These changes were noted and Sjåvik requested
a new draft of the legislation to be sent to the FCFA shortly. There was some discussion around the newly proposed RCEP timeline and its impact on the UW budget. While members thought that shortening the process would be helpful in some aspects, the RCEP process is an important one. A motion was made and members voted unanimously in favor of keeping the timeline they had worked out in the most recent draft of the legislation. Chair Sjåvik stated that he would like to see good representation at the next SEC meeting and invited Kirtley, Christie, Carline and Cameron to attend. He noted that he hopes to be scheduled earlier on the agenda for the next meeting to allow time for discussion by SEC members before putting the final draft to a vote there.

**********************************************

The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 a.m.
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