Council Chair Rich Christie called the meeting to order at 9:12 a.m.

Meeting synopsis:

1. Approval of the agenda and minutes
2. Update on Faculty Council on University Libraries membership selection
3. College RCEP concerns – David Lovell
4. Medical School FTE and Senate representation
5. Adjournment

1. Approval of agenda and minutes

The agenda for the meeting and the minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

2. Update on Faculty council on University Libraries (FCUL) membership selection

Christie reported that he had contacted FCUL for input on how to handle the impact of the pending removal of faculty groups on FCUL member selection. The initial response from FCUL Chair Isabelle Bichindaritz was that Faculty Groups were an essential guiding principle for FCUL membership, and the Council may propose importing the Faculty Group system into the FCUL mandate if and when the time comes.

Christie briefly mentioned the librarian status issue. FCUL will ask John Vallier, the librarian representative to FCFA and President of the Associated Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) for a briefing.

3. College RCEP concerns – David Lovell

Christie introduced David Lovell, Chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), who addressed concerns that had been raised in SCPB while reviewing recent procedures conducted under rules for the Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs (RCEP). These procedures are not entirely clear about the progression and timing of a process, such as the one recently completed, that over time moved three existing schools from within one college into another college – and then eliminated the original college. Questions raised included whether this should have been one process and not, as it turned out, four separate processes. What if the college had included seventeen schools and/or programs?

Christie said that the code as implemented implicitly required a program-level RCEP process for each affected program, as well as the college-level RCEP process. That is, the changes caused by the College level RCEP would automatically trigger the program level review. However, this was not the interpretation applied by the Secretary of the Faculty or the SCPB chair, and was critiqued as prohibitively time-consuming.

Another question raised was how, once a college is "emptied" by individual program processes, can there be faculty input to the process to eliminate that college, if there are no longer any faculty within the empty shell?

SCPB discussion of this included the following questions and observations:

- Faculty within each recently impacted unit preferred a separate, program RCEP process so that their voices and concerns would not be diluted by the entire college, which may well have other concerns and priorities.
- The process should have started earlier to ensure the inclusion of all concerns. By the time the process began, all significant decisions had been made.
- Do existing provisions give department members sufficient input in college-level RCEPs?
- There’s no real provision for moving all the programs from an entire college into another college.
Members of SCPB, in their mercy, do not suggest that FCFA begin yet another review and revision of RCEP procedures, but perhaps could look for ways to amend it to ensure faculty participation during all the various options for RCEP procedures.

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien said that an additional concern is that while limited procedures allow for a majority of voting faculty in a single unit to request the full RCEP process, if that same unit’s transition were to be handled within a college RCEP, their sense that a full review is warranted may be out-voted by the faculty in other units within the college. That has not happened so far, but it is in the realm of possibility.

Another possible pitfall in the current procedures would be a situation where two units are potentially being merged into one unit under the limited process. As the Code now stands, the majority vote of the larger unit in deciding what level of review is most appropriate may prevail over the wishes of the majority of the smaller unit.

Both of these concerns could be addressed by permitting the majority of faculty from any one affected program to petition for a full RCEP process at the college or program level. There was tentative Council agreement to make this part of any change.

Other concerns expressed:
- The college-level process cuts one full level of review (the program-level). It seems odd that revising a whole college would take significantly less effort that revising a program, as would be the case if there was no program-level RCEP required for a college RCEP.
- Faculty must make the Code more clear, or future decisions may end up being decided by the Courts.
- Revision would probably lead to larger, more complex procedures.

Christie suggested that in preparation for future discussions, the Council ponder the following options for possible Code revisions that address the ambiguity related to college- and program-level RCEPs:
- Explicitly require a program-level RCEP process for each program affected by a College RCEP process (not popular with the Secretary of the Faculty);
- Require a program-level RCEP process for those units that request it;
- Continue with the implicit program-level RCEP requirement (another unpopular option);
- Augment the college-level RCEP so that it explicitly addresses how program concerns are dealt with.

4. Medical School FTE and Senate Representation

Chair Rich Christie reported that a concern had been raised at the January 28 Faculty Senate meeting about Medical School FTE and Faculty Senate representation if the Senate restructuring legislation were to be approved. The concerned faculty member wondered if a significant portion of the faculty members listed from the Medical School might not be full-time.

After discussion the Council concluded that this concern arises from the ambiguous nature of the term “FTE”. One set of FTE data reviewed used the term FTE to measure state funding of positions. Another definition of FTE refers to the percentage of appointment as faculty, which is a personnel action independent of state funded salary.

For example, a tenure track professor in a nine month appointment has a 100% FTE nine month faculty appointment which is also a 100% FTE state funded appointment. A research professor in the same department would have a 100% FTE twelve month appointment with 0% FTE state funding. According to the Faculty Code, the voting status of Faculty is determined by the percentage of their appointment, not by the percentage of their state funding. Thus both faculty in the example are voting faculty.

Kevin O’Brien reported that he had determined that almost all of the faculty members from the Medical School have 100% (full-time) faculty appointments. Since most Medical School faculty are funded primarily by grants and contracts, the Medical School has the low state funding FTE numbers found in various University financial reports. The Secretary of the Faculty reported that the determination of voting status for faculty is made from a database “tuned” to definitions and requirements defined by the Faculty
Code, i.e. percentage appointment as faculty, not state funded FTE. The Council concluded that the proper definition of voting faculty is being applied.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

* * * *

Minutes by Susan Folk slfolk@u.washington.edu

Present:
- Regular: Astley, Bryant-Bertail, Christie, O’Brien, Ricker, Sjåvik
- President’s Designee: Cameron
- Ex Officio: Vallier
- Guests: Alex Bolton, Council Support Analyst
- Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty
- Bruce Balick, Chair, Faculty Senate

Absent:
- Regular: Carline, Di Stefano, Kirtley, Phillips, Scheuer, Wilcock
- Ex Officio: Corbett, Padvorac