Chair Jan Sjåvik called the meeting to order at 10:34 am.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and minutes of the May 23, 2006, meeting

Both the agenda for the day’s meeting and the minutes of the May 23, 2006, meeting were approved unanimously.

Voting rights for the president’s designee and the members of representative groups were discussed. Because of the unique focus of this particular Council on faculty matters, historically these members, although essential contributors to deliberations, have not been voting members of the Council. A motion was made to continue in this precedent. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

2. Introductory comments: Gail Stygall, Faculty Senate Chair, and Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Faculty Senate Chair Gail Stygall requested that the Council incorporate the following three issues into its agenda for the academic year:

a. A university technical group on pod-casting would like to explore the possibilities of expanding services presently available to faculty and students. There is currently no formal practice or policy in place to protect the author of materials used in pod-casting, and a question has been raised about control of these materials. Who owns these materials? Who decides when and how they should be updated? Stygall asked the Council to consider what policies might be adapted to help protect scholarly material that is posted to the web for students use. She added that there’s a certain urgency to this question with increasing concerns about a flu pandemic and the possibility of needing to conduct classes remotely. Members of the pod-casting technical group would welcome the opportunity to meet with Council members on this topic.

b. FCFA is also asked to participate in the exploration of alternatives to the current 2% salary program. The minimum 2% merit adjustment has turned out to be a 2% maximum for many faculty. The Senate leadership would like faculty feedback on a different salary step system that might look like the “California Plan” – three steps for assistant professors, four steps for associate professors, six steps for full professors and one super professor step. Three representatives from FCFA will join three members of the Committee on Planning and
Budgeting to form a Special Committee to look at the options, including the costs involved in converting to any alternatives considered. Gail will meet with the Special Committee initially to help launch its efforts.

c. Stygall’s final request was that FCFA revisit RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation and Elimination of Programs). The last major revision of that legislation was drafted at a relatively contentious time of significant financial difficulty university-wide and reflects a concerted effort to ensure fairness and transparency in the process. In so doing, the process enacted was quite involved and time consuming. Currently there are a number of programs that are simply fading away due to lack of interest, as is continually the case in academia. There should be a much simpler, faster process for such programs when contention, university politics and financial emergencies are not factors in the program’s demise.

Lea Vaughn drafted a revision of RCEP in 2003 which may or may not address the above concerns, but should be reviewed for possible applicability. The draft was not acted upon at the time. Sjávik will invite Vaughn to a future FCFA meeting to discuss how her draft might relate to the issues raised by Stygall.

Vice Provost of Academic Personnel Cheryl Cameron requested that the Council be a resource for the development of the University’s emergency preparedness plans and policies. She introduced Steve Charvat, the presenter on emergency preparedness issues and Rhonda Forman, Director of Academic Human Resources.

3. Emergency preparedness issues. Guest: Steven Charvat, MPA, CEM, UW Emergency Management Director

Steve Charvat invited FCFA to begin thinking about how faculty might be able to continue their teaching, research and service during and following a large scale catastrophe. His office of Emergency Management is relatively new – established in 2003 following a number of thought-provoking events – the 2001 earthquake, the Urban Horticulture fire, the Educational Outreach fire, and WTO demonstrations. The UW has always had an Emergency Plan, but Charvat and his office (two employees including himself) has been charged to update that plan and ensure that it encompasses possible events that weren’t taken into account in the earlier plan. The office has been successful in bringing in funding to support its work, including Homeland Security funds. Charvat described pandemic flu as the “disaster de jour,” noting that the president’s cabinet had met two times recently on how best to be prepared for that eventuality.

Input from the Office of Shared Governance, through Faculty Councils (including FCFA), is sought on the following issues related to a prolonged emergency situation:

- Human Resources
- Instructional Alternatives
- Continuance and Prioritization of Critical Research
- Outreach and Communications

For example, “essential employees” need to be defined, identified and then informed of what is required of them. Support and provision for these employees and their families will need to be considered. Legal issues surrounding instructional alternatives (e.g. the pod-casting issue raised above [1.a.] by Stygall) including ownership of instructional materials will need
to be studied. Infrastructure capacity to support the volume of activity required to conduct massive amounts of on-line teaching will also need to be explored. The Council should consider how to provide for continuing critical research, to equip faculty with the information and tools they need in order to be effective counselors for the students in their classes in emergency situations.

In response to an inquiry from Sjávik about what specifically FCFA could do to help, Charvat replied that the Council could work on a list that would enumerate it’s top three concerns related to each of the bulleted points above. Due to the number of Council members absent, Sjávik will distribute an e-mail request for Council attention to this matter. Once that list of twelve concerns has been drafted, Charvat will be invited back to continue the discussion.

4. University salary policy (introductory discussion)
Sjávik noted his interest in being one of the three FCFA members appointed to the special committee assigned to consider the current and alternative salary policies. Due to the number of absent members, Sjávik will circulate an e-mail message explaining the need and asking for more volunteers. The three members assigned to the special committee will act as liaisons to FCFA throughout its deliberations.

5. Revisit RCEP rules (introductory discussion)
Sjávik has a copy of Lea Vaughan’s draft revision of RCEP rules and will invite her to a future meeting to discuss how it might relate to Stygall’s concerns (1.c., above). It is important to define what needs to be “fixed” in the policy. At least one of the intentions is to look for ways to simplify the process. In the meantime, he will send copies of Vaughn’s draft revision to Council members. Sjávik and Cameron will deliberate on who else to invite to the Council who could talk about experiences dealing with program eliminations under the current policy.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 p.m. Minutes by Susan Folk, Office of Regional Affairs, slfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-221-4183.
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