Chair Jan Sjåvik called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and the minutes of the October 15, 2007, meeting.
2. Brief updates.
3. Reorganization, Consolidation & Elimination of Programs (RCEP) discussion.
5. Additional Business

1. Approval of agenda and minutes.

The agenda and the minutes of the October 15, 2007, meeting were approved.

2. Brief updates.

The FCFA legislation concerning removal of Faculty Senate Officers and the Secretary of the Faculty was approved (with four friendly amendments) at first readings of both the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate. Chair Jan Sjåvik reported that he feels confident the legislation will proceed smoothly through its second readings.

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

Chair Jan Sjåvik began the conversation by thanking Míceál Vaughan for preparing the way for the Council by distributing his rough draft of possible revisions to the procedures, based on conversations from the last FCFA meeting. Vaughan assured the Council that his renaming of the PIC to the Watchdog Committee was tongue-in-cheek. He solicited more appropriate names, and Rich Christie suggested the External Oversight Committee.

Specific issues and questions discussed included:

- The need to map a full time-line for the procedure;
- Defining the roles and responsibilities of the two committees (Watchdog and Review) and the two committee chairs: the former would address local school/college concerns and process, while the latter would be specifically directed to consider ‘external’ impacts of the school/college’s decision;
- Clarifying the membership of each committee, including students, and voting rights for all member;
- Clarifying how the two committees relate to each other and to the timeline for the procedures—and particularly to establish some formal connection between the Watchdog and Review committees, perhaps by having one member continue from the former to the latter;
- Defining the roles of each committee for collecting and analyzing information about the proposed action. For example, the Watchdog committee would be expected to receive information provided by the Dean to the college council, and to request information that would illuminate the proceedings of the council. The Review Committee might be expected to request additional information from the Dean, faculty in the school, and from other units potentially affected by the proposed action;
- Defining the specific responsibilities of the Dean and the college councils in this process;
- Clarify the issue of any “vote” that might be taken by the college council, the Watchdog Committee or the Review Committee, and who would be eligible to vote;
- Consideration of the level of detail that should be included in any revision of the RCEP – the alternative being a corresponding set of Guidelines outside of the Faculty Code;
• Provision for extending deadlines for the Committees (particularly the Review Committee) if the reorganization is particularly large and/or complex;
• Reconsideration of the definition of program as it relates to undepartmentalized schools and colleges.
• Reducing the number of ‘final decisions’ called for in the text.
• Reconsideration of the roles, respectively, of Provost and President in these processes.

Given these, and other, issues, Vaughan was asked to incorporate appropriate revisions into the document and distribute draft number two prior to the next FCFA meeting. Vaughan, Carline and Sjåvik will work on refining the definition of a program.

4. **Consideration of possible FCFA Review of Chapter 28 (Adjudication Procedures).**

Chair Sjåvik told the Council that the recent *University Week* article by Senate Chair Dan Luchtel listed faculty grievance procedures as one of the issues he hoped to address this year. Sjåvik suggested that given Luchtel’s concern it might be an appropriate time for FCFA to look at Chapter 28. This might include simply talking about it without (necessarily) a view of changing it; determining what about the procedures is working well and what is not; or, given the agenda before FCFA this year, leaving it for another time.

After some discussion, the Council decided that it should address specific concerns that Luchtel (or others might raise) but that a general discussion about the procedures would not be a good use of the Council’s time this year. Sjåvik will talk with Luchtel and others to define areas where practical improvements can be made to the existing procedures.

5. **Additional Business**

Jan Carline asked the Council to consider the possibility of taking up the issue of the voting status of faculty paid entirely by outside organizations. Jan Sjåvik asked Carline to e-mail him a brief statement of the issue; he will find a spot on a future agenda for it to be addressed.

A motion to adjourn was approved unanimously at 10:30 a.m.
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