Chair Jan Sjávik called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda and minutes.
2. Reorganization, Consolidation & Elimination of Programs (RCEP) discussion (continued).
3. Additional Business

1. Approval of agenda and minutes.

The agenda and the minutes of the November 1, 2007, meeting were approved.

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

Chair Jan Sjávik began the conversation by thanking and introducing Míceál Vaughan, who distributed updated versions of the revised RCEP procedures. He explained that he had incorporated main points from the discussion at the previous (November 1) meeting in the current draft. He reviewed the major changes and his rationale, given the previous meeting’s discussion and concluded by saying that he had not yet weeded out unnecessary material or edited for clarity and ease of reading. The document concludes with a two-page time-line based on the draft revisions.

Other proposals for additional changes included:

- In Section A, add campuses since they have degree-granting status.
- In Section B, add “or Chancellors.”
- In Section A, consider some mention of undepartmentalized schools and colleges as being included within the purview of these regulations. A question was raised as to whether they were included as “degree granting units.”
- Consider a footnote that would clarify what a “degree” is and is not.
- Add some latitude for extension of deadlines when necessary. These extensions might be granted by the Secretary of the Faculty.
- Check the use of the term “program” in Section 23-23.C of the Code and make sure the use of the term in this Section does not lead to confusion.
- Consider adding language to the effect that movement of graduate degree programs from one unit to another (which otherwise does not impact either unit) would not need to apply procedures for RCEP.
- Ensure that the rationale in any draft legislation going to the Faculty Senate include intent that the procedures don’t mean to usurp Graduate School procedures, but may leave the option open for reorganizations at the graduate level when there is significant impact to one or both units involved.
- In Section B.1. add “or realignment of academic priorities” for clarity – acknowledging the periodic need for such realignments.
- Consider having the External Faculty Committee appointed by the Secretary of the Faculty, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Chair.
Consider leaving the appointment of the Review Committee as is (if it isn’t broken, don’t fix it!).
In Section B.6, change Provost to President in the penultimate line.
In Section C, consider including an option for a simplified or less time-consuming process in cases when the merger of two colleges is not contested. (Although questions were raised about the possibility of that ever being the case.)
Distinguish between “recommendations,” made at many stages throughout the procedures, and the ultimate “decision” made by the Board of Regents.

3. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

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

Minutes by Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty, sfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-543-2637.
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