

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
February 25th, 2016
9am – 10:30am
Gerberding 26

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the minutes from January 28th, 2016
 3. Chair's report
 - FCAS ABB Report
 - Salary Policy – Impact on Tri-campus
 4. Survey Results of FCTCP Priorities
 5. Strategy Discussion/Action Items for FCTCP Priorities
 6. Good of the Order
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from January 28th, 2016

The minutes from January 28th, 2016 were approved as written.

3) Chair's report

FCAS Activity-based Budgeting Report

Erdly noted the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) created a report on Activity-based Budgeting (ABB) in an attempt to measure the funding model's impacts on a variety of elements at UW Seattle. He suggested the FCTCP consider conducting a similar analyses for the UW Bothell and Tacoma campuses during the next academic year (2016-2017). It was noted ABB has not been implemented down to the academic unit level at UW Bothell.

Erdly read the four major FCAS findings from three ABB surveys at UW Seattle:

1. "ABB is poorly understood by the majority of the campus community and some curricular decisions have been made based on this misunderstanding."
2. "ABB is used differently in different Colleges/Schools. In some, the effect of ABB is not explicitly felt beyond the Dean's office; in others, the contributions of individual faculty are evaluated based, at least in part, on the SCH they generate."

3. "Collaboration between programs has suffered and is suffering as competition for SCH has increased."
4. "Class sizes have gotten larger, often for non-pedagogical reasons (i.e., to increase SCH)."

Future collaboration with UW Educational Outreach

Erdly noted Rovy Branon (vice Provost, Educational Outreach) has agreed to join the council to discuss conceptual ideas relating to educational outreach and strategic planning, including the implementation and delivery of new programs and initiatives. Branon had expressed that there are potential collaborative opportunities between campuses, as no one campus would be able to implement some of the ideas without buy-in from another. It was noted Branon will be invited for a future meeting of the FCTCP to discuss this matter.

Salary Policy – Final Version – Impact on Tri-campus

Barsness explained the Class A legislation on the faculty salary policy will undergo its second consideration in the faculty senate on March 3rd. She explained two versions of the policy will go forward, the original (with edits from the "Code Cops"), and the Presidentially-amended version. She explained the President's amendments included a cover letter, which mentioned that the same outcome might be achieved with a simpler policy change.

It was noted SEC members and faculty senators are requesting a draft of the adjoining Executive Order from the President's office which sets tier and promotion raise amounts.

Erdly explained with exception of Bob Stacey (Dean, College of Arts and Sciences), there is significant worry from Deans and Chancellors pertaining to the fiscal sustainability of the policy in schools and colleges, and many have expressed disapproval with it. It was noted the complexity of the proposed policy is another concern. Erdly explained the last faculty senate meeting revealed a lack of support from UW Seattle faculty for an amendment expanding the number of possible tiers for varying lecturer roles. While at the same time, several UW Bothell and Tacoma campus lecturers supported the amendment.

Council members were asked for their feedback on the proposed salary policy.

Crowder noted the College of Arts and Sciences is preparing for the policy, and working to plan for its implementation (if approved). He noted that there does not seem to be a universally-high level of understanding for the proposal. Crowder noted each FCTCP member should encourage their school/college/department/unit to evaluate the policy for feasibility.

Tennis noted the Assistant Dean of the Information School (I-School) has ran some models for the policy. These models were presented to the School's Elected Faculty Council (EFC), and will be presented to the full faculty of the I-School soon after. Tennis noted he will speak with the Assistant Dean about the template they are using to model the policy, as it was noted this may be useful to other bodies hoping to conduct similar analyses.

4) Survey Results of FCTCP Priorities

Erdly thanked each member who submitted responses to the recently broadcasted council survey on FCTCP priorities. He explained the results showed that a domain change of the council was the highest-prioritized action item. He went on to explained the next three highest-rated action items revealed through the survey (Exhibit 1):

1. Examine the relationship between the three faculty governance structures – Faculty Assembly (UWT), General Faculty Organization (UWB), and the Faculty Senate (UWS).
2. Determine the shared mission and relationship between the three campuses -- a plan for our future.
3. Develop clear decision-making processes that are of strategic and/or operational significance – and specify where the authority lies for different types/levels of decisions.

He noted items prioritized as “low” will not be discarded, but will likely be taken up later. He explained the council may use the survey responses as a starting point to conduct a quick overview of the high-rated items, and generate action items where possible.

5) Strategy Discussion/Action Items for FCTCP Priorities

Erdly mentioned that improvement of FCTCP meeting infrastructure was also a highly-prioritized item. There was some discussion of additional desired support. The two desired improvements noted were a meeting space (or spaces) wherein Bothell and Tacoma faculty can attend council meetings while remaining on those campuses (via collaborative technologies), as well as “live access” to faculty senate meetings and events for faculty senators from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.

After some discussion, a distinction was made between “conceptual” objective items and “tangible” objective items. Some examples were given. “Examining the relationship between the three faculty governance structures” (Seattle, Tacoma, Bothell) was noted as a tangible item, whereas “identifying the foundational values shared and those that are unique among the three campuses” was noted as a conceptual item.

Crowder suggested that the first major task of the FCTCP should be “determining the shared mission and relationship between the three campuses.” There was agreement on this point, but it was noted if this relationship is to be defined or envisioned, the process must include all the right stakeholders. Crowder explained there has been a question of whether or not the council has it in its purview to develop a vision or definition of this relationship; he explained one point of justification for this effort is that no one else at the UW seems to be doing this work. Barsness expressed support for the effort, and explained she and faculty senate chair Norm Beauchamp sit on the Strategic Campus Plan Committee, and may be able to bring the outcome of this work to that body and facilitate a discussion there.

There was a suggestion to slice the overarching question of the “shared mission and relationship of the three campuses” into an intersection of the issues - then taking those issues and analyzing them to generate outcomes. This was agreed to be a good pathway forward. Barsness suggested the first point

of focus might be graduate programs. Erdly agreed, and noted for locating additional issues for this purpose, some good resources might be prior council minutes and the work of FCTCP subcommittees.

Some additional avenues for locating challenges for this purpose were noted. Two ideas mentioned were a focus group with the faculty chairs from UW Tacoma and Bothell, asking these stakeholders what their biggest challenges have been, and bringing information back to the FCTCP, as well as asking the executive committee at UW Bothell to generate a list of their own challenges.

After more discussion, graduate programs were located as a good starting point for this work. A plan was formulated to move forward:

- 1) Create summary lists of issues, points of tension, etc., beginning with graduate programs
- 2) Establish a time for key stakeholders to discuss the topic with council input
- 3) Generate a report and broadcast it widely
- 4) Repeat for other items

It was noted previous tri-campus reports might be useful to members to gain background on other issues. These reports can be found online at:

<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/councils/fctcp/procedures-policies-reports/>.

6) Good of the Order

This item was missed due to time constraints.

7) Adjourn

Erdly adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Kyle Crowder, Bill Erdly (chair), Joseph Tennis, Margo Bergman
Ex-officio representatives: Zoe Barsness, Freddy Mora
President's designees: Patricia Moy, Bill Kunz, Susan Jeffords

Absent: **Faculty:** Ann Frost
Ex-officio representatives: Sarah Leadley, Mark Pendras, Casey Mann

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – fctcp_objectivessurvey_summaryofresults.xlsx

Objective	Majority of members prioritized:			
Develop a new-revised domain/charge for the council.	H			
Enhance communication with Board of Regents (BOR).	M/L			
Improve FCTCP meeting infrastructure/council support	H			
Determine processes for consultation and advice on new initiatives at a school, college or campus level that assure consideration and/or integration of all three campus perspectives.	H/M			
Develop a relationship between the FCTCP (currently the key forum for multi-campus faculty voice) and the Board of Deans and Chancellors (BODC, forum for multi-campus, school, college administrative perspective sharing).	H/M			
Identify methods to provide recognition for service related to tri-campus governance	L			
Develop tri-campus procedures for creation and approval of new graduate programs.	M			
Identify policies, procedures, and mechanisms that support UW accreditation processes.	L			
Understand what a UW degree means as they are conferred across the three campuses.	M			
Examine the differences and similarities of student experiences across the three campuses -- that is, what does it mean to be a UW student/graduate?	L			
Examine differences/similarities in faculty needs, expectations, reward structures, support, etc. across the three campuses.	M			
Examine the differences/similarities in staff needs, expectations, reward structures, support, etc. across the three campuses.	M			
Identify critical attributes of the UW experience or context communicate our core values to critical external constituencies (e.g., state legislature, potential students, business or funding communities).	M			
Identify the foundational values that are shared and those that might be unique across the three campuses.	M			
Examine the relationship between the three faculty governance structures – Faculty Assembly (UWT), General Faculty Organization (UWB), and the Faculty Senate (UWS).	H			
Determine the shared mission and relationship between the three campuses -- a plan for our future.	H			
Develop clear decision-making processes that are of strategic and/or operational significance – and specify where the authority lies for different types/levels of decisions.	H			