

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
January 28th, 2016
9am – 10:30am
Gerberding 26

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Introductions
 3. Review of the minutes from November 19th, 2015
 4. Chair's report
 5. Collective bargaining – tri-campus related questions from faculty – summary of activities (Erdly, Barsness)
 6. FCTCP/Registrar Office Processes/Opportunities – (Tina Miller, Associate Registrar; Marianne Ramos, Curriculum Procedures Analyst)
 7. FCTCP Charge Revision and Action Items – Continuation Discussion
 8. Good of the Order
 9. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Erdly at 9:08 a.m.

2) Introductions

Members and guests introduced themselves. Leadley explained she is the new ex-officio representative from the ALUW (Associated Librarians of the University of Washington), replacing Jennifer Sundheim. Freddy Mora introduced himself as the ex-officio representative from the Professional Staff Organization (PSO).

3) Review of the minutes from November 19th, 2015

The minutes from November 19th, 2015 were approved as amended.

4) Chair's report

Erdly noted as a faculty union drive continues at the UW, there is little available information on what it means to be a part of a collective bargaining unit which comprises three campuses (Seattle, Bothell, Tacoma). He questioned the effect unionization will have on tri-campus governance, noting an answer to that question may dictate decisions on voting for or against a faculty union for some faculty - though the answer is not known. Erdly asked about next steps in the faculty senate pertaining to faculty unionization.

5) Collective bargaining – tri-campus related questions from faculty – summary of activities (Erdly, Barsness)

Barsness (vice chair, Faculty Senate) explained a survey has been broadcasted by the faculty senate to the UW faculty community in an effort to prioritize the questions faculty have about unionization. She explained this data has been gleaned and categorized, and is currently available on the faculty senate website.

She explained that the faculty senate recently held a large town hall-style meeting wherein a mixed six-member panel of pro and anti-union faculty members spoke on unionization and answered questions posed by others in attendance. She noted the meeting was designed to highlight questions and concerns of faculty, and if possible, to provide answers. Barsness noted the town hall meeting was recorded in its entirety, and the recording is available on the faculty senate website.

She explained faculty should consider how shared governance is working within their units. She noted this question creates a nexus to the discussion of the advantages or disadvantages of making a large-scale change.

6) FCTCP/Registrar Office Processes/Opportunities – (Tina Miller, Associate Registrar; Marianne Ramos, Curriculum Procedures Analyst)

Tina Miller (Associate Registrar, Graduation and Academic Records/DARS) noted Jennifer Payne has left the UW Registrar's Office for a position in the UW Foster School of Business; Payne worked in the Registrar's Office for ten years and was integral in the work of several faculty councils who work to review and approve university curriculum. Marianne Ramos (Program Assistant, Curriculum Office) was introduced as the interim Program Assistant, also in Payne's former role.

Miller explained a software change is underway within the Registrar's Office. The new software is web-based, and will provide the ability to replace many paper curriculum-related forms with online forms. Miller explained the change is likely to be rolled out in the spring of 2016, and will also provide the ability to inform individuals who have submitted a 1503 form where the form is in the process for approval; this was a procedure that was formerly manually handled by the Registrar's Office. Miller explained after question that members from UW-IT are currently meeting with an array of groups to assess the needs for potential other changes/greater support in the curriculum process. Erdly requested that the FCTCP be involved in these discussions, given their role in the process related to tri-campus review. Some discussion ensued on the difficulty of utilizing hard copies for this process.

There was some question of if the UW's three campuses have separate registrars. Miller explained there are "campus" registrars, and the UW Curriculum Committee (the body who is the final stop for most curriculum requests) does include membership from all three campuses. Discussion ensued on course overlap between campuses and course equivalencies. It was noted the UW is in unique in that it has single transcripts for students despite their parent UW campus. Miller clarified that student transfers between campuses are handled by the Registrar's Office, though course equivalencies are set within the relevant departments, and a student can look at the transfer guide for a department once those equivalencies are set.

Miller noted for the council that the UW College of Engineering (CoEng) is seeking to largely revise the way in which they enroll their undergraduate students. She explained Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) chair Patricia Kramer and others have been working with the college on their proposal,

though no formal request has been made. Erdly explained the CoEng change will also come to the FCTCP as part of tri-campus review.

7) FCTCP Charge Revision and Action Items – Continuation Discussion (Please see attached file “FCTCP Group Discussion Summary”) (Exhibit 1)

Erdly explained many ideas came out of the last meeting during the discussion of how best to optimize the FCTCP and its associated functions, which have now been documented along with other elements of the council’s discussion (Exhibit 1). He explained this discussion especially relates to tri-campus review for new programs, noting that if the council was to make any changes, one might be to add the phrase “graduate programs” to tri-campus review. He noted the change is doable, and not complicated. He explained many individuals have expressed support that graduate degrees should come to the FCTCP for tri-campus review. There was some discussion of implementing tri-campus review for graduate programs, and discussion of tri-campus review itself, with some members noting the process may need to be revised before a change in responsibilities is made, to place tri-campus review earlier in the curriculum approval process. Erdly encouraged that the council and its members meet with specific groups to see how tri-campus review may be optimized.

Erdly explained another issue the FCTCP has been attempting to work through is the identity of the three campuses. Moy (president’s designee) agreed, and noted that the council will benefit from working inductively to optimize its functions, but also should consider larger questions pertaining to the university system.

A member suggested the council discuss bigger picture questions with stakeholders in the room, maybe via a day-long retreat. Another member suggested the council choose from a list of larger objectives, and discuss these in the next council meeting. Barsness explained it may be useful first to have a meeting with the FCTCP several “president’s designees” (members appointed by the president to aid the council in its work), asking their concerns over the tri-campus system.

After more discussion, Barsness suggested surveying everyone on the council electronically, then ranking the order of council-optimization objectives based on the priorities of members. This was generally agreed to be a good idea, and there was a desire that a survey be broadcasted before the next council meeting.

8) Good of the Order

This item was missed due to time constraints.

9) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Erdly at 10:30 a.m.

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

Present: Faculty: Bill Erdly, Joseph Tennis
Ex-officio reps: Zoe Barsness, Sarah Leadley, Freddy Mora
President’s designees: Patricia Moy
Guests: Tina Miller, Freddy Mora

Absent:

Faculty: Kyle Crowder, Ann Frost, Margo Bergman

Ex-officio reps: Susan Jeffords, Bill Kunz, Casey Mann, Mark Pendras

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCTCP Group Discussion Summary_numberingadded_v3.doc

FCTCP 2015-11-19

**FCTCP Objectives 2015/2016 – Group Discussion Summary
Version 2.0 (1/22/16)**

Note: This working document summarizes ideas generated during the FCTCP meeting discussion that occurred during the November 19, 2015 FCTCP regular meeting. It has been organized and reviewed – including some additional items generated by the FCTCP Council Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.

FCTCP 2015-2016 Overall Objectives

1. Develop new-revised domain/charge for the council
Given the UW's evolution and many years since the FCTCP's inception, revisiting the council's mission is in order.
 - What would this be? What are the new/changed responsibilities, what types of metrics might be in place to monitor progress? Changes require us to draft Class A legislation.
2. Enhance communication with Board of Regents (BOR).
The BOR has increasingly recognized the UW as a three-campus system, and has grown increasingly appreciative of what is distinctive about each of the three campuses.
 - Begin to document more effectively how we work together as a system
 - Norm Beauchamp (Senate Chair) would love to have data to share with the BOR by year's end regarding illustrative tactics or initiatives.
 - The BOR Chair has requested a summary report from FCTCP reflecting concerns & opportunities, recommendations regarding next steps for the three campuses.
3. Improve FCTCP infrastructure/support.
This council faces particular challenges other Senate councils do not – e.g., geographically distributed membership; travel times to meet in person; meeting in hybrid (semi-face-to-face, semi-virtual) formats.
 - Identify and implement ways to maximize meeting effectiveness and efficiency – particularly as we balance operational responsibilities (FCTCP Post-tri-campus reviews) with many other issues such as long-term planning, tri-campus communication, awareness of new/pending issues, shared governance structures, etc.
 - Frequency of meetings, support for working groups, subcommittees
 - Methods for onboarding new committee members as this committee works with many complex issues that require a significant time investment/level of experience to understand prior to making specific recommendations.

Tri-Campus Relations: Identifying Key Issues, Facilitators of, and Challenges to Tri-campus Initiatives

Several key areas of focus emerged in our discussion including:

1. What are the current 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?

FCTCP 2015-11-19

2. What is (and should be) the 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)?
 - How might communication and collaboration between tri-campus faculty bodies and the BODC be improved?
3. What support is currently available or required to facilitate tri-campus work and/or execution of tri-campus collaboration and initiatives?
 - What additional technological support is necessary to facilitate more effective and efficient tri-campus work (e.g., teleconferencing for councils, senate, etc.)
 - What kind of additional funding is required to support council information gathering and research work that addresses tri-campus issues?
 - What kind of additional support is needed to promote governance activities and encourage faculty to invest in these efforts?
 - Time
 - Rewards/career progression
 - Recognition
4. How do these issues currently manifest themselves in two critical areas: (A) the creation of graduate programs and (B) UW accreditation? How can we improve tri-campus relations in both areas?

KEY QUESTIONS – A Tri-campus Perspective:

1. What Makes the UW Distinctive?

- What does a UW degree mean across the three campuses?
- What does it mean to be a UW student?
 - What do all UW students—regardless of school, discipline, program or campus—share in regards to their educational experience? Their formation as a UW graduate? What are the core attributes of the “Husky Experience”?
- What does it mean to be a UW faculty member?
 - What do all UW faculty—regardless of school, discipline, program or campus—share in regards to their values and responsibilities, and how they strive to serve the various facets of the UW mission?
 - What support do faculty receive in regards to their teaching and scholarship? For example, is there a core “Husky Experience” for faculty? If so, what should the formative elements of that experience capture or be – especially within the context of the three campuses?
- What does it mean to be a UW staff member?
 - What do all UW staff—regardless of school, discipline, program or campus—share in regards to their values and how they strive to serve the various facets of the UW mission?
- What 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)?

FCTCP 2015-11-19

- What foundational values undergird all of our scholarly or educational endeavors? (These may be adapted to the unique circumstance of a particular, program, school, college or campus.)
- In short, what differentiates a UW degree, community, or experience from that of any other institution of higher education?

2. Tri-campus Relations

- How are tri-campus strategy and tri-campus relations currently formally articulated and/or defined?
- Which types of strategic and/or operational decisions reside at the system and campus level or some combination of two (e.g., capitol budgeting, operational budgeting, academic programming, shared governance etc.)?

3. Graduate Programs

- How do new graduate programs/degrees proceed through the approval process?
Specifically:
 - Where and when do opportunities for tri-campus (and also cross-school/college) input currently exist—both formally and informally?
 - How is input/feedback from other interested or impacted programs, schools, colleges or campuses provided at each of those junctures identified?
 - Who, which groups, tend to provide that input?
 - How substantive does that input tend to be? What typically is its focus? Does its focus systematically differ by constituent group providing the feedback, input or commentary?
 - What are the requirements for response to that feedback/input or commentary from the program initiating the degree proposal?
- UW graduate offerings/tri-campus relations
 - Where and how are opportunities for tri-campus collaboration in regards to graduate degree offerings (and masters/professional degrees in particular) identified or leveraged?
 - What barriers and facilitators to tri-campus or cross-school/college collaboration currently exist for schools, colleges and campuses interested in launching a new graduate program?
 - Where and how are opportunities for tri-campus or inter-college/school conflicts of interest identified? Historically, how have these conflicts of interest been resolved or mitigated?
 - In short, how are schools, colleges and campuses encouraged to consider where and how their potentially new degree(s) fit into the *universe* of UW offerings, not just those of their own particular school, college or campus?

Council Action Items

- Review FCTCP minutes and reports archive to identify research and findings already available to the current council members

FCTCP 2015-11-19

- Review most recent UW accreditation report in regards to current articulation of tri-campus strategy and relations.
- Representatives from each campus conduct interviews and research to identify existing processes for tri-campus consultation and advice during development of new graduate programs/degrees and current barriers to and/or facilitators of tri-campus collaboration.

Other Potential Action Items

- Faculty Senate Chair/Vice-chair meet with Rolf/Ana Mari re focus on proliferation of graduate school degree programs and use as a lens to understand how coordination and cooperation is facilitated across programs and potential conflicts of interests between schools are mitigated.
- Set up meeting between council members and members of BODC and Graduate School (Becky Aanerud)?
- Bring in speakers from each of three campuses (grad school, too) that are responsible for shepherding PNOIs through the process → identify barriers/obstacles or facilitators in regards to how information about new programs/degrees is communicated to other schools, colleges and campuses. Explore similar issues in terms of how commentary and feedback are gathered as well as expectations and mechanisms for responses from the proposing program to other interested units (whether they be potential collaborators or internal “competitors”).
- Invite speaker from PCE to explore how graduate and professional programs administered by PCE may or may not differ compared to those administered by the sponsoring campus, college or school.
- Explore the impact of ABB on cross campus and cross college/school graduate course enrollment. Collect and review data on cross campus, and cross-college/school, graduate school enrollment over last 5 years (or other appropriate timeframe) to assure review of pre and post ABB graduate school enrollment data.

Document history:

Version 1.0 11/19/2015

Barsness

Version 2.0 1/22/2016

Erdly, Barsness