

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
November 19th, 2015
9am – 10:30am
Gerberding 36

Meeting Synopsis

- 1) Call to order
 - 2) Review of the minutes from October 29th, 2015
 - 3) Chair’s Report
 - 4) Governance Review – FCTCP Study
 - 5) Salary Policy Revisions – Tri-Campus Implications
 - 6) Good of the order
 - 7) Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Erdly.

2) Review of the minutes from October 29th, 2015

The minutes from October 29th, 2015 were approved as amended with one abstention.

3) Chair’s Report

Erdly noted one of the challenges of the council is the small amount of times it meets over the course of the academic year. He explained subcommittees are important to the efficient functioning of the FCTCP for this reason. It was noted the Subcommittee for Tri-campus Review reviewed a number of new degree programs in their last meeting, and expect more in their next meeting.

Erdly explained he recently attended a meeting of Governor Jay Inslee wherein several main issues relating to higher education were noted – some of these included:

- UW representation in the state legislature
- Impacts of collective bargaining
- Access to higher education for Washington students
- Keeping tuition rates low

4) Governance Review – FCTCP Study

Erdly explained the council had begun efforts during the 2014-2015 academic year over conducting a study of the “relationship between the three UW campuses.” He explained the council found this idea to largely correlate to the future of the university on the whole, especially as the institution and its assorted parts continue to grow and expand. Erdly noted there have been strategic opportunities missed in the past due to a failing in synergizing efforts around aligned initiatives.

At this point in the meeting, Barsness (vice-Chair, Faculty Senate) and Erdly initiated a council discussion to identify ways to improve the efficient functioning of the FCTCP and tri-campus governance on the whole. Barsness took notes viewable on a white board to help track the opinions and suggestions of council members during this discussion (Exhibit 1). Some of the takeaway points from the discussion included:

- ❖ It was noted the council would like to change its focus from a “policy-focused group” to a “strategy-focused group.”
- ❖ Tennis questioned the relationship between the FCTCP and the Board of Deans and Chancellors, as the objectives of the two bodies seem to align. Barsness agreed and explained the Board of Deans and Chancellors is one of the only forums where tri-campus issues surface, besides the FCTCP.
- ❖ Barsness explained the FCTCP has the benefit of representation from many UW constituencies across the campuses. She explained the FCTCP’s charge has been very narrow however, and reactive in its nature.
- ❖ It was noted UW Bothell and UW Tacoma are underrepresented on faculty councils - bodies which have some power over a number of university-wide policies, processes, initiatives, and regulations. It was also noted that without a vision for the relationship of the three UW campuses, even coordinating greater inclusion of Bothell and Tacoma campus constituents on councils does not provide for a high impact. Erdly explained the FCTCP needs to have its appropriate small group focus on hashing out a statement on the “tri-campus vision,” also explaining how the FCTCP will be revised to help achieve the vision’s outcomes.
- ❖ Barsness explained the current President and Provost have taken note of the opportunity the FCTCP has to offer up a strategy relating to the three UW campuses.
- ❖ It was noted the FCTCP would benefit from greater technical support/equipment to include its UW-T and UW-B constituents.
- ❖ Barsness noted the council should consider what the key characteristic benefits of the UW are, as these must be valued, and incorporated into the strategy.
- ❖ Moy (president’s designee) suggested the FCTCP consider how the UW campus system is currently described within the UW Accreditation documents, and how this may be improved.
- ❖ A member posed that the conversation of tri-campus governance should be held at a higher level, and not within the council. He explained the council should focus on just one or possibly two issues, and see if work can be accomplished around those, to provide evidence for the benefits of campus synergies. The council discussed several possible issues to be considered (detailed in Exhibit 1).

5) Salary Policy Revisions – Tri-Campus Implications

Erdly asked members to review the revised faculty salary policy if they are able (available on the faculty senate website), and to talk to their constituents about the legislation. He noted if approved by the faculty senate, the policy will substantively alter the UW faculty code. He clarified that the faculty salary policy is slotted to go through its first consideration at the next faculty senate meeting, on December 3rd. Barsness noted there is a rationale statement attached to the policy, which is useful for comprehension of the complex and lengthy code changes.

6) Good of the order

It was noted a task list will be defined for council members to aid in coordinating efforts related to the next calendar year.

7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:32 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: Patricia Moy, Casey Mann, Zoe Barsness, Sarah Leadley, Freddy Mora
President's designee: Patricia Moy
Guests:

Absent: **Faculty:** Ann Frost
Ex-officio representatives: Mark Pendras, Susan Jeffords, Bill Kunz

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCTCP group discussion summary v2

**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?
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)?
- 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
- 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