

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY**

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, **November 18, 2004**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Marcia Killien presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Killien (chair), Barsness and Leppa;
 Ex officio members Bellamy, Cameron, Chen, Fugate, James, Laverty and Nelson;
 Guests Don Janssen, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards; Lea Vaughn,
 Secretary of the Faculty.

ABSENT: *Professor* Behler, Schwartz and Stein;
 Ex officio members Emery and Stygall.

Synopsis

1. Approval of the minutes of October 12, 2004.
2. Transfer Credits. (Proposed Transfer Credit Legislation: a discussion)
3. University of Washington Website Listing All Degree Programs at All Three Campuses (initial discussion of idea to create such a Website).
4. Status of FCTCP's Recommendations on Executive Order (Regarding 3-Campus Curriculum Coordination Process).
5. Coordination with Graduate School Reviews.
6. Report from Tri-Campus Task Force Retreat.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the October 12, 2004 meeting were approved as written.

Transfer Credits. (Proposed Transfer Credit Legislation – Guest, Don Janssen, FCAS Chair)

Here is a background on the Transfer Credit legislation that FCAS Don Janssen wrote (and that FCAS approved) to accompany the FCAS proposed Transfer Credit Legislation:

Brief History

The University of Washington had been limiting community college transfer credits to a maximum of 90, while allowing students to transfer more than 90 credits from four-year institutions (even if those credits were lower-division). Substitute House Bill 2382 was passed by the 2004 legislative session and signed by the governor with an effective date of June 10, 2004. SHB 2382 requires Washington public baccalaureate institutions to treat the transfer of lower-division community college credit the same way they treat lower-division credit from four-year institutions. The Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) approved a temporary recommendation to the Provost last spring, but now needs to make the necessary Handbook changes to officially bring us into compliance with SHB 2382.

Proposed Changes

Our proposed Handbook changes are easiest understood in three parts:

First – We propose that lower-division transfer credits be limited to 90 at the time of admission to the University. (first sentence of Section B). The reference to two-year community colleges is removed. This brings us into compliance with SHB 2382.

Second – We recognize that there are legitimate reasons within specific majors to permit the transfer of more than 90 lower-division credits. The mechanism we propose for the transfer of these additional credits (second sentence of Part B and following two subsections) is that they

advance a student toward a degree, and this transfer has the approval of the student's school or college. This approach has the additional benefits of not transferring credits that a student may not use (possibly pushing them into UW's "too much credit" category), and giving the student the option of deciding which credits are transferred.

Third – We clearly state the maximum number of credits that a student can transfer (New Section C). Students must complete a minimum of 45 credits at the university to earn a baccalaureate degree and more than 135 transfer credits would therefore be unnecessary.

Janssen noted: "The legislature has said that all lower-division credits are to be treated the same, regardless of where they come from. At UW, Seattle, about 2/3 of the credits for a baccalaureate degree are lower division credits; sometimes only 25% of a student's credits are upper division. The FCAS proposed legislation, as you can see, has a suggested limit of 90 transfer credits at the time of admission to the University. Then, when a student has been admitted to a major, he or she can request transfer of additional credits, according to what the school or college deems appropriate. No more than 135 credits could be transferred towards the student's baccalaureate degree. As stated in the Proposed Changes, a minimum of 45 credits must be earned at the University itself.

Janssen said the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) expressed concern that FCAS had not heard from the other campuses; thus he is here today to see if FCTCP has questions or suggestions for the proposed legislation.

Nelson brought up the concern he raised in the following E-mail sent to all council members: "As you explain it, the intent of the legislation seems unproblematic. But I still believe the community colleges will react negatively. There is nothing in the language that clearly expresses the intent as you explained it. A sentence such as 'More than 90 credits of lower division work will be accepted at the request of the student if those additional credits satisfy major requirements or can be used as free electives. Academic units will determine whether additional credits can be used in this way.' would clarify matters and would give a commitment that additional credits will not be denied simply because they come from a community college. But, again, this is a faculty issue."

Janssen said one consideration that would have to be kept in mind is that there are students who transfer to the University simply as lower division students, and do not enter a specific department on arrival. Thus, wording is needed that accommodates this fact. But aside from this one consideration, Janssen thought Nelson's suggestion to be very helpful.

After further council discussion, the following amendment in Section 6. B. was suggested: "The University of Washington will accept in transfer toward a bachelor's degree no more than 90 lower-division credits prior to admission to a major. After a student has been admitted to a university major, additional lower-division transfer credit may be allowed when the student requests the transfer, and those additional credits satisfy major requirements or can be used as free electives. Academic units will determine whether additional credits can be used in this way." Section 6. B. (1) and (2) would thus be eliminated.

FCTCP member Carol Leppa made a MOTION to adopt the amended language in the FCAS proposed Transfer Credit Legislation. FCTCP ex officio member (with vote) Christene James SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE FCAS PROPOSED TRANSFER CREDIT LEGISLATION WAS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY ALL ATTENDING VOTING MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY (FCTCP).

University of Washington Website Listing All Degree Programs at All Three Campuses (initial discussion of idea to create such a Website) – FCAS Chair Don Janssen

Janssen said it was pointed out, at a debriefing of the recent Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force Retreat, that if someone wanted to find out what degrees are available at the University of Washington, he or she would have to go a campus-specific Website to see what degrees were available at that campus, but could not go to an integrated Website showing all degrees available at the University of Washington (which

would also allow for campus-specific breakdowns of degree programs being offered at specific campuses only). At the debriefing, it was noted that at the University of Illinois there is a Website that shows all degrees available at all institutions of higher learning throughout the state. “We’re not thinking of a Website on that scale, but of a Website that shows all degrees at the University of Washington,” said Janssen: “a single-location Website.”

Tim Washburn, Assistant Vice President, Enrollment Services (and a member of both FCAS and SCAP, the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs), has told Janssen that Admissions could put the Website together. But Washburn wants input from UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell. Janssen is putting the idea out to FCTCP to “get the idea going”. Leppa said, “You can effectively do this now by going to individual campus Websites; you just don’t have a single Website showing all three campuses’ degree programs.” Nelson asked, “What, specifically, is meant by ‘degree’ in this instance?” Janssen replied: “Majors and concentrations”. He noted that Washburn said this would be “a unifying UW project.” Council members agreed. Leppa said, “If you go to the UW Home Page now, you get an image of UW, Seattle. You would want to have a Home Page that did not suggest UW, Seattle alone.” The council concurred with Leppa’s point. Asked about implementation of such a Website, Vaughn said C&C (Computing & Communications) does the “portal page”. She also said the Graduate School should be contacted if graduate degrees are going to be listed on the proposed Website. Janssen asked FCTCP members to send any additional ideas they have to FCAS or to him directly (dnjan@msn.com). Killien said FCTCP would like to be part of the process considering the design of the Website.

Status of FCTCP’s Recommendations on the Executive Order on Curriculum Review Process

Jack Nelson asked the status of the FCTCP recommendations on three campus curriculum review. Killien sent the FCTCP recommendations on the Three Campus Undergraduate Curriculum Review Procedures (06/02/2004) and an accompanying letter to Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden in June 2004, with a copy to the president. She recently asked current Faculty Senate Chair Ross Heath what the status of the recommendations is. Heath said that he intended to review the recommendations and take action during Winter Quarter; in the meantime, if any new curricular proposals come forward, he intends to operate under the guidelines set out in the Executive Order and by the FCTCP recommendations. When he receives a proposal from the president for review by the Faculty Senate, Heath will send it to FCTCP and any other council he believes to be most appropriate, depending on the proposal.

Vaughn reminded the council that a new proposal could end up in the provost’s office, once the provost assumes the new responsibilities over all academic affairs that President Emmert has said he will be granting the new provost. Killien said that, in the meantime, the president’s Executive Order will hold. The question, she said, is: How are new proposals to be disseminated? Vaughn said it is the president’s prerogative to determine in what way the Executive Order is implemented. She said she could suggest that it be implemented as Class “C” Legislation. But she added: “It needs discussion.” Killien said she gets requests now about possible new programs from UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell ready to undergo the curriculum review process. “So can we send out an informational notice from Ross Heath saying, ‘This is the way it is going to be,’ with a cover letter, until we hear otherwise? She will discuss this further with Ross Heath and report back to the council.

Coordination with Graduate School Reviews

Killien asked the council if it would be useful for FCTCP to know about new Graduate School programs? The council, as a whole, thought it would be useful. Cameron said five candidates for Dean of the Graduate School are being interviewed; this process will continue through January 2005 at the very least. The search committee will then make its recommendation to the president. The new dean is not likely to be known until at least the end of Winter Quarter. Killien said Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the Graduate School, will be asked to visit the council to address the issue of apprising FCTCP of new Graduate School programs, and any other issues of related interest. It was pointed out that two programs likely to be moving through the curriculum approval process in the near future are a minor in Africaner Studies – at UW, Tacoma – and a Global Honors Program, also at UW, Tacoma. And Bellamy said several programs are anticipated in the near future from UW, Bothell.

Report from the Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force Retreat

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn said much work was accomplished at the Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force Retreat, which took place at the Salish Lodge at Snoqualmie Falls, and which included upwards of 90 participants.

The retreat originated with a plenary session that previewed the plans attendant on House Bill 2707 (and its potential impact on campus relations if campuses move to becoming four-year institutions). The retreat then separated into breakout groups discussing “all degrees of collaboration and autonomy” at and among the three campuses. “Our group looked at the Faculty Code and at Promotion and Tenure,” Vaughn said.

Following extensive discussion, the breakout groups reported back to the entire body. Vaughn distributed some “Final Observations and Comments” from her breakout group, whose focus was Faculty. The working group thought that the idea of successive compacts or plans made a great deal of sense. However, the adoption of successive plans should not be used to dodge the need for a clearly articulated long-term goal for the future of each campus and their relationship. Without such a goal, development will continue on an ad hoc, and arguably irrational, basis.”

Other main “Comments” include the following. “Shared governance should be a given as the Faculty’s vehicle for voice in the management of the University, no matter which model of tri-campus relationships is adopted. Tenure granted at each campus is acceptable, but what did raise major concerns are the standards by which tenure is awarded. Teaching is a central faculty concern regardless of campus affiliation. The ‘University of Washington’ name affects recruiting but there are also discrete reasons for choosing Bothell, Tacoma, or Seattle, and these reasons matter. Similarly, whom is hired sends messages about identity. Faculty need to be involved in Stage 2 discussions about the tri-campus plan.”

Significant “Observations” of the Faculty breakout group include the following. “The Faculty Code (the standards) and shared governance (as a process of creating and implementing standards) are hard to break apart analytically. That said, the two together represent a unique part of the University’s ‘brand’. Historically, there has not been a conscious or unconscious decision about the ‘yours, mine, and ours’ issues confronting the three campuses so it is that much harder to try to separate these matters out now. Further, it is not clear that the Seattle campus has ever made a conscious, consistent decision about central versus local control. Governance evolves with growth; some have said that democracy is for the well to do. This is because growth (in the form of program development) saps energy from governance. Nonetheless, the governance model should all, even encourage, evolution and growth. During the course of the discussion, two metaphors emerged for discussing the relationships and future of the campuses: Family metaphors (intact families in which an older child is confronting much younger siblings after having been an only child for a long period of time, or a blended family of children with one older child and two much younger ones), and Biology (evolution, convergence, divergence, extinction, diversity).

Vaughn said President Emmert attended the retreat on both Friday and Saturday. He addressed the plenary session, but mostly listened to what others had to say. Two members of the Board of Regents also attended the retreat. The report from the retreat will be sent to the Regents. Phase 2 will be, in part, the result of what the Regents decide they want to do.

Vaughn said there were nine working groups in all at the retreat. They were quite broad-based in scope, and included, among others: Libraries, the Provost, Human Resources, Faculty, Staff, and Administrators. Asked about key ideas (other than those already referred to in the Faculty working group), Vaughn said Gail Dubrow of the Graduate School stressed the need for a five-year plan: to have consecutive five-year plans to help the process keep its focus, though not at the expense of an overall 50-year goal for the University. “We need to think about separate faculty senates on all three campuses,” Vaughn said. “UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma have so much going on at their own campuses that each campus may want to have its own faculty senate.” Killien asked, “Where would coordination occur?” Vaughn said there could be a council for the University composed of a smaller body of people from the three campuses to coordinate the visions and structures of all campuses.

Vaughn said, “We wanted the Regents to have all pertinent information,” and said she believes the retreat accomplished that goal. She said President Emmert made a “clear statement” that emphasized the historical experience in both Washington State and the nation as a whole: There are no instances of three R1 universities so close together as are the three campuses of the University of Washington. There is no instance of splitting off of campuses in that way, in such close proximity.

Bellamy said core assumptions of other working groups included: regularly revisiting the question: What is best for students at all three campuses? What kind of mission and management structures need to evolve at the three campuses, and the University as a whole? What kind of flexibility in the relationship between the Regents and each campus would create the best working relationship? How could the research component be best characterized on campuses without doctoral programs?

Nelson said there is a clear concern among UW, Seattle faculty that, if UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell “get too big, it will debase the quality of University of Washington degrees.” Bellamy said the question must be asked: What does the University of Washington degree guarantee? He emphasized that there should not be a distinction between degrees at the different campuses.

Killien said, “Many of these discussion items have been discussed in FCTCP the last three years.” Vaughn said what was new among the discussion items at the retreat were resource questions and issues. Laverty said the discussions addressing mixed-mode collaboration and autonomy at and among the three campuses presented challenging questions for both short- and long-term goals of the University.

Vaughn said that looming over all the issues discussed at the retreat is the obstacle to tri-campus effectiveness created by I-5. “We need a shuttle between the three campuses, especially between Tacoma and Seattle. If we had that, we could do much more. That external piece was missing from the discussions at the retreat.”

Killien said that, as to implications for FCTCP from the Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force Retreat, “The retreat could serve as a model for what can happen on tri-campus issues, and it offers broad perspectives.” She said the council will see what agenda items it may be able to derive from the retreat.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is tentatively set for Tuesday, December 7, 2004, at 2:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. The council will be notified several days beforehand if the meeting is canceled.

Brian Taylor
Recorder