

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 8:30 a.m. on Monday, **October 29, 2001**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Meszaros (Chair), Coney, Crawford, Goren and Schaufelberger;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Kubota, Lou, Olswang, Primomo, Silberstein and Sjavik;

ABSENT: *Professor* Leppa;
 ex officio members Ludwig and Nelson.

Introduction of FCTCP members – Chair Jacqueline Meszaros

Council members introduced themselves and identified their departments, programs and units, and their campus, in the University.

Discussion of the council’s primary charge for the academic year: defining “campus” as opposed to “school” or “college”. Faculty Senate Chair Brad Holt hopes the council will be able to develop legislation on this issue that will serve the welfare of the entire University.

Meszaros said the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy was created by the passage of Faculty Senate Class A legislation at the March 1, 2001 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The legislation received final approval from President McCormick and became effective on April 9, 2001.

The composition of FCTCP is, as with all faculty councils, a core group of regular voting faculty (in this instance, faculty from all three campuses), and ex officio members from various administrative units (also, in this instance, from all three campuses).

Meszaros noted that the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses opened a decade ago. Faculty from the Seattle campus played a significant role establishing the two other campuses. They helped create curricula specifically designed to meet the goals of the programs at each campus; they helped create faculty governance (including specific Handbook policy statements for each campus), and they helped set up “fire walls” to preclude the new campuses from “bleeding away resources” from the Seattle campus.

Meszaros said the UW Seattle faculty have been “a source of our strength.” In particular, the principle of shared governance embodied in the Faculty Code has made us strong.” Nevertheless, four years ago, faculty from the three campuses discussed the issue “that we were all governed by the same Faculty Code, but that UW Bothell and UW Tacoma had weak representation in the changes to that code. We began to discuss ways to enhance the representation of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses.”

Crawford said there had been an earlier joint faculty council. That council had promotion and tenure and advisory functions at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Collegial relations grew out of that council’s work and contributed to the Class A tri-campus legislation.

Coney said the decision of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses to engage in tri-campus legislation was “a courageous act.” She noted that some faculty at those campuses feared that to take this step could endanger their autonomy. Now, Coney said, there is an effort “to form a larger communal solidarity.” The “risk-taking” gesture on the part of the faculty at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell has proven to be a “good move.” Meszaros pointed out that the Senate had agreed not to move forward with the Tri-Campus legislation unless it was approved by both Bothell and Tacoma. Bothell’s faculty approved the legislation only if “it preserved our current control over curriculum and promotion and tenure. Closer ties would develop when desirable mechanisms for closer coordination are agreed to through the Tri-Campus Council. We passed a resolution to that effect.” Tacoma’s Executive Council passed a similar resolution.

Charge from Faculty Senate Chair to the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy: To Define “Campus”

Meszaros said, “Faculty Senate Chair Brad Holt has given the council the opportunity to define what is meant by the word “campus” and “to develop legislation on this issue that will serve the welfare of the entire University.”

Meszaros said the purpose of this definition will be, in part, to distinguish “campus” from “school” or “college.” The goal is to approach the definition “from the broadest possible perspective” while being specific enough to state the distinctive characteristics of a “campus.”

Though the council agreed that this issue would be a “good gauntlet to take up,” the council also decided not to focus exclusively on large, general issues, but to address more specific goals such as Honors legislation as well. “We have an experienced group in this council,” Meszaros said, well-suited to discussing complex issues involving all three campuses.

Olswang said a goal of the council could be “to find out where we have common baseline agreements on basic items, or disagreement. Will there be one Handbook for all three campuses? Or not.” He said the council could discover if there is a “baseline understanding” on that issue, or if it is a “problem to fix.” He said that he can imagine a way in which some parts of the Faculty Code and University Handbook could be separated so that some parts are commonly controlled and other controlled separately.

Honors legislation at UW Tacoma, it was decided, will be an agenda item at the council’s next meeting, along with the charge of defining the word “campus.” With respect to the Honors legislation, one consideration will be the differences in student needs between the two-year upper division campuses and the four-year campus.

It was pointed out that there are two faculty bodies at UW Tacoma (the Faculty Assembly) and UW Bothell (the General Faculty Organization), and questions for council consideration could be: In what matters will these faculty assemblies work with existing Faculty Senate councils? Are they to be treated as being equal to the Faculty Senate by the administration? And what voting procedures are to be in place for the senators of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses? Goren stressed that “ambiguity” surrounds many of these questions.

Crawford said the question: What is a campus? “underlies all that we do.” He said this definition may only come out over time. “What is the new entity of ‘campuses’?”, he asked. “We have acknowledged one Handbook, but what is one Handbook for three campuses?” He said there are different models to consider for what constitutes a “campus.” By analogy, the “multicultural” model calls for “equality, but with differences.” In contrast, the “assimilation” model grants equality but only on condition of the erasure of differences. He endorses a “multicultural” or “multi-campus” model. Thus, the question is: How much difference? Regarding “operational rules,” how strictly must the rules be adhered to? How much flexibility will the rules have? What mechanisms will promote creative resolutions to these questions?

Meszaros asked, “To what extent can this body (FCTCP) become a consulting, understanding body? And should it take on a special role to work out contentious issues?” She said a discussion of the “multicultural model” for a campus versus a “model of assimilation” could be “very useful.” Coney observed that the provost “thinks each campus should be entrepreneurial,” and that the Tacoma and Bothell campuses should, in some measure, forge their own identity through entrepreneurial initiatives. Coney said the next step would be to create support for such initiatives: active support for distinctive innovation. Crawford, who heard the provost make this appeal at the Tacoma campus, endorses the provost’s outlook. “The provost was inviting us to ‘invent ourselves,’” he said. He said this was excellent advice, but that it raises the issue of the Handbook and the role of campus Handbooks, which, as the council noted, needs to be addressed. Sjavik (who is from UW Seattle) drew an analogy to state and federal governments. He raised the question of whether we are essentially proposing that the main governing body of one state should also be the federal governing mechanism that oversees other states. Olswang indicated that he could imagine this working.

Asked whether her campus (Bothell) was predominantly “departmental,” Meszaros said, “Both UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have ‘programs’; we are not ‘departmentalized’.” (UW Seattle also has “programs,” but

predominantly has “departments.”) Meszaros said that the “programs” at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma “have many disciplines within each program.” Primomo said, “It is not, however, a particularly ‘clean’ system.” It needs to be clarified, she urged.

Schaufelberger said that, at some point, “we need to define what a ‘campus’ is before getting to Honors and the other, more detailed, issues.” The University of California multi-campus system was mentioned as a possible model; Crawford said it is indeed a good model, but not necessarily the most apposite model for the University of Washington. “We’ll need our own model,” he emphasized. Coney concurred, saying, “This university is unique; it is not like any other university’s system in the entire country.” Olswang said, “We need to look at our own rules.” Kubota said, “We’re still trying to figure out what our own campus is.” (Kubota is at the Bothell campus.) Coney asked, “What are principles that we do agree on? We need to find flexibility in terms of our vision for the University and in terms of our work here.” Primomo said that “campus” is embedded in legislation. “We’re perceived as a campus from the outside,” she stressed. Olswang said, “Yes; that’s the Code provision that’s missing in the Faculty Code, and I’m not clear as to our procedure.”

Coney said the procedure for faculty councils is that the Faculty Senate chair can present a charge to a council, or a council can determine and develop its own charge. Any proposed legislation will be taken by the council chair to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) for Class A, Class B, or Class C legislation. [What follows is a summary of Faculty Senate Legislative procedures.]

SUMMARY OF FACULTY SENATE LEGISLATIVE PROCEDURES

CLASS “A”

Class “A” legislation amends the *Faculty Code*, which appears in Volume Two of the *University Handbook*. For detailed procedures, see Chapter 29, Amendment of the *Faculty Code*. Enactment of legislation requires review and approval in the following order:

1. Senate Executive committee
2. Faculty Senate
3. President and Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations
4. Senate Executive Committee
5. Faculty Senate
6. Faculty (written ballot)
7. President (signature date is date legislation becomes effective)

CLASS “B”

Class “B” legislation amends sections of the *University Handbook* other than the Faculty Code. For detailed procedures, see Volume Two, Section 22-74, Senate Procedure: Class B Actions. Enactment of legislation requires review and approval in the following order:

1. Senate Executive Committee
2. Faculty Senate
3. President
4. Faculty (legislation is effective 21 days after publication unless objections are raised by 5% or more of voting members of the entire faculty or by two-thirds (2/3) of the eligible voting faculty of either the University of Washington, Bothell or of the University of Washington, Tacoma.)

If objections are raised:

5. Senate Executive Committee
6. Faculty Senate

7. Faculty (written ballot)
8. If approved by a majority of ballots cast, legislation becomes effective upon completion of the time period of the faculty vote.

CLASS “C”

Class “C” actions are non-legislative actions, including passage of resolutions, appointment of committees, approval or disapproval of committee reports, receipt of reports or information, and determination of Senate by-laws. They become effective upon adoption by the Senate. See Volume Two, Sections 22-71.C and 22-75, Senate Procedure: Class C Actions.

Olswang corroborated Coney’s assertion that FCTCP can recommend legislation to the Senate Executive Committee, and recommend changes to the University Handbook. It is through the mechanism of having the two faculty leaders at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses represented on this council that FCTCP can mediate difficult tri-campus issues, he said. Schaufelberger said, “We need to craft Code language that will allow flexibility for faculty at the other two campuses.” It was suggested that FCTCP needs to see where it needs flexibility (regarding, for instance, student-related issues). Coney reminded council members that the Faculty Code is literally part of the University Handbook; it is not separate from, or outside, the Handbook; it resides in it. Crawford pointed out that Bothell and Tacoma both have their own handbooks, initially created by the Senate, so there is some ambiguity about what the “the” handbook is.

Olswang said it would help the council to know what “inner rules” the Tacoma and Bothell campuses operate under. Many facets of the tri-campus discussion can only reach clarity and resolution if all three campuses understand the rules that govern each other.

It was pointed out that certain initiatives are particular to specific campuses, such as faculty honors at UW Tacoma (the same could apply to UW Bothell). Primomo said promotion and tenure is another “local issue” (at UW Tacoma) that will have a campus-specific resolution. (Promotion and tenure at UW Bothell would have its own campus-specific resolution.) Both campuses would be following Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code, but would have their own language for some aspects of that chapter. As Crawford said, “We do follow the Code, and the Code allows for flexibility in the interpretation by the Tacoma and Bothell campuses.”

Meszaros said the best way to proceed at the next meeting of the council, on November 19th, is to discuss issues of “general welfare” and to work towards a definition of the word “campus” (a definition driven by the question: How can the three campuses be stronger individually while forming a single cohesive university?); and secondly, to discuss the issue of Honors legislation at UW Tacoma, and any other campus-specific issues that time permits. Schaufelberger said, reiterating his earlier emphasis, “We have to come to some kind of resolution as to what a ‘campus’ is.”

Meszaros said the December 17th meeting could be devoted to the questions: Where do we need flexibility for the three campuses?, and: What options can be preserved for the three campuses as a whole?

Recommended guest speakers at future council meetings include Deborah Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, to discuss the three-campus relationship; the two Vice Chancellors of UW Tacoma and UW Bothell; Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, to discuss the Faculty Code (she is the “keeper of the Code”) and to explicate Class A, Class B, and Class C legislation; Norman Rose, former dean at UW Bothell and a faculty member at the Seattle campus; and Tim Washburn, Director, Admissions and Records, and Doug Wadden, chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, to discuss the issue of new programs and whether they should be reviewed by the FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP), or by independent reviewing committees at the two other campuses. (The two other campuses do not, at this time, send their new programs to SCAP for review and are not comfortable with the notion of doing so at this time. They believe SCAP, and FCAS generally, may well not understand the issues at the other campuses out of which new programs are created.) Meszaros suggested that coordinating discussions of curriculum through the Tri-Campus Council might make more sense.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, November 19, 2001, at 8:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder