

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY
THURSDAY, June 5, 2008, 12:30-2:00 p.m.
HUB 304 F

Chair Janet Primomo called the meeting to order at 12:37 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2008
2. Discussion with Chancellors Kenyon Chan (UWB) and Chancellor Pat Spakes (UWT): Working within the Tri-Campus framework
3. Review data and make recommendations from the evaluation of the three-campus undergraduate curriculum review process (Robert Corbett, Marcia Killien, JW Harrington)
4. Follow-up discussion on the revision of the Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP), Faculty Code Section 26-41
5. Brief update on Undergraduate Cross-Campus Enrollment policy Class B legislation
6. Brief update about UW Senate and Senate Executive Committee re-organization
7. Annual report to SEC
8. FCTCP review of BIOL-20071127, INFO-20080311, KOREAN-2007103.

1. Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2008

The minutes were approved as submitted.

2. Discussion with Chancellors Kenyon Chan (UWB) and Chancellor Pat Spakes (UWT): Working within the Tri-Campus framework

Chair Janet Primomo welcomed Chancellors Kenyon Chan (UWB) and Pat Spakes (UWT) and asked council members and guests to introduce themselves. Primomo then opened up the discussion by asking the Chancellors to speak in a general sense to the question of how can they best work across a tri-campus framework.

Chancellor Spakes thanked the council for the work they have done and handed out to them a document titled, "Strategic Plan, 2007-2017 University of Washington Tacoma." She explained that Tacoma was in the process of creating a strategic plan. The two Chancellors spoke about an executive order they were working on with the President that addresses the tri-campus issue of defining campus authority. It would identify areas now and in the future that need to be managed jointly with UW Seattle and areas that should be managed separately. Spakes also shared that she has been in conversation with the President for the last year and a half about organizing UW Tacoma into schools and colleges. Chancellor Chan acknowledged that UW Bothell is also beginning those conversations and handed out a document titled, "The 21st Century Campus Initiative, University of Washington Bothell Priorities Plan 2008-2020." Both guests spoke about

the need to sort out lines of authority to run campuses. Chan noted the kind of questions they face, such as what is the role of the Chancellor, where do you send questions about the curriculum, and how do you follow procedures that can conflict with the handbook? He shared that there are many little, but important, details to work out, and that he sees FCTCP as an important council to help deal with those issues.

Chancellors Spakes and Chan noted that they “hold sacred” the list of things that are decided jointly between campuses, such as curriculum and technology. However, they would like to manage the use of their own facilities, which is currently decided by the President and a council on facilities and services. They noted the need to get something written down for clarification. The feeling is that if they have authority over the campus, they should have representation on committees that impact their campuses, like the budget and use of facilities. Spakes spoke about how Arizona State University’s campus worked and how implementation plans were varied. She noted that there is confusion of procedure versus policy here. They all want one policy but the procedures for implementing it should be talked about at each campus.

There was discussion about faculty code procedures and the protection they provide for faculty. It was also pointed out that the code doesn’t provide guidance for growth and change at campuses, especially radical change at a small campus. Primomo summarized the discussion as two-part:

- Growth, in terms of developing colleges and schools at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses
- Growth issues as they relate to the old RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs)

Primomo noted that RCEP and campus growth is a tri-campus matter that FCTCP can address. Council member David Lovell observed that issues of growth and change affect all 3 campuses and that while there have been many reactions to the proposed revisions to the RCEP process he doesn’t see the changes as radical but as a way to simplify a very cumbersome process. Council members discussed the RCEP process as it relates to program approval, the process needed to start or end a program and the impact on undergraduate students when programs are ended. Chancellor Chan, speaking to his UW Bothell experiences, noted that the RCEP revisions do not take into account how campuses have grown and how they are able to do things more independently. Chan said that he would like to begin meeting regularly with FCTCP to discuss tri-campus issues.

Council member Steve Collins described the difficulty of getting things done and said that anything that simplifies the RCEP process is a step in the right direction. He felt that tying RCEP to campus growth is a mistake. Lovell explained the issue of growth from the perspective of the Faculty Senate at UW Seattle and how RCEP will impact the proposed College of the Environment. The proposed program changes at UW Tacoma will necessitate an RCEP review because they have not previously been grouped together and will have a new authority. Council members discussed the reorganization of programs into schools and colleges and whether it will happen all at once, or piecemeal. Lovell offered having the Faculty Senate leadership address this issue with the President and

Provost. Council member Marcia Killien spoke about the SCPB (Senate Committee on Planning & Budgeting) part of RCEP and the importance of having faculty, with UW Tacoma and Bothell representation, involved in the process. The question was raised, “what does it take to be a school or college?” Primomo noted that this will be an agenda item for next year.

3. Review data and make recommendations from the evaluation of the three-campus undergraduate curriculum review process (Robert Corbett, Marcia Killien, JW Harrington)

Council member Killien reported on the results of the FCTCP survey on the tri-campus review process that the council had agreed to reevaluate. She noted that a total of 96 surveys were sent through Catalyst, most of which went to people who were involved in the review process. Killien explained the 26.4% response rate and the UW NetID issue that produced a “flawed” sample. She offered some observations on the survey responses that included that there was pretty good representation across the 3 campuses in the responses, that in general, most respondents said they were either satisfied or very satisfied with the review process, and that dissatisfied respondents indicated that they wanted more closure in the process, so that they could know the final outcome of proposed changes. Council members discussed ways to close the feedback gap that would provide information on the final changes made in the reviews. They also considered displaying more prominently the Curriculum office website. A major limitation cited in question #6 was the need for greater context in the email notification sent to faculty about the reviews. A suggestion was made to ask the Curriculum Coordinator in the Registrar’s office to add some wording to help contextualize the program requests. A request was made for a slight modification to the 1503 form to reflect the differences in the approval process at the three campuses. Chair Primomo noted that she will follow up with the 1503 issue. Another issue raised was the question of whether or not new outreach courses went through the tri-campus review process. A recommendation was made to contact the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach.

Killien asked FCTCP members if they felt that there was anything more that they needed to do with the survey. It was felt that it was too early to disband or change the current review process. Killien noted the usefulness of the council in addressing difficult issues. She saw the council as a place to have conversations about important topics and a good model for bringing people together from the 3 campuses. Council member Alan Wood noted that he would like clarification about the council’s role. Lovell said that he could see an argument for making this council into something like SCPB. Wood added that there should be more thoughtful, strategic planning for all 3 campuses that interact at all levels and over time evolve.

4. Follow-up discussion on the revision of the Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs (RCEP), Faculty Code Section 26-41
There was no time left to address this agenda item.

