

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, **June 2, 2003**, in 142 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Killien, Leppa, Primomo, Schaufelberger and Stein;  
                  **Ex officio members** Cameron, D’Costa, Decker, Krishnamurthy, Nelson, Olswang and Whitney;  
                  **Guests** Warren Buck, Chancellor, University of Washington, Bothell; Vicky Carwein, Chancellor, University of Washington, Tacoma; and Weldon Ihrig, Executive Vice President, University of Washington.

**ABSENT:**     **Ex officio members** Fugate, Sjavik, Swinney and Wadden.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the May 5, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

**Honors legislation**

Meszaros said Carolyn Plumb, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Laura Newell and Tim Washburn, also of FCAS, presented the Honors Legislation to the Faculty Senate at the final Senate meeting of the academic year, on May 15<sup>th</sup>. The legislation passed. UW, Bothell voted to award a President’s Medal this year. The student awarded the Medal is the first transfer student to be so honored. “This was a three-campus effort,” said Meszaros. She said all the finalists for the award at UW, Bothell “were thrilled.”

Buck pointed out that the President’s Medal is separate from the Chancellor’s Medal, which is also awarded to a student of academic distinction, but to a student who has also “negotiated tremendous odds” in achieving excellence at the university level.

**Draft of final report on FCTCP lessons and insights on tri-campus relations: guests - Warren Buck, Chancellor, University of Washington, Bothell; Vicky Carwein, Chancellor, University of Washington, Tacoma; and Weldon Ihrig, Executive Vice President, University of Washington**

Meszaros said the goal of the final report from the council is to present “the vision that works best in the judgment of the faculty who have been working on the problem of three-campus relations for many years.” Meszaros distributed the following draft:

**THREE-CAMPUS FACULTY RELATIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON: A FACULTY VISION**

The faculty of the University of Washington – Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma – is a single faculty. We all are guided by a single Faculty code and we are all responsible, with our administrators, to ensure the well-being of the University of Washington as a whole, per Chapter 13 of the University of Washington Handbook. Our faculty responsibilities, delegated through Chapter 23 of the Faculty Code, include requirements for admission and graduation, curriculum and academic programs, scholastic standards, certifying graduates and additional matters that affect our ability to adequately instruct and supervise our students.

In some ways, however, the faculty act as separate faculties, safeguarding somewhat different missions, serving different constituencies and working in different locations. We have come to understand – after years of collaboration, consultation, and, sometimes, conflict – that our campus faculties need a good deal of autonomy in order to make the best possible decisions for our campuses but also a good deal of

coordination to ensure that the essential principles and objectives that unite us are advanced on all University of Washington campuses.

The Faculty Senate’s Tri-Campus Council has worked for the past two years to develop legislation that defines “campus” (as distinct from school or college) for the purposes of the Faculty Code. This Council includes equal representation from the faculty organizations of all three campuses as well as ex officio representation from the administrative, staff and student leadership of all three campuses. We have concluded, after a great deal of careful consideration, that a federated design for cross-campus governance is wise and constructive.

The federated vision recognizes that we are one faculty that sets University-wide policies through the Faculty Senate’s Council system. We are also separate faculties responsible for implementing Senate policies on our own campuses. Historically, the Senate has recognized the General Faculty Organization in Bothell and the Faculty Assembly in Tacoma as the bodies through which the new campus faculty implement their faculty responsibilities; the Seattle faculty employ the Faculty Councils of the Faculty Senate for implementation purposes. Campus faculty also rely on their faculty governance bodies to establish local policies and procedures so as to best serve their local missions and constituencies.

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy believes that the faculty of all three campuses can embrace this vision, that it reflects the best of current practice and that it will work well for us in serving our constituencies, particularly our students. We recommend it also to our colleagues in administration and to our Regents.

\*\*\*\*\*

Meszaros said the vision is, in part, “a three-campus vision for curriculum coordination.” She emphasized the need of faculty at all three campuses “to have autonomy to implement curriculum that best serves *their* students.” She said, “The University must maintain a centralized delegation for standards. Policies must be set for all of us, and be safeguarded, by the Faculty Senate. But individual campuses – in the respects delineated in the draft legislation – must have their own autonomy.”

Ihrig said former UW President Richard McCormick asked him to chair a group for discussion of non-academic three-campus relations. “I don’t usually work on the academic side,” he stressed. “Fred Campbell gave me a draft to look at. We look at administrative, and not academic, issues: in this case, the working relations of the three campuses. We’re not looking at what your council is doing.”

Meszaros said, “We came to understand that this is an important time to look at the three-campus vision.” Ihrig said, “We’re not in conflict. But regarding the three-campus ‘system,’ we’re *not* a ‘system.’ We don’t have Chancellors *and* a President, as the University of Indiana in Bloomington does: We’re a three-campus university. And we’re not like the University of California ‘system,’ which has ‘stand-alone’ corporate offices.”

Buck said that Ihrig’s definition “is a clear one. However, Washington State University is now a ‘system.’ The word can be localized. The three-campus university is fine; but the WSU ‘system’ is *not* a national trend.” Ihrig said, “*But*, their ‘system’ is very bureaucratic; and we don’t follow WSU’s lead here at the University of Washington.”

Buck said, “But what WSU is grappling with – they’re going in the right direction ideologically. We *have* to ponder the three-campus university here: what and who we are. The future here is *now*. We need to act now to avoid misunderstandings in the future.” D’Costa said, “The interdependency of the three campuses is the key to this unity: interdependency at many levels. We can go by what we know: It’s a ‘system,’ in some sense of that word.”

Olswang said, “So we officially avoid the use of the word ‘system.’ We *are*, however, systematically related.” Buck said, “President McCormick asked us to look at the operations of the three campuses, and to put forward our recommendations to the President. It’s the *process* of making those recommendations that

we can touch on now: recommendations affecting faculty, staff, students and administrators. We can incorporate some of the Tri-Campus Council's ideas into this process. We could ask you to visit our committee. The process is important, and *this* is a major element of the process." Ihrig said, "When we have a draft we'll want the Tri-Campus Council to look at it."

Killien asked Ihrig, "Where is *your* group moving? When will your committee *have* a draft?" Ihrig replied, "We've had fits and starts. We're trying to get a statement of the umbrella's way of doing business; to create a context in which individual policies can be set in several areas: risk management, student affairs, environmental issues, and many others. We're trying to get the right context. We worked on a two-page document trying to set an overall philosophy. The 'system' vs. 'university' issue came out. At this point, we're *close* on this issue. We hope to get the draft done by summer."

Killien said, "We come back to a lack of shared communication. Until we, across our bodies, agree on the highest level of assumptions, we can't move forward. *Without* that, what's the future of our work here?" Primomo asked, "Where's the overlap with Weldon Ihrig's committee? We can't wait for administrative decisions on issues that won't affect *our* realm. We should move forward with *our* work." Stein said, "We talked about policy (controlled by the Faculty Senate) and our separate campus operational autonomy. There could be individual issues that would be handled by faculty councils on the individual campuses."

Schaufelberger said, "The proposed code changes are an elaboration of our philosophy. We have, in the first place, the faculty, and the keeper of codes in the Faculty Senate, which represents the whole University. We have the policy of the codes, which is handled through the Faculty Councils. We believe that some operational matters can be handled at individual campuses. We could recognize a senior faculty organization at each campus. Where matters are cross-campus, we could go to the Tri-Campus Council or some other appropriate council. It seemed last week to be acceptable to all three campuses, as long as the separate campuses operate according to the policies of the Faculty Code. Tenure and promotion procedures would follow the Faculty Code at all three campuses. But they wouldn't have to go through the Faculty Senate. In other words, they could be done as they are being done now. It would be the same with curriculum." Asked whether a faculty member from UW, Bothell or UW, Tacoma could be the chair of the Faculty Senate, Schaufelberger said, "Yes, a UW, Bothell or UW, Tacoma faculty member *could* be chair of the Faculty Senate, exactly as a UW, Seattle faculty member could be chair."

Carwein said, "When *we* [at UW, Tacoma] think of UW, Seattle, we also think of the University as a whole. That's a problem for us. There's not a corresponding *entity* for UW, Seattle." Decker corroborated Carwein: "There's the GFO (General Faculty Organization) at UW, Bothell, and the Faculty Assembly at UW, Tacoma; but what's the corresponding organization at UW, Seattle *if* the Faculty Senate represents the whole University?" [It was agreed that there is no corresponding organization at UW, Seattle.] Carwein added: "If *we are* three campuses – with distinct, unique contributions to make – where's the vision of what these three unique campuses *are*, and *can become*?"

Meszaros said, "In the last two years, we've come closer to a federated idea. *At table*, the progress we've made so far *does* get agreement: a central policy, but separate operational management at the individual campuses. We need to get an understanding to carry around with us in our heads."

Both UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell council members stressed the fact that those campuses have determined their own academic growth from their inception to the present.

Olswang said, "Each campus is responsible for its own curriculum and new programs. I don't think you want GFO and TFA to be part of the Faculty Senate; they would be ill-served as part of the Faculty Senate, in the sense that everything would then have to go *through* the Faculty Senate." Schaufelberger said, "The idea is to sub-delegate operational matters to the GFO and TFA." Olswang said, "We've *done* that in our draft of Section 23.45 D of the Faculty Code. That's already been seen to. I don't think faculty organizations want to be an *arm* of the Faculty Senate, and to have to report to the Senate Executive Committee."

Buck asked, “Where does the University of Washington leave off, and UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma begin? *If* we’re three campuses, what’s the overall structure, and what are the individual pieces?”

Meszaros asked, “Is there some place in the Faculty Code that says explicitly that local campuses can take care of themselves?” Olswang said, “We’ve taken care of that.” Buck said, “Under the rubric of Chancellor, there are faculty, students and staff. There’s an overlap.” Stein said, “This [vision statement] clarifies the role of faculty on individual campuses.” Olswang said, “On the structure we’re building, only UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell can give direct advice to chancellors. Seattle doesn’t have that individual entity.”

Carwein said, “If the Faculty Senate represents the whole University, why do we need separate entities at UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell? But there’s no demarcation at UW, Seattle.” Olswang said, “We need to get beyond the view that UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell are the equivalent of ‘college’; you don’t have a college advisory body unless the Senate appoints one.”

Primomo said, “We *do* have *this* body, with some of the operations that don’t fit into the Faculty Senate purview. It would be very helpful to have these reports; it is beneficial to us – at UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma – to be part of the Senate. We won’t, however, change the Senate from being a Seattle-focused body, or the Senate Executive Committee from being a Seattle-based body.”

Decker said, “[2003-2004 Senate Chair] Doug Wadden said this isn’t an issue likely to be resolved until the new president is here and until accreditation issues have been addressed. So we probably should not get too dug in on any particular conception.” She added that the question of the differences between the Seattle campus and the two other campuses, and between the Bothell and Tacoma campuses themselves, will certainly come up with the new regime.

Meszaros said, “We want to get our best understanding on paper. And I would like to ask for suggestions as to where we might take our final report. Regent Chin has asked to see a report. And we’ll take it to the President, the Provost, and the Chancellors. But other suggestions would be welcome. Suggestions for appendices are also welcome. This document should help our colleagues understand next year why they should vote for our legislation.”

Olswang suggested a history of the council as an introduction to the vision statement. “You need a document to explain the philosophy and the effect of this legislation: its outcomes. And you need to clarify that this is a three-campus University that bestows separate responsibility on all three campuses, while having a Faculty Senate and one University Handbook that sets policy for the University as a whole.”

Meszaros said, “The Senate’s Faculty Councils set University-wide policy but also deal with implementation of a number of matters specific to Seattle.” Buck said, “Section 23.11 B says, ‘the University of Washington, Seattle,’ and not just ‘the University’ by itself.” Olswang said, “This was drafted under the current structure. This is a Regents statement. I would suggest that the council agree to this factual change to ‘the University, Seattle.’ ”

A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE ALL CHANGES MADE IN SECTIONS 23-11 B., 23-45 D., AND 23-48 D. IN THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION. (The changes in the latter two sections are changes to include the comma in “University of Washington, Bothell” and “University of Washington, Tacoma.)

THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Meszaros said, “This will go to the Senate Executive Committee.”

Whitney suggested mentioning in some way that the vision statement is meant to serve several different but complementary purposes.

Carwein said, “When former President McCormick talked to me about heads of campuses, I thought ‘dean’ did not fit. McCormick said it was political that ‘dean’ was left on; but it’s not a ‘dean’ role, and in my

view – with respect to the ways that programs actually function – the word ‘program’ does not fit. We’re way beyond that. The title doesn’t fit us any more. We should have fixed these titling problems long ago.”

Olswang said, “Be sure to include the language about the three-campus University in the vision statement.”

A MOTION WAS MADE TO ADOPT THE VISION STATEMENT WITH AMENDMENTS REFLECTING TODAY’S DISCUSSION AND APPROPRIATE APPENDICES. THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.

Lastly, Meszaros said, “We need to celebrate the idea that we should evolve differently at the three campuses, and that the University should embrace that idea. I am very impressed with everyone’s patience and good will in working toward a vision of tri-campus policy.”

### **Next meeting**

This was the final FCTCP meeting for the 2002-2003 academic year. The council’s next meeting will take place in October of Autumn Quarter 2003.

Thanks to all members of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy for their excellent contributions throughout the year.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder