

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 p.m. on Monday, **May 13, 2002**, in 142 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Coney, Crawford, Schaufelberger and Stein;
 Ex officio members D’Costa, Futrell, Kubota, Loustau, Nelson, Olswang and Silberstein.
 Guests Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty; Doug Wadden, chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

ABSENT: **Professors** Leppa;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Lou, Ludwig and Sjavik.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the April 15, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

Continued work on definition of campus

Two drafts were distributed to the council: 1) Crawford’s draft of Sections 13-23 (Legislative Authority of the Faculty), 24-45 (Campus, College, and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure), and 23.48 (Procedures for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campus Colleges and Schools); and Olswang’s draft of Sections 23-11 (listing dates when the three campuses of the University of Washington were established by legislative action, and listing the colleges and schools that have been established within the University); 23-23 (Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments – Definitions); and 23-45 (A. “For each of the University of Washington in Tacoma and the University of Washington in Bothell, the campus faculty shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure, subject to the provisions of Section 23-46.”).

Olswang raised a question regarding Crawford’s draft: Section 13-23 D. “For each of the University of Washington in Tacoma and the University of Washington in Bothell, the campus faculty shall determine its own organization and constitution, and adopt its own by-laws and rules of procedure, including rules of voting and quorum, for the purposes of exercising the powers and performing the duties delegated in the Handbook II.13.23.” Olswang’s suggestion was to simply add “for that organization” after the phrase “including rules of voting and quorum.” Olswang said 23.46 “covers rules that govern voting at the departmental level and everywhere else.” He said the suggested correction would avoid conflict with the Faculty Code. “It would limit the language to governance matters, which would be quite all right. The concern was with the breadth of the language.”

Meszaros suggested modifying 23.48 D to refer to sections 23-43 and 23-45 only, and not to “23-43 to 23-46” because 23-44 is about the Graduate School and so would not be affected. (This further means that 23-48 A would start out: “When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43; 23-44; and 23-45. A-C...”)

Nelson suggested limiting 23-48 D to actions that deal with campus admissions, school standards or graduation. Nelson added: “The intention is not to affect rules of promotion and tenure.”

Coney said, with respect to point #5 in Section 13-23 A (“criteria for faculty tenure, appointment and promotion”), “The question is how to relate this to the University Handbook.” It was pointed out that this is the University Handbook. Crawford’s suggested changes and additions are in bold in the draft. Coney said that, under 13-23 C and D, “What happens in the process from the Chancellor to the President? Does it go to the Board of Regents in that process?” She was told that the Chancellor must approve faculty action before it goes to the President and then, after the President, to the Board of Regents.” But Olswang noted that “this is only ‘information.’”

Crawford said, also with respect to point #5: “It does not mandate that criteria be approved or determined at the campus level.” Olswang said, “The President has to approve. And any proposed regulations formulated by University faculty must go to the Faculty Senate for review in 60 days.” Olswang stressed that he is not opposed to campuses having their own promotion and tenure review procedures. He also asked, “How could it be certain that one of the 1-7 points in 13-23 A would be picked up?” Under 23-48 D, a campus faculty action will be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty who may, at her or his discretion, refer it to a faculty council for comment. The purpose of 23-48 D, however, is to make the FCTCP the primary site for matters that require three-campus coordination.”

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn said, “If I get something from, say, Nursing, that includes UW Tacoma and UW Bothell as well as UW Seattle (parallel programs on two or more campuses), where do I send it?” Stein said, “We will get it (the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy), and we could get input from other faculty councils.” Stein emphasized that, if it were something that affected UW Seattle only, it would not need to come to FCTCP. Coney said, “If something is for UW Seattle only, FCTCP would not be in the process. FCTCP is for issues dealing with all three campuses.”

Vaughn said, “It is not explicit that FCTCP has a coordinating function.” She asked the council, “How much do you want to be coordinating, and how much do you want to stay a ‘policy’ council, especially in light of the Rose Task Force’s possible suggestions for faculty council reorganization?” Olswang said, “You can’t legislate everything. But if the Secretary of the Faculty wants to send it to other councils, she can. Internal tracking is a Faculty Senate mechanism. As long as it is understood that the President has the ultimate authority to accept or reject a recommendation on a new or revised program proposal.” (Though historically, the President has rarely, if ever, controverted the approval of a new program or program change by the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs, or SCAP, whose parent body is the Faculty Council on Academic Standards.)

Olswang, in summary, said, “It *must* go to FCTCP, but *can* go elsewhere too.” Though Olswang was not suggesting that FCTCP should be the approving body of new or changed UW Tacoma and UW Bothell programs *before* they go to Tim Washburn at Admissions and Records and on to the President (which is where proposals approved by SCAP are sent). He was only saying that FCTCP must see any proposal of a new program from UW Tacoma or UW Bothell. As to who will be vested with the power to approve or disapprove such a proposal, that is a major question yet to be answered in these discussions, he observed. Vaughn noted that “Section 23 gives me [the Secretary of the Faculty] the authority to send a new proposal [from UW Tacoma or UW Bothell] to FCTCP and to FCAS (and SCAP).”

Meszaros, reflecting on the inception of the tri-campus council, said, “When our faculty agreed to the ‘tri-campus legislation’ that brought this council into being, we felt there *should* be more coordination among the faculty at all three campuses, *but* that we would retain our authority over our own programs.” She said the faculty at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma felt this to be absolutely crucial.

Faculty Council on Academic Standards Chair Doug Wadden said, “FCTCP: Is this a super-council over all others?” By that he meant: Does FCTCP supersede a function previously granted to another council? He stressed that only a couple of faculty councils (Faculty Affairs and Academic Standards, both of which meet every two weeks, and not once a month, which is the case with all other faculty councils) have been responsible for [the major proportion of] Class “A” and Class “B” legislation in the Faculty Senate. And the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) regularly meets to assess in exhaustive detail proposals for new programs and program changes.

He also pointed out that, with respect to proposals for Distance Learning programs at any or all of the three campuses, members of FCAS and FCEO (Educational Outreach) were part of a Distance Learning Task Force that put in a great deal of time working out Class “B” legislation that was approved by the Senate Executive Committee on October 8, 2001, approved by the Faculty Senate on October 25, 2001, and signed by the President and put into effect on November 26, 2001. Paramount in the “Guiding Principles behind the legislation” was that the same review process be provided for Distance Learning courses (whether DL courses offered directly by academic units or through UW Educational Outreach) that is provided for

regular classroom courses “to assure that all UW credit courses accomplish equivalent educational goals, regardless of mode of delivery.” A no less paramount guiding principle is that UW departments “have full responsibility for content and staffing of Distance Learning courses, whether offered directly by the unit or through UW Educational Outreach.”

Crawford said, “There is nothing in this draft that makes FCTCP a ‘super-council.’ If FCAS has problems with a new program from UW Tacoma or UW Bothell, FCTCP would take that very seriously in performing our function as a body that facilitates coordination among the campuses, as would the President.” Nelson said, “Historically, UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have established their own procedures [for program approval], and do not desire that that process should be changed.” Meszaros reiterated: “We want the faculties at all three campuses to hear each other, but UW Bothell approves a new program [originating on its campus], and UW Tacoma approves a new program [originating on its campus], and *that* need not change. But this is a mechanism [FCTCP] for all campuses to be heard.”

Vaughn said, “Don’t you want to know about parallel programs [at UW Seattle]? If a department at UW Seattle had a new Distance Learning program, it could affect UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. You’d want to know about that parallel program’s (or parallel course’s) existence.” Olswang said, “Regarding the fundamental issue, either we’re in total violation of the Faculty Code, or something else has happened. I assume that authority over certain things has devolved from the President to bodies such as SCAP. Over time, SCAP has become the *de facto* body for program approval. Why not the same, then, for UW Bothell and UW Tacoma? The process now is not, technically, in the Code. To the extent that the Code is not being followed, the approval process would be the same for UW Bothell and UW Tacoma as it is for UW Seattle departments.” Stein said, “But because we’re so small [at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell], *this* [FCTCP] should be the approving body of new programs, with input from other faculty councils.” Meszaros said, “At this time, we want faculty review, but *not* to give up our authority.”

Wadden said the location of the unit submitting a proposal is of no consequence, “since most departments do not represent themselves anyway. The ability of SCAP [the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs] to solicit input from wide-ranging University programs is a part of the established record of the council.”

Olswang said, “As for defining what comes here [to FCTCP], not everything in points 1-7 of Section 13-23 requires coordination. If you then go to 23.48 A, you see that there is no limitation in terms of topics that faculty action can address [admissions, scholastic standards, curriculum, graduation, honors, personnel policy, schedules, registration, or student discipline]. If you limit it to policy topics – you could use the terms ‘campus admissions, campus scholastic standards,’ etc. – then ‘policy’ issues come to FCTCP. Therefore, this council would deal with policy issues at the campus level.”

Wadden said, once again with respect to the Distance Learning legislation, “We gave faculty oversight [of their DL programs]. We felt it was needed. We created a faculty review: a more restrictive waiver process. Now, we’re looking for examples of DL courses to use in our preparation of Distance Learning legislative guidelines. If we bypass FCAS (and SCAP), there’s no faculty review mechanism *overall*. FCAS also reviews minors, and we’d like more input from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. Also, as a result of the deliberations in the Rose Task Force, we may be collapsing FCAS and FCEO into a single council.”

Wadden said there is concern in FCAS about duplicate courses, or what Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn referred to as parallel courses. And particularly as regards Distance Learning courses, the question of equivalence has received countless hours of discussion. What exactly constitutes equivalence? Especially in Distance Learning. (David Szatmary in Educational Outreach has upwards of 150 DL courses he wants to move forward: “a veritable log jam.”) How many of these courses are equivalent to their regular classroom counterparts? Basically [speaking of FCAS], When *are* we engaged? And when are we *not* engaged? Our present process is to *approve* proposals or send them back to the department for changes or clarification. We don’t just sign off on proposals informally.”

Meszaros said that on May 31st, FCAS wants to hear from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma representatives, not only on Distance Learning, but on other issues as well. Wadden suggested that FCTCP ask the people

at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma who are most directly involved with Distance Learning and other curricular issues if they would like to attend the meeting on the 31st. That meeting will take place at 1:30 p.m. in room 142 of Gerberding Hall.

Silberstein said, “We’re all committed to faculty oversight, and no one is talking about bypassing that process. But UW Bothell and UW Tacoma hear much of the discussion as something that leads to the question: Does UW Seattle *review* our programs, or *approve* them? Faculty agree that we want oversight authority over curriculum. But UW Bothell and UW Tacoma are concerned about who has authority over their programs.” Meszaros said, “The sticking point, for us, is that we do *not* want FCAS (or a new council composed of FCAS and FCEO) approving our programs.”

Meszaros said trenchantly, “We [who inaugurated the programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma] were asked to be innovative and creative. Our students are, in certain respects, different from the students at UW Seattle, being, for the most part, placebound, and, in many instances, timebound. [From the FCTCP minutes of November 19, 2001: “In summary, the branch campuses were(are) intended for citizens living in urban areas who are placebound, timebound, workbound and financially constrained.”] If people do not have a stake in the success of our students, they will not be able to appreciate the specific nature of our programs, or the specific nature of our innovations and creativity. The Faculty Senate *originally* set up a *separate* body for faculty governance at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell (the former now has the Faculty Assembly and the latter the General Faculty Organization), and this has been very important for our survival. It seems, however, that whenever we try to do things either quite different from, or quite similar to, the way things are done at UW Seattle, we are considered threatening.”

Olswang said, “I hear: ‘It’s time to have *advice* from FCAS, and other councils; but UW Bothell and UW Tacoma should *approve* their own programs.’” Meszaros corroborated Olswang’s observation. Olswang added: “UW Bothell and UW Tacoma programs are so integral to the University of Washington that they should be reviewed like all other departments. Their programs should be rolled into the same process that all our departments and units at UW Seattle are rolled into. It may have been done differently up to now, but times have changed. Which is why these programs [from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma] should be reviewed like all other departmental programs.”

Stein said, “We don’t *have* faculty oversight like all the UW Seattle departments and colleges. FCTCP could be the *interim* approval body until UW Bothell and UW Tacoma catch up to UW Seattle in the representation of senior faculty at their campuses, which at present is minimal.”

Wadden stressed that approval of programs is “an operational mechanism that takes a lot of time,” which is why FCAS formed a separate subcommittee (SCAP) to devote itself to reviewing new programs and program changes.

Coney reiterated an idea discussed last year that there be three SCAP’s, one on each campus. This would give each campus’s new degree programs a full and sympathetic hearing. Then there could be a hearing for final approval at a University-wide level, whether in the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, or some other body.

Meszaros said that both UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have been able to sustain that operational mechanism since their inception, and to review and approve their own programs efficiently. They would welcome input from FCAS, and from other faculty councils, but desire to continue approving their own programs, for all the reasons already stated.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, June 10, 2002, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor Recorder