

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, **May 5, 2003**, in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Leppa, Primomo, Schaufelberger and Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Nelson, Olswang and Whitney.

ABSENT: **Professor** Killien;
 Ex officio members D’Costa, Decker, Fugate, Krishnamurthy, Sjavik, Swinney and Wadden.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the April 21, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

Honors legislation

Meszaros said Carolyn Plumb – Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards – and Don Janssen – a voting member of FCAS – did well in presenting the Honors legislation to the Faculty Senate on April 24th. Plumb sent a statement to the entire Faculty Senate prior to the meeting, setting out the *raison d’être* of the legislation, and explaining the inclusion of Honors for a transfer student, but the Senate failed to pass the legislation, chiefly because of concern over the number of credits for transfer students. The Class B legislation will come before the Faculty Senate again at its May meeting.

Olswang pointed out that the UW, Tacoma and the UW, Bothell campuses will still be able to bestow their Honors awards on the graduating senior with the most distinguished academic record.

Legislation defining campus

The council made one change in Section 23.11A, deleting the word “in” and replacing it with commas. And the council supplanted Section 23.23E with the following language:

When interpreting any section of the University Handbook at the UW, Bothell or the UW, Tacoma, if the relevant section does not explicitly refer to the UW, Bothell, the UW, Tacoma, campus, or Chancellor, then the word “college” shall refer to “campus,” the word “Dean” shall refer to “Chancellor,” and the words “Department Chair” shall refer to the designated program director or program head.

John Schaufelberger made a MOTION to approve the revised legislative language on Campuses. The MOTION was seconded and a vote was called.

THE COUNCIL VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE ITS REVISED VERSION OF SECTIONS 23-11, 23-23, 24-45, AND 23-48, AND TO TAKE THE PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE CHANGES ON CAMPUSES TO THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT ITS FIRST MEETING IN AUTUMN QUARTER 2003.

(SECTION 13.23 IS AN EXECUTIVE ORDER.)

The revised version of these sections will be sent to the council as an E-mail attachment.

Meszaros began a discussion about a possible Section 13.32: Authority and Responsibility of Campus Faculty. She distributed a draft meant only as a spur for conversation.

Meszaros looked at the University of Michigan and the University of California to see how they handled legislative differences at their different campuses. The University of Michigan was difficult to read in this respect because its campus-specific provisions are dispersed throughout its faculty handbook. At the University of California, however, there is “one place that describes the authority and responsibility of the divisions, and this idea seemed to appeal to people at our last Tri-campus meeting,” said Meszaros. [This is not to be confused with the local legislation maintained by the largely autonomous faculty governing bodies on each campus throughout the U Cal system.]

Olswang said, “It is wise at this point to draft something that makes clear the independent role of the campuses. There is nothing wrong with faculty working on clarifying an Executive Order. But we *cannot* have two Faculty Codes. The faculty as a whole gives authority to sub units, which proceed under faculty delegation to itself. It’s good, and necessary, to talk about faculty authority, but with the understanding that there is but one Faculty Code.”

Olswang said there is a document being worked on now by the campus Chancellors and Executive Vice President Ihrig on “system vs. campus.” It will be completed and will be “out” by the next academic year. “Each campus will have its rules about how it does its business,” said Olswang.

Topics mentioned in Meszaros’s draft that the council might consider in subsequent meetings include: the authorization by the President for the faculties of the UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma campuses to formulate regulations for the immediate government of their campuses and to share responsibility with him or her and with their Campus Chancellor in matters such as campus educational policy and general welfare, campus scholastic policy, including requirements for admission, graduation, and honors; formulation of campus procedures to carry out the policies and regulations thus established, as well as other matters; the determination by each campus of its own organization, and the selection of its own officers, and the adoption of 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 proposed Section 13.32; matters which concern programs, colleges or schools situated within the jurisdiction of only one Campus, and whether they would require action only by that Campus faculty; and the possible transmittance by each Campus faculty of resolutions on any matter of Campus concern to their Chancellor and then to the President, with copies to the Faculty Senate.

Draft of Report on FCTCP lessons and insights on tri-campus relations

Meszaros distributed a draft of a report on “Three-campus Faculty Relations at the University of Washington.”

Meszaros’s draft has three foci: “History,” “Visions and Values,” and “Lessons and Challenges: Faculty Responsibility and Authority.”

Under “History,” the draft includes the following:

“All University of Washington faculty – UW, Bothell, UW, Seattle and UW, Tacoma – are governed by the principles and policies defined in the University of Washington’s Handbook and Faculty Code. The legislating authority for the Faculty Code is the Faculty Senate. For many years, the faculties of UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma each had only a single representative to the Senate that crafted so many of the rules that bound them. Additional coordination was achieved through a committee that was associated with the Senate and also with the faculty governing bodies in UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma. Originally, that committee was known as the Special Committee on Branch Campuses. Later it was known as the Joint Branch Campus Council. That council, the sole mechanism for faculty to discuss matters across campuses, was eventually disbanded, leaving the faculty of the three campuses with no coordinating mechanisms at all. Administrators across campuses had mechanisms for consulting on matters of shared concern but faculty did not.”

“In 2000, new Faculty Senate legislation created a Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy with equal representation from each campus. This body is responsible for policy matters that affect all campuses. It

provides a forum through which faculty can once again consult on matters of shared concern. The legislation also gave UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma representation on the Senate Executive Committee and proportional representation in the Senate. The new campuses welcomed the opportunity to be more fully represented in the body that controls the Faculty Code. They also welcomed the opportunity to achieve better coordination on other matters through the Tri-Campus Council. They were concerned, however, that their assent to the legislation not be interpreted as an intent to cede their local responsibilities and authority.”

“The Tri-Campus Council was charged initially to define ‘campus’ (in distinction from ‘school’ or ‘college’) in the Faculty Code. Its initial charge also asked the group to explore mechanisms by which the three faculties can coordinate with regard to creation of new curriculum. After two years of work, we have made significant progress. In order to do so, we have had to confront fundamental questions with regard to what it means for the University of Washington to be a three-campus university. With this report, we aim to share with our colleagues, administrators and regents our lessons and insights into what sorts of three-campus arrangements will best serve the welfare of the University.”

Under “Visions and Values: the New Campus Vision,” the draft includes, among other passages:

“The new campus faculty find the current arrangements healthy and constructive. We seek to consult widely with our colleagues on matters of shared concern. However, we consider the separate responsibilities and autonomy we have been historically endowed with to be important to our ability to innovate, to serve our nontraditional students and to build distinct, local identities.”

“Many of the new-campus faculty and administrators were attracted to the UW to create something like the University of California (Cal) system, which is considered by many to be the most successful university system in the country. Cal has colleagues establish a system-wide faculty senate responsible for policies and values that unite all campuses but they have also established largely autonomous faculty governing bodies on each campus. Given our physical proximity and resource challenges, the new campuses imagine that some closer relations may be desirable than those found in California. However, the guiding principle that has excited many of us enough to join the UW is the idea of creating strong, differentiated campuses.”

Under “Lessons and Challenges: Faculty Responsibility and Authority,” the draft includes, among other passages:

“In Seattle, the Faculty Senate serves not just as a legislative body with regard to the Faculty Code. It also acts as an implementing or executive body for the schools and colleges. New programs, new courses, elimination of programs and the like must be approved by standing Senate Councils, the same Councils that create legislation/code that guides all campuses. A number of faculty from Seattle believe that the campuses need to be considered as essentially equivalent to a school or college and so bring matters such as curriculum to the Senate in UW, Seattle for final approval.”

“At the new campuses, the implementation of policies has been achieved through local committees of the UW, Bothell General Faculty Organization and the UW, Tacoma Faculty Assembly. The faculties of UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma have been and currently are the final faculty arbiters of what curriculum should be offered to serve their constituencies. They maintain that this arrangement is working well and that it is not appropriate for the Senate in UW, Seattle to become involved in such approvals.”

“This has been our major areas of disagreement. Seattle faculty believe that the Senate must be the final faculty arbiter on these matters; that this is its responsibility. UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma faculty believe that their organizations must continue to serve as the final faculty arbiter in these matters; that this is their responsibility. All involved recognize that further scrutiny and coordination occur through administrative channels after faculty determinations have been made and that the Board of Regents is actually the final arbiter on all these matters. However, shared governance is the hallmark of any great university. Insofar as our faculty all take their responsibility for the welfare of the university seriously, their ownership of issues has made it challenging to reach agreement on several matters.”

Meszaros said, “We need UW, Seattle input on this. Is this is a *shared vision* or would UW, Seattle like to add a *different vision* or work toward some slightly different but shared statement?” Olswang said, “We have the Faculty Senate, which is the Senate for all three campuses. This could be a hurdle that will prove difficult to get over. The Faculty Senate is *broader* than UW, Seattle now. But the Senate is also *claimed* by UW, Seattle faculty. It has a different role that is hard to accept by UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma.”

Meszaros said, “The plan is to get volunteers to turn this draft into a finished report to be presented to the Regents and the new President. We want to show the evolution of the three-campus University, and give a clear sense of where we are now.” Stein said, “This document needs to be short, yet it must delineate the conception and history of the council, what the council has done up to now, its vision, and whatever recommendations it has on tri-campus issues. This document is what people will actually read about FCTCP: a concise report.”

Schaufelberger said, “This can be important for helping the Senate understand our proposed legislation when it moves forward next year.”

Primomo and Stein will work on the “History” section, and Schaufelberger will work with Meszaros on the “Visions and Values” section. Olswang suggested the report include a response to the question, How did we get to this point [at which we are now]?; a record and explanation of FCTCP accomplishments; and a clarification of roles for the council and the three campuses in tri-campus shared governance.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, June 2, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder