

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 11:00 a.m. on Monday, **April 21, 2003**, in 142 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Meszaros (Chair), Killien, Leppa, Primomo and Schaufelberger;
 Ex officio members D’Costa, Decker, Nelson, Wadden and Whitney;
 Guest Fred Campbell, former Dean of Undergraduate Education.

ABSENT: *Professor* Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Fugate, Krishnamurthy, Nelson, Olswang, Sjavik and
 Swinney

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the March 10, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

Legislative language

Below are: 1) Steven Olswang’s suggestions for a possible revision of the legislative language on the tri-campus program approval process; and 2) the previous version of the same language. These changes occur in Section 24-48: Procedures for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campuses, Colleges and Schools (pages 5 and 6 of the draft of the proposed legislative changes).

The suggested changes are: the addition of the word “curriculum” in the first sentence of “D”; the deletion of the words “and the chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy” at the end of the same sentence; and the deletion of “3” [including 3a and 3b] in “E”.

STEVEN OLSWANG’S SUGGESTED REVISION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE:

D. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43 and 23-45 at either the University of Washington in Bothell or the University of Washington in Tacoma, and approved by the Chancellor of the campus, and such actions deal with campus admissions, scholastic standards, curriculum, or graduation, the Chancellor shall file a copy with the President and the Secretary of the Faculty. The effective filing date for proposals received after May 15 and before September 15 shall be considered to be September 15.

E. The action taken under provisions of D of this section becomes effective sixty days after such filing of copies, unless,

1. it has been approved at an earlier date by the President, in which event it becomes effective upon such approval; or

2. the President within a sixty-day period suspends its effect, in which event he or she shall notify the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, which shall take up the matter, and, within another sixty-day period, make a recommendation to the President for final decision.

F. When a matter is so referred to the President by the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, the President, after a hearing, shall decide whether the proposed action becomes effective. In so doing the President may employ whatever procedures he or she deems necessary or helpful.

PREVIOUS VERSION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE:

D. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43 and 23-45 by the campus faculty organizations at either the University of Washington in Bothell or the University of Washington in Tacoma, and approved by the Chancellor of the campus, and such actions deal with campus admissions, scholastic standards or graduation, the Chancellor shall file a copy with the President, the Secretary of the Faculty, and the chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy. The effective filing date for proposals received after May 15 and before September 15 shall be considered to be September 15.

E. The action taken under provisions of D of this section becomes effective sixty days after such filing of copies, unless,

1. it has been approved at an earlier date by both the President and the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, in which event it becomes effective upon such approval; or

2. the President within a sixty-day period suspends its effect, in which event he or she shall notify the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, which shall take up the matter, and, within another sixty-day period, make a recommendation to the President for final decision; or

3. the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy within the sixty-day period suspends its effect on grounds either

a. that it fails to conform with general University policy or regulations, or

b. that it requires review by other colleges, schools or campuses which may be affected by it, and refers the matter to the President for final decision.

F. When a matter is so referred to the President by the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy, the President, after a hearing, shall decide whether the proposed action becomes effective. In so doing the President may employ whatever procedures he or she deems necessary or helpful.

Meszaros said Olswang's intent was "to keep what we had, but to enable curriculum approvals to be campus approvals."

Meszaros said the Secretary of the Faculty would refer any necessary tri-campus curriculum approval process matter "to the appropriate council, which is the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy."

Draft for discussion: new section to the legislative language: Section 13.32 Authority of Campuses

Meszaros distributed to the council a "DRAFT for Discussion": a new section to the legislative language: Section 13.32: Authority of Campuses.

Meszaros's DRAFT is as follows:

13.32 Authority of Campuses

A. General Provisions

1. Each Campus faculty (hereafter: Campus) shall have authority to organize, to select its own officers and committees, and to adopt for the conduct of its business rules and regulations for the purposes of exercising the powers and performing the duties delegated in the Handbook II.13.23. Such actions will be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty.

2. In the discharge of the powers and duties delegated in the Handbook II.13.23, the University of Washington in Bothell and the University of Washington in Tacoma shall constitute appropriate faculty committee structures which will execute and enforce the strictures set forth in the Handbook of the University of Washington and will take appropriate consultation with the Campus Chancellor or appropriately designated representative.
3. Matters concerning curricula offered within the jurisdiction of only one Campus require action only by that Campus.
4. Campus faculty shall solely recommend to the President all candidates for degrees in a program, college, school, or Graduate Division under its jurisdiction.
5. Each Campus is authorized to receive and consider reports and recommendations from the Faculties of programs, colleges and schools located wholly or partly on the Campus which it represents, from its Campus committees, from local administrative officers, and from other Campuses.
6. Each Campus is authorized to transmit reports directly to the President on any matter of Campus concern.

B. Legislation and Resolutions

1. Campus legislation may not contravene the provisions of the Handbook of the University of Washington.
2. Each Campus may transmit resolutions on any matter of University concern directly to the President, with copies to the Faculty Senate. Such resolutions may also be transmitted to the Senate for consideration and concurrence; or the Senate may originate and transmit such resolutions.

C. Campus Jurisdiction

1. Matters which concern programs, colleges or schools situated within the jurisdiction of only one Campus require action only by that Campus.

Meszaros said the idea of this proposed new Section to the legislative language “is to have one Section where campus legislation appears. Also, since campus bodies *execute* policy, not just *set* policy, the language addresses this. Executive functions of the faculty do not appear to be mentioned anywhere else in the Code.”

“All of these things are going on now, except B 2. If we take what Steven Olswang has done [in the proposed changes quoted above] and add the new Section 13.32, I think it would take care of what we’ve been working toward all along.”

Schaufelberger said, ‘I don’t see anything, as is, that affects the authority of the Faculty Senate. Steven Olswang did add ‘curriculum’.’ Meszaros said, “We’ve never had concern over the policy dealing with curriculum. Our concern is over the approval process. Section 13.32 tries to address processes.”

Killien asked, “Are you *limiting* by *adding* to the Code? You want as little in the Code as possible. Or, to put it another way, you want any changes in the Code to be *durable*, and to last for as long a time as possible.”

Decker said, “23 E precludes our saying again that campus *isn’t* a college. It’s been a matter of interpretation.” Campbell said, “On page 6, Steven Olswang suggests that campuses have control over their curriculum.” Meszaros asked, “Will it be all right to add ‘curriculum’, or something more specific?”

Primomo said, “Steven Olswang wanted us to say whether or not we’re comfortable with ‘curriculum’ being added (as in 6 D). *I’m* comfortable with it.”

Campbell said, “This *does* say that the *other* campuses do have curriculum control.” Meszaros said, “Good! That’s good. I know how to proceed with that.” Primomo said, “The *way* we’ve used curriculum means *program* approval, but that needs to be clear.”

Leppa said, “If [page] 6 is true, doesn’t that contradict E on page 3? If ‘Chancellor’ and ‘Dean’ are synonymous?” Campbell said, “Steven Olswang is *not* trying to suggest equivalency between ‘Chancellor’ and ‘Dean’. In a new document, the Chancellor reports to the President, but the Dean does *not* report to the President.” Killien said, “The equivalence of language was supposed to clarify, but *this* way of writing legislation is confusing.”

Decker said, “It *would* be preferable to have a section on campuses.” Campbell said, “It’s hard, though, to get a whole section through the Senate.” Primomo said, “‘Chancellor’ and ‘Dean’ are already identical in Chapter 12. Why is there a need to say this yet again?” Meszaros corroborated Primomo: “I checked the Code; the equivalence is in 12-24.II where ‘Chancellor and Dean’ is defined.”

Campbell said, “It’s a careful and deliberate process in the Senate, and getting a whole section through is a long process. *But*, I’m *for* the idea of a whole new Section [13.32].” Meszaros said, “We can’t put through any legislation until next year [the next academic year] anyway. We could, however, have a couple of meetings and draft language that we like. If we come up with something we prefer to our current draft, we could use it instead. If we don’t, we’ll stick with our current draft” Primomo suggested that “a separate section would be nice because some of our interest is to express our own vision.”

Wadden said, “The recent accreditation meeting referred to a three-campus institution. But problems were encountered with the mission objectives. The accreditation committee said the institution has been weakened by across-the-board cuts. And they hit hard on the three-campus objectives. They found a lack of clarity about where the University of Washington is going, and how the three campuses fit into that framework.”

Wadden added, “We have to look at state institutions and institutional networks. The idea of three codes [for the three campuses] would be difficult. Other places have a system-wide Board of Regents. We need to know the role of the Regents and of the state in *our* structure. If we don’t do something, the vision we’ve been striving for will be lost.”

Decker enthused: “I’m impressed by how much you *have* discussed here, even if you don’t have legislation yet. The conversations from the last two years [in FCTCP] should be shared.” Campbell said, “Jane [Decker] has this right. A question to be considered is: How do we make what we *have* work better? Now, after 10 years, there is a whole new set of questions confronting the University. There is an opportunity now to make statements about what needs to be preserved and advanced. Any vision [responsive to the new questions] you could arrive at would be excellent.”

Wadden asked, “Do you want to *wait* on the legislation?” Meszaros said, “We want to let the new President know that we have a well-articulated understanding of what would work well for the University. We’ll work on the articulation of that vision over the next two months. We want to clarify the *intent* of the proposed changes in legislative language, and take that to Steven Olswang. And we want to work on the new Section 13.32. Lea Vaughn [Secretary of the Faculty] and I have a draft of a letter to [Board of Regents Vice President Ark G.] Chin. We should create a framing report of what the three-campus structure consists of. ‘Framing the question’ is the best way. We’ve had one meeting at UW Bothell to discuss the future of the campus and our relationship to the University as a whole.” Wadden was asked when the accreditation report would come out: “It won’t come out until Autumn Quarter,” he said.

Campbell said, “The three campuses don’t have a shared vision of the future of the University as yet. The legislature has one mandate for the University of Washington, Washington State University, and the other four-year institutions of higher learning in Washington state. That will change soon. It would be better to

see them [the institutions in question] *individually*.” Meszaros mentioned that she has not been able to find the report that the Regents originally commissioned on how other multi-campus universities work and what would be desirable for the UW.

Primomo said, “Program approval *is* the sticky original issue behind all this.” Wadden said, “You could target groups you will want to meet with in the Fall, in whatever report you do.” Killien cautioned: “In the discussions of our vision, we want to be mindful that the ‘visionary’ sometimes loses track of the practical. But these two documents we have now can be exemplars.” Wadden said, “The new President will be key to any discussion.”

Meszaros summarized: “There are three main facets to our report: 1) our vision; 2) the values we want to espouse; and 3) the lessons we’ve learned from the discussions of the past two years. We need to get the necessary documents together to create our report. (We need to include a curriculum coordination document in the report.) And we need to meet with Weldon Ihrig.”

Campbell said, “I think a question worth asking while creating this report, and at all times, campus-wide, is: ‘What do we *collectively* do for the public good? What kind of division of labor across the three campuses are we creating to best serve the public?’ ”

Honors Legislation

Meszaros said the Honors legislation was approved by the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting on April 7, 2003, and will be presented by FCTCP regular guest Carolyn Plumb, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, at the Faculty Senate Meeting on April 24, 2003. (The legislation is given in full on the last page of the minutes.)

Meszaros said, “The language in the legislation was crafted to allow for flexibility of language on the part of the Bothell and Tacoma campuses in naming their medals. The language appears to work well. The legislation passed by a majority, but not a large majority, at the Executive Committee Meeting.

“University of Washington” Resolutions

Meszaros said UW Bothell and UW Tacoma sometimes have a “dilemma” when “University of Washington” resolutions come up at Senate meetings. “We don’t want to side-track important Seattle faculty conversations, but these resolutions almost never fit our needs or consider us. As an example of what can happen, with respect to the resolution to set aside part of April 23rd as a day of discussion about the War in Iraq from diverse points of view, both in classes and in seminars and open forums at the UW Seattle campus, UW Bothell had already set a day for seminars and discussions on the War in Iraq jointly with Cascadia. Also, the resolution mentioned Kane Hall as the location for presentations and referred to only one campus. We did not want to interrupt the important conversation our Seattle colleagues were having about the substance of the resolution, but it was clear that the resolution never considered us. Also, sometimes our faculty might like to be heard on a topic that has not become an issue in Seattle. Perhaps the Bothell and Tacoma campuses could create their own Class C resolutions. The UW Seattle resolutions do not always work well for all three campuses.”

Primomo said, “The Senate *is* Seattle-centric. So much of the Senate structure *is* Seattle-specific. I have to ask: Is coming to the Senate Meeting a good use of my time. It’s all afternoon, and it’s a different thing in terms of our time: those of us coming from Tacoma and Bothell. The time demands on us are greater, not less, now than years ago. We need a more efficient structure.”

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, May 5, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor

Recorder

| Present Code Language | Proposed Changes |
|---|---|
| <p data-bbox="151 262 678 317"><u>Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11: Grades, Honors, and Scholarship</u></p> <p data-bbox="151 354 480 384">Section 3. Honors Awards</p> <p data-bbox="151 422 699 604">A. The President's Medal shall be conferred at Commencement upon the graduating senior who has the most distinguished academic record. A transfer student who is eligible for University honors may be considered for the President's Medal.</p> <p data-bbox="151 642 691 699"><i>S-B 86, November 1961; S-B 138, December, 1981: both with Presidential approval</i></p> | <p data-bbox="740 262 1373 317"><u>Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11: Grades, Honors, and Scholarship</u></p> <p data-bbox="740 354 1070 384">Section 3. Honors Awards</p> <p data-bbox="789 422 1365 485">A. Four Medals shall be conferred at the annual commencement ceremonies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="881 489 1406 909">i. At the Seattle commencement ceremony, a President's Medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior who has completed at least three-fourths of his or her degree requirements at the University of Washington Seattle campus and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students. The President's Medalist shall be selected from among graduating seniors eligible for University Honors. <li data-bbox="881 1024 1393 1444">ii. Also at the Seattle commencement ceremony, a President's Medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior who entered the University of Washington Seattle campus with at least 60 transfer credits from a Washington community college, and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students. The President's Medalist shall be selected from among graduating seniors eligible for University Honors. <li data-bbox="881 1560 1386 1713">iii. At each of the Bothell and Tacoma commencement ceremonies, a medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior with the most distinguished academic record. |