

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, **April 15, 2002**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Meszaros (Chair), Crawford, Schaufelberger and Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, D’Costa, Futrell, Loustau, Nelson, Olswang and Silberstein.

ABSENT: *Professors* Coney and Leppa;
 Ex officio members Kubota, Ludwig and Sjavik.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the March 13, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

Continued work on definition of campus

Meszaros distributed a letter to the UW Board of Deans [March 4, 1996, UW, Tacoma] by Sue Thomas Hegyvary, Dean and Professor, University of Washington School of Nursing, entitled: “Building a Three-Campus University of Washington.” Meszaros said the letter articulates several levels at which Hegyvary believes the campuses need to coordinate as closely as possible with one another. The letter places strong emphasis on the importance of shared responsibility among the three campuses, and on the issue of trust.

The letter states: “If the University is the larger corporate and political entity, it requires system-wide coordination, as well as coordination at program level, with clear understandings of the mission or ‘niche’ of each campus, their interdependencies, and their autonomy.”

It goes on to say: “I doubt that we envision a homogeneous University of Washington in all its parts. But we’ve not said with clarity what a multi-campus UW should and can look like in 15-20 years. Leaving the answer to political expediency or environmental determinism will happen by default unless we add a heavy measure of rational design. Are the missions of the three campuses, now or in the future, the same? If they are, what happens to UW’s critical role as a major research university? Conversely, if every campus and program must reflect the mission of a Research 1 university, does that preclude local diversification? Can ‘pooled interdependence’ bind them as diverse units into a whole stronger than any can be alone? Can we as individuals respect that ‘different from’ is not the same as ‘lesser than’?”

Meszaros recommended that council members read the letter in its entirety as a possible source of insights and ideas about cross-campus coordination.

Meszaros distributed two documents about the University of California system: “A Capsule History” by Jeff Hall, Senior Policy Analyst [September 1995], outlining the University’s conception and growth into a statewide multi-campus University; and “Standing Order 105. Academic Senate” [July 15, 1994], containing: 105.1 Organization of the Academic Senate,” and 105.2 Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate.”

Meszaros noted that the documents on the University of California reveal that “the initial Senate fought hard for faculty having a voice.” When new campuses were first introduced, it was required that “everybody had to concur on policy changes.” Later, four different levels of local and parallel committees were established. These committees were both autonomous and unified. In the 1950’s and early 1960’s more campuses were added to the already-existing campuses at Berkeley, Los Angeles, Riverside, Davis and Santa Barbara, and the University became “a federal system,” said Meszaros, “each campus responsible for its own major business, and having its own individual academic senate, with the University having an overall senate, with representation based on size. The overall Academic Senate is a mechanism by which the University’s multiple campuses can communicate their concerns.”

Steve Olswang asked why the FCTCP subcommittee has not met to discuss how the introduction of schools and colleges might affect legislation. Meszaros indicated that the Tacoma Faculty were not able to prepare for such a discussion in the last couple of weeks. Crawford clarified that UW Tacoma's Faculty Assembly Executive Committee did not intend to impose a gag rule on the council regarding discussion of schools and colleges. The request was only that work on related code language await the outcome of present discussions among faculty at UW Tacoma.

Crawford distributed a DRAFT of his suggested changes to Section 13-23: Legislative Authority of the Faculty; Section 23-45: Campus, College, and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure; and Section 23-48: Procedures for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campus Colleges and Schools. [The word "campus" in these titles of sections is an addition to the previous language.]

Crawford's DRAFT reads as follows (**bold** represents his suggested changes and additions to the current language):

Section 13-23 Legislative Authority of the Faculty

A. Subject to the provisions of paragraphs B and C of this Section, the President authorizes the University faculty to formulate regulations for the immediate government of the University and to share responsibility with him, **the Chancellors at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses**, and the academic deans in such matters as:

- 1) educational policy and general welfare;
- 2) policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities;
- 3) scholastic policy, including requirements for admission, graduation, and honors;
- 4) approval of candidates for degrees;
- 5) criteria for faculty tenure, appointment and promotion;
- 6) recommendations concerning the campus and University budget;
- 7) formulations of procedures to carry out the policies and regulations thus established.

B. Each action of the faculty under the provisions of paragraph A of this Section shall be:

1. in accord with the applicable statutory provisions (see Volume I, "Statutes," RCW 28B.20.200) and with the Regents' resolution of May 19, 1956 (Section 12-11) and
2. subject to such rules as the Board of Regents may prescribe, and
3. subject to such executive orders as the President within his **or her** authority may issue.

C. A faculty action under provisions of paragraph A of this Section shall become effective upon its approval by the President, **and, when taken by faculty at the Bothell or Tacoma campus, the prior approval of the Chancellor of the campus.**

D. In order that the Board of Regents may be aware of policies and actions proposed by the faculty, the President will communicate to the Board all recommendations of the faculty which concern the welfare of the University.

E. Except in cases of emergency, policy decisions which affect matters listed in paragraph A of this section will not be made by the President **or the campus Chancellor** without consultation with appropriate officers of the faculty organization established under the provisions of Sections 13-22 **and 23-45.**

Section 24-45 Campus, College, and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure

Sections A, B, and C would remain as they are.

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. [NOTE: a rewrite from the original 23-45. A draft submitted to FCTCP by the subcommittee.]

E. Legislative Authority of Campus Faculty

The campus faculty organization shall serve as the legislative agency of the campus faculty, in accord with responsibilities authorized to the faculty in the University Handbook II. 13.23.]

23-48 Procedures for Adoption and Coordination of Policies and Procedures by Campus Colleges and Schools

A. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections **23-43; 23-44; 23-45, A-C; and 23-46**, and the action so taken deals with admissions, scholastic standards, curriculum, graduation, honors, personnel policy, schedules, registration, or student discipline, the dean shall file copies of it with the President and with the secretary of the faculty for transmittal to the appropriate faculty committee, or if there is no other appropriate committee, to the Senate Executive Committee. The effective filing date for proposals received after May 15 and before September 15 shall be considered to be September 15.

B. The action 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 committee in which event it becomes effective upon such approval; or
2. the President within the sixty-day period suspends its effect, in which event he **or she** shall notify the faculty committee to which the matter has been assigned; or
3. the faculty committee within the sixty-day period suspends its effect on ground either
 - a. that it fails to conform with general University policy or regulations, or
 - b. that it requires review by other colleges or schools which may be affected by it, and refers the matter to the President for final decision.

C. When a matter is so referred to the President by a faculty committee, 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.

D. When faculty action is taken under the provisions of Sections 23-43 to 23-46 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, 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.

The DRAFT includes changes suggested by today's council discussion.

Crawford said he used Code language for his DRAFT in order to "advance the discussion." He said he also built on the subcommittee's document, to which he made slight changes. He said his changes "include specific references to Chancellors and campuses to make clear that faculty of the University are also faculty of campuses as well, not simply faculty of the overall University." He made changes to Section 13-23 C "to include specific references to UW Bothell and UW Tacoma." Regarding his rewrite of the DRAFT of 23-45, he said it is "important to affirm the authority of faculty at the campus level." Should UW Tacoma or UW Bothell go to schools and colleges, he added, such an affirmation would likely be essential for faculty support."

Olswang said, "The changes make sense to me as they relate to Section 23.45." He added, "This does not change the Faculty Senate's authority." He noted that D and E of Crawford's draft are "inconsistent" and "confining" as worded. He said, "The 'campus faculty organization' has no meaning. What does E add to D?" Nelson agreed with Olswang: "E does not add to D." Crawford responded that he recognized the apparent inconsistency but that campus faculties have already determined that the Faculty Assembly at UW Tacoma and the General Faculty Organization at UW Bothell are the official voice of campus faculty, with explicit authority to legislate on a range of matters. Section E, he said, simply makes this explicit. Schaufelberger said, "Yes. Incorporate it into D." The suggestion was made to add the words "...powers delegated in the Faculty Handbook in 23.45."

Crawford said he "combined A and B and eliminated the reference to 23.46 because the rules of voting and quorum may be appropriate for the Senate, but not the Faculty Assembly. We need to change our definition of quorum to be able to do our legislation. We passed this on our by-laws last year. The 23.46 model should not apply to all three campuses. This distinguishes the campus's ability to exercise its Faculty Assembly legislation."

Olswang said, "You propose to take Regents rules that delegate to the faculty the right to make its own procedures (rights that apply to the whole faculty of the University) and apply them to individual campuses. To run your own organization, you want your own rules. That's OK, as long as the University of Washington's binding decision making is not affected." Crawford replied that in "implementing" the Code on the campuses, some will inevitably regard faculty actions as "Code-bending". This council, he added, will be dealing with such issues for a long time to come.

Olswang said, "You should have the power to have your rules for local decision making, though the President would ultimately need to approve any Code-based decision. All shared faculty 'actions' are subject to the approval of the President and the Board of Regents." Olswang said it was "good to put in the language that approval goes through the Chancellor's office; that it does not preclude the power of the Chancellor to have authority separate from the faculty." Regarding the latter, Crawford said, "Could it not be said of the language: 'the faculty shall legislate on these matters,' that it is a provision that has evolved over time?" In Seattle, he added, "the administration seems to appreciate, and is sensitive to, a process whereby executive orders are made within an established tradition of shared governance."

Olswang said, "One policy applies to all the faculty regarding tenure criteria and standards. You can't change rules regarding criteria." Crawford said, "It seems to me that when a faculty appointment is not transferable among campuses, that's where we can look at criteria." Said Olswang, "But each of the 17 colleges has its own criteria. We have programmatic tenure, but *not* University-wide tenure. You're tenured in the program on your campus. But a UW Tacoma faculty member *is* a member of the University of Washington. That does not, however, affect that faculty member's being, for purposes of promotion and tenure, specifically a UW Tacoma, program-based faculty member."

Schaufelberger suggested adding "campus" to all the titles in Crawford's DRAFT. The council concurred.

Crawford said that, in 23.48, he "reproduced the language of 23. A, B and C. I only added a 'she' and specified when actions are taken under provisions of 23.C. to continue the authority of the colleges, in recognition of this being a University regulation for the coordination of policies. What is desired is to set up procedurally what coordination can take place. I changed the language in 23.48 to include campuses and to include the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy among those to whom copies of faculty action are filed, along with the President and the secretary of the faculty. Specifically, the copy would be sent to the chair of the Tri-Campus Policy council."

Olswang said, "Your objective is to say: There's a *process*. It goes through several bodies." Crawford asked, "Are there faculty actions that can *stop* on campuses and *not* go forward through this process?" Said Olswang, "Why add in E.2 a secondary timeline for review? Change it in E.2 and B.2 to make it parallel."

Meszaros said, "I see an implication: The Tri-Campus Policy council will be in part a 'coordinating council,' not just a 'policy' council. I understood this to be consistent with the definition of the council in the code, but I know that some in the Senate do not read it this way. Also, what we are proposing here is FCTCP scrutiny of things that come from UW Tacoma and UW Bothell, but not from UW Seattle. There is a lack of parallelism. We may not be able to fix this, but it seems worth considering."

Schaufelberger said, "But it is the responsibility of FCTCP members from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma to speak out where appropriate, when there are Tri-Campus implications." Crawford said, "But, *other* chairs of councils should be aware of FCTCP." Silberstein said, "E.1 implies that the President and FCTCP should go around other councils." Olswang said, "No. This *is* the responsible council." Silberstein said, "But the other councils should be consulted." Meszaros said, "Perhaps that could be stated in the charge of the council."

Nelson said, "We need to know what *does* go to FCTCP first, before going elsewhere." Crawford said, "We wouldn't object to FCAS making suggestions about UW Tacoma degree program proposals, but that, following approval of new programs on the campuses, final approval would come from FCTCP and the President." Meszaros said, "No. The *campus* would approve. The FCTCP would ensure that other campuses comment and it would have to 'approve' only if a campus was seeking expedited approval. I think it's a safeguard so that expediting does not short-circuit the consultation processes. For example, our faculty [at UW Bothell] *do* vote on new programs. We would like to coordinate with the faculties on all three campuses *with respect to* this process. But we need to be the faculty that determines what to do following that consultation." It was suggested that this issue is part of the larger issue of the definition of campus that the council is considering.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, May 13, 2002, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder