

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

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

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Killien and Primomo;  
                  **Ex officio members** D’Costa, Decker, Krishnamurthy, Nelson, Olswang, Wadden and Whitney;  
                  **Regular Guest** Carolyn Plumb, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards;  
                  **Guest** Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.

**ABSENT:**     **Professor** Leppa, Schaufelberger and Stein;  
                  **Ex officio members** Cameron, Fugate, Sjavik and Stygall.

**Approval of minutes**

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

**Follow-up on the President’s/Chancellors’ Medals legislation**

With respect to the academic honors for outstanding transfer students at UW Seattle, UW Tacoma, and UW Bothell, it was observed that both the Tacoma and Bothell campuses are considering Chancellors’ Medals whereas FCAS is proposing a President’s Medal for transfer students for the Seattle campus. UW Tacoma has finalized their decision on this. Meszaros said there will be a meeting at UW Bothell this week with students to discuss the medals. Some students at UW Bothell want the medals to be as much like the President’s Medal at UW Seattle as possible. “This would require an amendment to FCAS’s legislation, so we’ll finalize our decision soon as well,” said Meszaros.

Primomo said, “If it doesn’t say ‘President’s Medal,’ it doesn’t have to go through Senate legislation since it would be a campus matter.” Olswang said, “The president has discretionary funds that would help with the cost of die, if a separate die is necessary.”

It was noted that at UW Bothell there is already a Chancellor’s Medal. It goes to the student who has proven to be the most inspirational to his or her fellow students. Instituting a Chancellor’s Medal for outstanding academic performance will make it necessary to change the name of this award.

**Follow-up on Three-campus curriculum coordination**

Meszaros distributed a sheet showing a draft of possible “Three-campus new curriculum review procedures.”

Following today’s council discussion, the sheet now reads as follows:

These procedures apply to new undergraduate degrees, majors, options, concentrations, minors (and certificates) and substantive changes to same (these procedures apply to what is known at UW Seattle as “SCAP non-routine submissions”).

**Curriculum Preproposal Coordination**

At the time a proposal is either:

- added to the HEC Board list annually as a possible new offering; or
- is brought for discussion to the Interinstitutional Committee on Academic Programs,

it will be posted for comment to the entire University (i.e., three-campus) community:

- in University Week (annual notice): then check the HEC Board list;

- on the Faculty Senate's undergraduate education Web Site.

At the time of posting, an e-mail notification will be sent to all Deans, department chairs, campus faculty organizations and campus staff organizations for further distribution.

Comments may include:

- concerns about duplication/ensuring distinctiveness;
- opportunities for coordination/synergy/efficiency;
- ideas for strengthening/improving;
- lessons from other faculties' experience.

It is expected that most faculties/staffs will NOT comment on most proposals. Faculty/staff are to comment when they have important concerns or insights to offer.

In a chart that Meszaros distributed showing, graphically, the "Preproposals" and "Final Proposals" procedures, the first line under "Final Proposals" has been altered to read: "Interinstitutional Committee on Academic Programs or College Curriculum Committee or Campus SCAP (whichever comes first)." Under "30 days for comment," the "Provost's Web Site" has been changed to the "Faculty Senate Web Site." Under "Notify" in the "Preproposals" column, "Librarians and Professional Staff" have been added to "Campus staff organizations."

Olswang said it should be noted that "proposals are not substantively developed when they get put on the HEC Board list. The University simply provides this annual list of what it may like to offer in the next few years to the HEC Board." Nelson added, "Can't interested faculty just read this on the HEC Board site? Faculty are already so busy. Why add to their work load?" Killien emphasized that "curriculum is the domain of the faculty, so it might be a good idea to make the HEC Board list more readily available for comment. After all, our goal is enhanced communication." Plumb said, "It is important in that faculty would be interested in general knowledge." Olswang said, "It would be fine to do this. Though the list can become an overkill. But units *should* talk to each other."

Meszaros asked, "What about the Interinstitutional list?" Decker said, "It's part of the official commenting process." Meszaros said, "This is *only* for University of Washington courses. But, if the University is telling the outside community that it is considering a program, it should also tell its own units." Vaughn said, "Why not have an understood policy that it's posted once a year on the HEC Board list and on the ICAP several times a year?"

Meszaros said, "For University Week, should we wait until it's fast-tracked or until it's more fully developed?" Vaughn replied, "You want to have something developed enough that there's something to talk about." Wadden said, "Annual or quarterly notice won't reach the curriculum committees, but what you propose sounds fine." Olswang said, "There should be a place to see if someone else has the same thing in mind. You need a *singular* place to go to."

Killien suggested that "if all other steps are on University Week, and you then go to the Senate Web Site for *another* notice, you lose the singular location." It was pointed out that Robert Corbett – Coordinator of New Programs in the Office of the Provost – might maintain a site for this purpose. Meszaros said, "We only need to have the HEC Board list posted and write folks to comment. It sounds today as if we only require an informal exchange, and that deans and the provost do not need to be involved at this stage."

Olswang said, "Comments *will* be part of the file." Plumb said, "The *idea* of a proposal would probably be circulated *within* departments." Wadden said, "A chair would go to a divisional dean and explore a new proposal there first. Any new proposal also gets significant assessment in the College Curriculum Committee." Decker added, "But *primary* deans wouldn't talk to each other. Too much else is going on." Meszaros said, "We can get rid of SCAP, then, at this level." Wadden said, "Yes; it's about communication at this stage." Olswang said, "Robert Corbett sends out notice to ICAP." Decker said, "By the time the proposal reached the GFO [General Faculty Organization], it was fairly well developed."

Olswang said, “Who *gets* this notice?” Wadden said, “Staff wants ‘to be in the loop,’ especially when issues of implementation are concerned.” Meszaros said, “They would like to be able to offer advice when they see potential resource or implementation issues.” Vaughn said, “Hearing from staff can be helpful with respect to many aspects of these issues.” Olswang said, “We need to decide the *purpose* of the comments. It’s one thing to make the campus more aware; it’s quite another thing to send it to deans and department chairs.”

Meszaros asked, “Who will pin down this process?” Wadden said, “Deans and department chairs will be the main conduit.” Decker said, “Faculty should know at the proposal stage. We would notify faculty leadership.” Vaughn suggested, “You could send one E-mail to deans and department chairs and chairs of faculty organizations at all three campuses.”

### **Statement on this council’s progress (requested by Regent Chin)**

Meszaros made a statement before the Presidential Search Committee last week. Following the statement, Regent Chin asked for more information about our Council’s progress and the progress of the administrative group that is working on three-campus structural issues.

She said she wanted to say something about where the council is with respect to the University Handbook. Olswang said there are really four perspectives regarding the University Handbook; those of: 1) the Faculty Senate; 2) the administration; 3) UW Tacoma; and 4) UW Bothell.

Meszaros said, “I think we should prepare a concise, two-page statement.” Olswang said, “When the Tri-Campus faculty council was created, there were Class A statements approved by the Faculty Senate, and dicennial documents.” Killien said, “A statement needs to start with when the council was created, what its goals were, and where we are at present.”

Meszaros said, “So we’ll outline four basic issues: 1) legislation on the definition of a campus; 2) the review of things we’ve made progress on; 3) what’s still on the table; and 4) what are disagreements. She emphasized that she believes Regent Chin’s reason for requesting the statement about the Tri-Campus council is “a general curiosity.”

Meszaros’s Statement to the search committee was as follows:

24 Feb 2003, Forum on UW Presidential Search

Statement by Jacqueline Meszaros, Associate Professor of Management, UWBothell,  
Chair, TriCampus Council of the University Senate.

I’m speaking to you on behalf of the faculty governance bodies at UWBothell and UWTacoma. We think it is important to remind the committee that managing the University of Washington as a dispersed set of campuses with different missions adds an important layer of complexity to the president’s job. He or she will need to help us wisely balance autonomy with integration among our three campuses.

Significant campus autonomy is important to enable the new campuses to thrive and develop differentiated competences and identities of their own. Strategic autonomy also ensures that all our faculties (Bothell, Tacoma and Seattle) are spending our time on the problems that are most important to our own development – not worrying over issues that are important to other campuses but not particularly to ours.

On the other hand, we need strategic points of integration to ensure that we all achieve the high standards of intellectual quality and challenge for students that are the hallmark of University of Washington endeavors.

The new campuses should be attractive assets to an incoming president. We aim particularly to serve the intellectual needs of the state and the region, providing a healthy and politically appealing complement to Seattle’s largely national and international focus. We serve underserved student populations, which also

helps make the UW a more attractive local citizen. As smaller faculties, we may serve more readily as labs and incubators for new options in education than some of our more mature Seattle counterparts. We encourage you to get potential candidates excited about this entire portfolio of University assets.

In sum: as you move forward with the search, please keep in mind that the new president will not only lead the mature, distinguished Seattle campus. He or she will also need to nurture a couple of blossoming (sometimes difficult) adolescents struggling to establish their own identities. It is enormously important that we succeed in this for the sake of our students, so that they are proud to come from UWB and UWT, not just UW. We hope you will seek a leader who is wise and secure enough to encourage us adolescents to continue to build our own capabilities and reputations – and who can take pride in enabling our development.

We anticipate that such a president will, in addition to being wise and secure, have:

- high tolerance for ambiguity;
- low need for control;
- a collaborative, open working style; and
- a gift for designing visions and values that can unite and inspire our diverse, enormously talented three-campus community of colleagues.

We actually believe these qualities would be extremely valuable for the entire University community, but they are particularly salient to us.

### **Continued discussion of proposed legislation defining campus**

Meszaros said, “I’ve looked at Code equivalents for other multi-campus universities: the universities of Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, California, and others. And none is clear about this relationship. How governing bodies relate to each other is vague in all cases.”

Regarding the Code Cops issue, Meszaros said, “We didn’t *want* to *weaken* the Code. We’ve been *implementing* the Code at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma. But some people are uncomfortable with that.” Olswang said, “There are curriculum issues as well as other issues. The legislation we’ve been discussing says, for the purposes of the Code only, that a program director is equivalent to a chair, and that deans are equal to chancellors. Basically, all sequences work the same.” Decker said, “Actually, that’s not quite true. What *is* the same is that it goes to the provost.” Olswang said, “The sequence works throughout the Code. The Code says that, regarding local decision making, local departments (at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma) can make their *own* decisions *if* they are consistent with the Code.”

Meszaros said, “On curriculum policy, I think we all agree on FCAS’s role. The problem is that FCAS performs an executive function in Seattle that has been decentralized historically to our campuses. So our sticking point seems to be *outside* the Code. In the Code, Councils are defined as policy-making bodies. We were comfortable with that when we agreed to the Tri-campus Legislation. Our problem is that these Councils also fill executive functions in Seattle while our campuses handle the executive functions locally. Where is the executive part written? Perhaps we can just change that.” Vaughn said, “That has standing because of weight of past practice. It isn’t written.” Meszaros said, “So it is very like the standing of our campuses’ practices?” Primomo noted that “we must look to the future as we resolve this.”

Olswang said, “On curriculum policy, I think we all agree on FCAS’s role. The problem is that FCAS performs an executive function in Seattle Can we agree that we’ll resolve this issue: Does the curriculum approval process have to go through FCAS or not? The Code Cops say FCAS must be the final decision-making body.” Vaughn said, “The voting faculty decide, *not* the Code Cops. The Code Cops are advisory to the Senate Executive Committee.” Meszaros said, “In actual practice, SEC would overturn anything that came to it suggesting that FCAS should *not* be the final decision-making body.” Vaughn said, “Not necessarily.” Olswang said, “If the council agrees that there should be a three-campus approval process – to be signed off by the president – then I’ll accept that, though I may not agree with it. But can we say that we’ll finalize the curriculum approval process at the next council meeting? Then we can tell FCAS whether they need to change, in part, their current status with respect to curriculum approval.”

**Next meeting**

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, April 7, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder