

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
Tuesday, March 7, 2007
36 Gerberding Hall

Chair Marcia Killien called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Synopsis:

1. Opening by the chair
2. Updates on new-program reviews (UWS, Diversity minor; UWT, IAS concentrations to majors (12 proposals); UWT, computer engineering and systems
3. Update & discussion of proposed reorganization of councils
4. Agenda items for next meeting

1. Opening comments from the chair, introductions, agenda, minutes

Chair Killien welcomed council members and guests.

Approved minutes of the February 7, 2006, meeting are posted on the Website.

2. Update on new-program reviews

Killien reported that the UW diversity minor has been approved; it is one of the first to be approved through the new process. It elicited no negative comments, and Killien approved it on behalf of the Council. It was sent to the president on 2/20/06.

Two additional new-program proposals pending, both from Tacoma.

IAS concentrations to majors (as proposals) have elicited a number of comments. Stein said that this reflects questions raised earlier about the criteria on which to base decisions, and how seriously the comments should be taken. Killien noted that some of the comments on these proposals, if accurate, may indicate concerns that the HECB might also have. Corbett concurred.

Killien suggested a joint meeting with the chairs of the program approval committees from each of the 3 UW campuses to discuss criteria for review of proposals, responding to comments, and Corbett could talk about what the HECB looks for. FCTCP members concurred with this plan.

Computer Engineering and Systems proposal. Comment period ended 2/10. Bellamy reported that considerable number of comments came from Seattle that Tacoma should not be creating this program versus making comments on the program itself – the redesign of the review process was intended to avoid this kind of situation.

These proposals will be coming to the council, which will then look at how the campus responded to these comments. Killien added that the FCTCP review considers if the originating campus makes “honest, thoughtful” responses. No one campus has the power to approve or disapprove development of a program on another campus. Barness pointed out, however, that they (Tacoma) have no standards for judging the comments.

Killien noted that curriculum proposals may be received that raise question of resources (support) involved, which are within administration’s purview rather than faculty’s domain. This will probably be increasingly

the case as campuses continue to grow, and also as programs become more interdisciplinary, the boundaries among areas of knowledge are increasingly blurred.

3. Update & discussion of proposed reorganization of Councils (G. Stygall)

Gail Stygall—ex-officio member of the council and vice chair of the Faculty Senate—provided the council with historical background on the Special Committee on Council/Committee Restructure, which she currently chairs. The committee was appointed to follow up on the results of a previous study conducted in 2002-03. Under chair Norm Rose, that earlier committee developed a proposal recommending restructuring to change faculty councils/committees into *university committees*. Faculty councils are often duplicated by administrative committees, so the proposal was based on the concept of having everyone at the table. The proposal had to be set aside due to an unexpectedly difficult climate at the university that year. With more favorable circumstances, including the attention of President Emmert, the committee has been re-formed and the proposal resurrected. The restructure committee feels a mixed organization is needed, although keeping separate Faculty Affairs and FCAS, with their specifically delegated authority from the faculty for curriculum, which should be kept separate from administrative committees.

The committee has raised the question of which committees might be combined to create a unified administrative/faculty committee. FCTCP was suggested as one of these. Two weeks ago, Gail and the Faculty Senate Chair talked with the president, and asked for permission to move forward on this idea, to have a council of half faculty, half administrative representation with co-chairs representing each group. The earlier ad hoc committee on compression had this structure and it seemed to work well.

Stygall asked for the council's reactions to this proposal, thoughts about issues they anticipate, what changes might be required in the Faculty Code to address these changes. The committee intends to present legislation to the Faculty Senate on May 8. An extended and detailed discussion ensued. Some key points and questions:

- Combining administration and faculty representation allows decision-making in one place versus multiple venues (or subcommittees) offering input on issues.
- What would happen to ex-officio representatives (students, retired faculty, librarians, professional staff), i.e., how to retain those voices.
- Killien observed that the council formerly included more ex-officio administrators, but now lacks administrative members from all UW campuses, which tends to hamper decision-making.
- It was pointed out that the newer campuses need to conserve resources. Such a structure suggests that representatives would be needed from each campus on each new committee, but would each campus have those representative resources?

The possibility was raised that some of the university committees would not be tri-campus; many topics are relevant just to the Seattle campus. – perhaps FCTCP could be empowered to actually make the decision about which topics require tri-campus participation.

A mixed structure might then include university committees and some that are campus-specific committees, with duplicate structures across the campuses – but still leave question of mechanism for determining “faculty only,” “administration only,” or tri-campus committees.

- Another mixed structure might keep FCTCP as a faculty council, but also form a university committee with FCTCP members as the faculty membership. This would allow separate meetings of the faculty council and separate recommendations to the faculty senate.
- To avoid the two newer campuses being “overwhelmed” by Seattle, measures are needed to ensure input solicited in several ways. The FCTCP is an apt venue for such discussion.

- The restructure is an attempt to reorganize the way decisions are made and where power is placed and exercised. Faculty prerogatives should not get subsumed in any new committees. Concern was expressed that campus authority for curriculum might be lost without FCTCP's status as a faculty council.
- A positive is that the recommendation is for a single structure where considerable number of administrative tri-campus issues could be addressed (without a lot of sub-committees). On the negative side, however, there are some governance issues specific to the faculty. If the council gives up that arena of oversight, then might be ceding this to another group.
- Stygall mentioned that the restructure committee is conducting a survey of what councils, committees do at other peer institutions. Perhaps FCTCP needs to do an inventory of what's going on at Tacoma and Bothell campuses that Seattle should be aware of when creating groups – e.g., to talk about undergrad issues. If pursued, this needs to be institutionalized over a period of time.
- If FCTCP becomes this joint committee it might monitor the minutes of all three campuses (and request reports), especially given Stygall's observation that "no one at the highest administrative levels monitors discussions as to whether Tacoma and Bothell are included."

Chair Killien summarized the discussion: while there are several important unresolved questions (e.g., who's on the committees, who votes), the tenor of the group is more positive than negative re its willingness to test out the restructure committee's suggestion that FCTCP become a joint faculty/administrative committee. The charge to and the membership of the council will be important considerations. There is concern about the actual time commitment involved in faculty governance at this level; and there should increased substantial recognition of the committee participation (eg. Specific release time recommended).

Stygall was asked to present the final recommendation of the restructuring committee at the April FCTCP meeting.

4. Agenda items for next meeting

In response to Killien's request for additional agenda items for the April meeting, the council agreed that she would invite William "Bill" Erdly, Chair of the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach, to join the group for a discussion of the impact of EO programs on enrollment on each of the campuses. She will also invite Ana Mari Cauce to talk about the climate survey relative to differences among the campuses.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m. Minutes taken by Laraine Hong, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW-Bothell. lhong@uwb.edu; 2-3276

Present: **Faculty:** Killien, Stein, Barsness, Leppa, Harrington
 President's designee: Bellamy
 Members of representative groups: Chen, Corbett, Weitkamp, Fugate
 Ex officio members: Stygall

Absent: **Faculty:** Krishnamurthy
 Ex officio members: Collins, Tenenberg
 Faculty Legislative representative: Lovell

Guests:
Laverty, UWb Chair, General Faculty Organization

Rea, UWT Faculty Assembly and member of the Special Committee on
Council/Committee Restructure