

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., February 23, 2012
26 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of February 2, 2012
- 3) Update from the Chair – SCPB, Faculty Senate Proposals that may have Tri-Campus impact
- 4) Communication of Tri-Campus perspectives/issues to President/Provost
- 5) Pre-planning Discussion/Questions/Data Requests for Invitation to Campus Admissions
VP/Directors
- 6) Next Meeting Items/Agenda
- 7) Adjournment

1. Call to Order

Council Chair Bill Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m.

2. Approval of February 2, 2012 minutes

Approval of minutes was postponed due to a lack of quorum, will be approved electronically.

3. Update from the Chair – SCPB, Faculty Senate Proposals that may have Tri-Campus impact

Erdly discussed the Class A Legislation regarding Diversity within the Promotion and Tenure guidelines. Vice Chancellor of UW Tacoma's Academic Affairs JW Harrington emphasized this does not propose a requirement, rather adds the subject of diversity within promotion and tenure section of the *Faculty Code*.

Another subject was the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)' drafted Policy on Satisfactory Progress. Vice Chancellor of UW Bothell Susan Jeffords informed that Debbie Wiegand from the Curriculum Committee had shared this information at her office. This effort was noted to extend beyond providing flexibility for Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate students entering with a greater credit load. Questions were posed on ability of students to register during summer quarter, and whether this had been broadly shared across the three campuses. Concerns were expressed regarding the potential impact of this on transfer or part-time students due to measuring by quarters and not credit-hours. ASUW Representative Maxine Sugarman informed that this policy was discussed at the ASUW Tri-Campus meeting, and students supported this policy.

Further discussion followed on whether the Faculty Council on Academic Standards establishes policy for the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. Though Bothell and Tacoma manage their own admissions and administrative policy, faculty has control of curriculum and degree processes. There was a suggestion to clarify the charge and jurisdiction of the Council; Vice-Provost Wadden will discuss this with Provost Ana Mari Cauce and Erdly will speak with John Schaufelberger, Chair of FCAS. FCAS does not have

representation from each campus, and councilmembers discussed how to best engage all stakeholders. Council members noted that this new policy is not necessarily contentious, but requires clarification.

Further discussion followed on what body determines the missions of each of the three campuses and their inter-relationships, and it was mentioned that President Michael Young asked this question earlier in the year. Wadden noted that the question of cross-campus strategy arises frequently, and emphasized the gradual nature of any changes in strategy across the campuses.

Investigations to address the faculty salary policy, due to lack of merit raises, were mentioned and a Faculty Salary Policy working group is being formed. Questions were posed on what is feasible under current policy, short and long-term changes and the involvement of Bothell or Tacoma administration and faculty within discussions. Wadden added that despite eagerness of UW administration to resolve this problem, it will be difficult to address in the current political climate.

4. Communication of Tri-Campus perspectives/issues to President/Provost

Erdly opened up discussion for suggestions of issues to be brought to the attention of the President or Provost.

Alignment of Seattle, Bothell and Tacoma Administrations on FCTCP

Wadden noted that perspectives expressed within this Council are often different than discussion occurring within the different administrations in Bothell and Tacoma. He suggested that FCTCP be more representative of the administration to better address the larger issues proposed.

Faculty Council Membership

Erdly suggested approaching the Faculty Senate to add more faculty members from each of the three campuses, and for meetings to be scattered across the three campuses. He also emphasized the need to improve the technological accessibility for the Council. Erdly considered that an increase in visibility of FCTCP activities could serve to gather more enthusiasm and efforts.

Role of Council

Erdly differentiated two potential roles of the Council: informing cross-campus strategies to faculty and actively generating legislation for the Faculty Senate. At the suggestion that the Council work to clarify processes and responsibilities across the campuses, Jeffords informed such documentation already exists. Another suggestion was for FCTCP to revisit which Faculty Councils required representation from Bothell and Tacoma faculty. Updates from the ALUW, PSO and other organizations were requested for future meetings.

Campus Goal Setting

Rebecca Deardorff, PSO Representative, suggested that a planning session between the Provost and the Chancellors be conducted to identify goals for each particular campus. Recent new leadership (within the Provost and Chancellor) may open the possibility for clarification. Harrington and Jeffords thought that sufficient coordination already takes place between the three campuses. Questions arose if there is redundancy in curriculum reviews and course approval processes, as reviews take place at Bothell or

Tacoma but require an additional review at the Seattle campus, whether this was necessary to meet the needs of different populations.

Communication amongst President and Provost with Bothell and Tacoma counterparts

Potential gain in strategy was suggested through scheduling regular meetings between the President and Chancellors across the three campuses, or Vice-Chancellors and Provost. Such meetings could be informational, regarding activities and trends, or non-academic elements such as development and relations. The value of having the Seattle administration weigh in on local strategies was questioned, noting that Bothell and Tacoma campuses develop in accordance to local need.

Technology Infrastructure Representation

Erdly informed of a past meeting with Kelly Trosvig, opening discussions of common goals across the three campuses to be addressed through Information Technology (IT) infrastructure. Discussion followed on updates on a contract with Microsoft, training and assistance necessary for transitions to newer systems, and open source software efforts. A potential presenter discussed was Betsy Tippins at UW Bothell who works closely with the Seattle campus. The Faculty Senate already sends representatives for oversight in IT, however there may be value in having a faculty representative involved with the discussion of the development of such infrastructure. Erdly noted that the different needs of the campuses. Though monies are centralized, and concerns may lie within how such funds are spent, there is a need to ensure presentation of perspectives across the campuses.

Maintenance of Data Storage, Archiving

Erdly sees the maintenance of data storage and archiving data as an important issue. ALUW representative Sarah Leadley highlighted this as a major concern for UW Libraries, highlighting efforts regarding data mining, access, however difficulties with infrastructure and servers. Deardorff noted that there is no process for archiving large datasets on campus. Questions were raised whether economies of scale or cross-campus sharing of information are being discussed. The topic was seen as parallel to new Human Subjects review discussions, whether to centralize or maintain separate systems.

5. Pre-planning Discussion/Questions/Data Requests for Invitation to Campus Admissions VP/Directors

Erdly noted that an earlier topic of discussion had followed regarding campus admissions, and asked to confirm Council interest in this subject. Philip Ballinger, Assistant Vice President for Enrollment and Director of Admissions, has pertinent data but asked for more specific information on what the Council would like to have presented. Harrington noted that Tacoma has been revising its process, focusing on clarifications for potential students, such as differentiating which programs are offered on which campus. He also expressed interest in the length of waitlists for the Seattle campus, and whether waitlisted candidates were informed of available spaces at Bothell or Tacoma. Wadden noted that waitlist numbers number in the hundreds, but not thousands.

Wadden emphasized an earlier suggestion for faculty to visit the online admissions page¹ in order to familiarize themselves with the process. Harrington noted difficulty in navigating the site. Sugarman

¹ Available at: <http://admit.washington.edu/Admission/Freshmen/Apply>

noted that UW may be losing additional applicants due to not participating in the Common Application,² which is a common application across many universities, and that questions for the UW application were specialized. Discussion followed on the potential gains and risks of participating in the Common Application and whether information was tracked where students who chose not to head to UW were enrolled. Ballinger's office would be able to provide data for the Seattle campus, but potentially not Bothell or Tacoma.

6. Next Meeting Items/Agenda

Erdly requested that Councilmembers email questions to him regarding UW admissions. It was agreed that admissions officers from all three campuses would be asked to present data at the next meeting.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 10:36 a.m. by Chair Erdly.

Minutes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. jayf@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Michael Kucher (representing Julie Nicoletta)
 President's Designee: Wadden, Jeffords, Harrington
 Ex-Officio Reps: Deardorff, Sugarman

Absent: **Faculty:** Collins, Roesch, Endicott Popovsky
 Ex Officio Rep: Fridley, Joseph

² Available at: <https://www.commonapp.org/CommonApp/default.aspx>