

University Of Washington  
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy  
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., February 2, 2012  
36 Gerberding

**Meeting Synopsis:**

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of November 17, 2011 minutes
- 3) Undergraduate Diversity Course Requirement Proposal
- 4) Communication of Tri-Campus perspectives/issues to President/Provost
- 5) Next Meeting Items/Agenda
- 6) Adjournment

---

**1. Call to Order**

Council Chair Bill Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

**2. Approval of November 17, 2011 minutes**

The minutes from the November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 meeting were approved with corrections.

**3. Undergraduate Diversity Course Requirement Proposal (ASUW presentation/discussion)**

Helen Fillmore, representing the Associated Students of the University of Washington, was introduced to the Council. She thanked the Council for hearing student voice on the proposed diversity requirement, informing of similar requirements in 8 of 11 peer state universities and a strong turnout amongst UW students in support of such a requirement. She discussed the framework in the policy statement to qualify courses that meet the requirement, and added that nearly 60% of current students are taking courses which would meet such requirements. Principal student concern was if potential requirement was plausible and significantly addressed diversity, without necessitating creation of new courses. She noted flexibility as course curricula could be altered to meet guidelines, without increasing graduation requirements. The suggestion is for two required courses for a total of between 2-5 credits, without specifying credit hours.

There was a suggestion that the large incoming population of former military returning to school should be included within diverse populations. As differently-abled population are included, it was suggested that military could potentially be included. A question was posed on who would determine which courses meet these requirements and how frequently this would be verified, and Fillmore informed that students wanted to leave this up to faculty or advisors, while allowing for appeals processes.

Discussion followed on contrasts between a local and global scale of perspectives on diversity. Doug Wadden, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, noted that the last time such an issue arose it was far more contentious than expected, with most disagreement around how to measure diversity. He lauded this proposal's broad definition of diversity. It was suggested that some objections may rise from the request of two courses, though not detracting from credits, and reviewing past pushback would be

helpful for this effort. The need to build policy that fits the difference in course credits across the three campuses was also emphasized to be considered in this proposal, as well as the impact on transfer students, arriving with more credits and difficulty in measuring course content in courses outside of the University of Washington. It was also mentioned that Bothell Learning Goals being developed would resonate with such a requirement.

Jonathan Winn, ASUW Director of Diversity, requested to know what may help to improve the adoption of the requirement across the three campuses and informed that the proposed requirement will be brought next to FCMA and FCAS. Erdly offered to enter Winn in contact with the Diversity Council at Bothell. Members debated on how reducing requirements to one course would compare to flexibility in content of two different courses. It was suggested that Ed Taylor, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, and his staff would have an understanding on the impact of such a new requirement, such as the capacity of space to house any additional courses needed, assistance with planning for students. Winn emphasized flexibility in the requirements at this time and provided his contact information for questions or comments.

Susan Jeffords recalled that past issues had arisen due to different interpretations of diversity, and discussion followed on the value of alignment between different groups working on Diversity across the three campuses. A clear definition of the decision-making body for what is considered diversity was expressed to be important, in order to not allocate too much power within a particular body. It was added there is recent emphasis on this subject, with the requested inclusion on language regarding diversity within the Faculty Code's Promotion and Tenure guidelines.

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

Bill Erdly noted more visibility regarding the relationship across the three campuses, and requested that the Council draft a list of considerations related to cross campus policy for the new Provost and President. A pilot project across three campuses is being launched for a joint information assurance undergraduate degree, and this may have potential to serve as a prototype for other collaboration providing insight in challenges in revenue sharing and credit transfer, for example.

Discussion followed on the opportunity of having a common undergraduate degree, and on infrastructure necessary for implementing such a program. Questions were raised to Doug Wadden regarding if a clearer definition of the system of campuses would help, similar to the University of California. Wadden mentioned that this had been considered and proposals have gone as far as sharing a student waitlist; however the University of California system is very different from the University of Washington. Susan Jeffords, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at UW Bothell, considered different admissions processes can actually benefit the different campuses, as each campus has a different student profile. She was unsure how she would feel about a common admissions process.

Wadden suggested that Phillip Ballinger, the Assistant Vice President for Enrollment, could provide further information regarding admissions and registration, and additionally that those interested in the admissions process should visit the admissions website. Though each campus has different review

processes and deadlines, applications request the same criteria from all students. Discussion followed on concerning retention rates at the Tacoma campus, and how to address this issue. Different student demographic profiles between campuses cause difficulty to compare retention rates, and questions were raised if establishing such profiles was intentional.

Other discussion followed on infrastructure to improve synergies, such as financial aid, tuition, or sharing of common administrative processes. Upon these suggestions, the importance of distinguishing “centralization” efforts from “pooling of resources” was emphasized from the perspective of Bothell and Tacoma campuses. In order to coordinate efforts, it is essential to clarify which body directs linkages between campuses, between the Provost, Faculty Senate and Chancellors. Wadden suggested that the Council form a list of areas which are unclear or require collaboration. Understanding how to best leverage resources across campuses will become even more important currently, due to tight resources from the state.

**5. Next Meeting Items/Agenda**

Erdly suggested that each member bring concerns and issues, and have Philip Ballinger and admissions officers from each campus to address such questions regarding cross-campus enrollment and admissions during the next meeting.

**6. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 10:32 a.m. by Chair Erdly.

---

*Minutes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. [jayf@u.washington.edu](mailto:jayf@u.washington.edu)*

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Endicott Popovsky, Roesch, Michael Kucher (representing Julie Nicoletta)

**President’s Designee:** Wadden, Jeffords, Harrington

**Ex-Officio Reps:** Deardorff, Sugarman (ASUW), Joseph

**Guests:** Shange Purnell, Helen Fillmore, Jonathan Winn

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Collins

**Ex Officio Rep:** Fridley