

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, **February 2, 2004**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Marcia Killien presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Killien (chair), Behler, Primomo and Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, D’Costa, Decker, Fugate, Heath, Nelson and Olswang;
 Guests Carolyn Plumb, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards; and Doug
 Wadden, Chair, Faculty Senate.

ABSENT: **Professor** Anderson and Leppa;
 Ex officio members Campbell, James, Stygall and Watts.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the December 8, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

FCTCP welcomes new member Constantin Behler

The council welcomed Constantin Behler, Associate Professor, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW Bothell, who is a faculty representative from the Bothell campus.

Executive Order 13-23C [revising Tri-campus Policy]: Legislative Authority of the Faculty

Olswang shared with the Council the President’s revision to Executive Order 13-23C.

[Executive Order 13-23C is as follows:

- 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 the faculty at the Bothell or Tacoma campus, the prior approval of the Chancellor of the campus, except, the approval of new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, regardless of campus of origin, will first be referred by the President to the Faculty Senate for coordinated review by all three campuses. Graduate degree proposals, regardless of campus of origin, are already reviewed by the Graduate School before being referred for Presidential and Board of Regents approval.]

Olswang said that Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden wrote to the president informing him that no comments had been received on the original version of the Executive Order that had been read in its entirety both at a Senate Executive Committee meeting and at a Faculty Senate meeting. No comments asking for revisions or changes were voiced at those meetings; thus it was assumed that the faculty representatives attending those meetings had no further changes to recommend in the Executive Order.

Olswang pointed out that all graduate degree programs are already coordinated through the Graduate School. Approval of any new baccalaureate degree program or certificate program proposed by UW Bothell or UW Tacoma would be deferred by the president until an appropriate council or committee directed by the Faculty Senate chair had an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal. That faculty council has been the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, whose Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) reviews new and revised programs on the Seattle campus and then approves them or sends them back to the home department or other unit for revision and resubmission. Olswang stressed that, just as UW Bothell and UW Tacoma degree programs would be reviewed in this manner, so UW Seattle degree programs would be made known to UW Bothell and UW Tacoma for their consideration and suggestions.

“This council’s work of two years is now in effect,” said Olswang. He added that the new Milgard School of Business at UW Tacoma will be presented to the Board of Regents for recognition as a University collegiate level unit headed by a dean. “It’s all fallen into place,” he said.

Various council members raised questions or concerns about the President’s revisions.

Killien said the Executive Order as worded “represents a change from what came through the council.” She also questioned the assumption that new undergraduate degree programs would be reviewed by FCAS. Olswang said, “The [Faculty] Senate will decide what committee or council the degree program proposals go through. The president’s position is that all three campuses must know when one campus has a new proposal.” Decker reminded the council that “the president *did* commit to this process. We did assent to a three-campus review process of new undergraduate degree programs.”

Wadden said, “At the SEC meeting, I asked President Huntsman if he would clarify his position, and he said that he agreed to defer approval of programs until the Senate had directed an appropriate review process. His objective was to have the programs discussed publicly. I said that the review process must be symmetrical. All three campuses must review a new program. If UW Seattle has a new program, it must show that proposal to UW Tacoma and UW Bothell. The details of this process – including the comment period – must still be worked out.”

Killien reminded the Council that the process of review has been the focus of the council’s work for the past two years, including the current task force, and agreed that it is important that the coordination and communication process be clarified. Olswang said, “That must be worked out in the Faculty Senate. That must be a conversation at the Senate level. *This* is about the president’s commitment to a three-campus review process. This is a statement of principle.” Olswang informed the council that the work on the Executive Order had to be completed as the president was leaving the country on business. “We had to get this done; it was in part a time issue.”

Plumb said, “It seems this came in after the fact. People didn’t have a chance to comment.” Olswang said, “The president *did* make a public statement. We can’t always have a 45-day comment period after every change.” Wadden read from the SEC minutes to which he had referred earlier. The president’s pledge was included in the section he read. Wadden stressed that he repeated this reading at the subsequent Faculty Senate Meeting. Olswang reminded the council: “The president issues the final order after considering comments sent to him during the comment period. But, as the name implies, it *is* an *Executive Order*. The president considers changes suggested to him; but he does not always agree with those suggestions.” Olswang asked Plumb: “What’s the *real* issue that you have?” Plumb responded: “*Process* is the real issue. There *would* have been different comments on this Executive Order.” Olswang said, “The president meant no ambiguity. But at this point, it’s moving forward.” Killien expressed the belief that it is important to be sensitive to these concerns about process in the future.” Olswang replied, “I’m in a different box on this. The president *did* make a public statement, which was in two forums: the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate.”

Update from Task Force on Curriculum Coordination

Killien said the Task Force on Curriculum Coordination – composed of Janet Primomo, Marcia Killien, Linda Watts and Carolyn Plumb, and chaired by Primomo – developed a draft of a “Proposed Faculty Review and Approval Processes for Curriculum.” She said this is “a substantive process of curriculum coordination.” The draft was distributed to the council.

Primomo noted that the draft is “a departure from the initial document of the last FCTCP meeting.” She said, “We looked at these [approval processes] by level of review, and worked from what we think of as the current process of curriculum review.” Killien said, “Our goals for all campuses are: 1) communication and coordination; 2) quality assurance; and 3) consideration of allocation of scarce resources.

Primomo said the process would begin with the Sponsoring Unit, which could be a department or a smaller unit. This is one level of faculty approval. The process would then proceed to the College or School level

(Program at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma). The third level would be that of the Campus (the Executive Committee of the General Faculty Organization at UW Bothell; the Faculty Assembly subcommittee at UW Tacoma; and the FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP). The final level *for courses* is that of the University, and the University Curriculum Review Subcommittee (Tim Washburn and administrative representation from UW Bothell, UW Seattle, and UW Tacoma).

“We wanted to note what we’re reviewing *for*, as well,” said Primomo. Killien asked the council for feedback. “Is this the review process as *you* see it?” Olswang said, “In the empty bottom-right-hand box, at the University level for degree programs, etc., you would have the Senate recommendation to the president.” Wadden said: “What happens now is that, when issues come to FCAS, proposals are sometimes referred to deans if there is an overlapping program. That sometimes happens now. This is not a *linear* process. The advising staff play a significant role. There is a lack of symmetry in language in this draft. You should rethink the draft in terms of symmetry of review.”

Stein said, “There is a difference between issues that arise between overlapping programs on the same campus and those that arise between overlapping programs at different campuses.” Decker said, “The Curriculum Review Committee *does* send material out for further review or for informational purposes.” Killien said, “What is needed here is more on the consultative part. That needs to be explicitly acknowledged in this document. But are there *different* things being reviewed on different campuses?”

Wadden said, “It would be more effective if the expectations [in the review process at all campuses] were more symmetrical. And clarifying *intentions* would be more effective as well.” Plumb said, “We need to have safeguards for potential overlaps in new programs.” Stein, however, observed that “overlap is not *necessarily* bad. We need to realize when it’s appropriate [for overlap to occur].” Decker said, “*I’m* not aware of when we’ve gone ahead with a new program *without* consulting the other campuses.” Olswang said, “If there’s going to be growth, it will be at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell; that communication link – FCTCP or whomever – needs to be in place.” Primomo said, “My concern is minimizing review by faculty at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell of all UW Seattle programs. We don’t have the time.” Heath cautioned: “But being *aware* is important.”

Wadden asked, “Is the early stage [in the review process] the best stage for *sharing*? It would be better to go through the first few stages, and *then* send the proposal to FCAS for review.” Decker observed: “Informal review work by faculty is distinct from the formal part of the process.” Killien pointed out that “the task force is concerned to encourage the practices that enhance *trust* among the campuses, and doing it in a way that doesn’t bog us down.” Plumb noted that “of course the campuses *do not* have exactly parallel processes.” Stein concurred: “True.”

Olswang observed that “in reality, UW Seattle *doesn’t* have any veto power. How do we recommend to the Senate leadership the proper reviewing bodies and process?” Decker said, “It will be good for all three campuses to *clarify* this whole process. We need to take time for this process.”

Killien asked council members to “look at this document [the 1/28/04 revised Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy: Proposed Faculty Review and Approval Processes for Curriculum] and send comments to Janet Primomo (jprimomo@u.washington.edu).” Olswang said, “We’d *like* to see a proposal come back to FCTCP that will show how this process will work.”

Wadden said, “FCAS should also look at this. The Senate can be a mechanism to facilitate this process. It needs people who are thinking about these issues, and groups *outside* faculty bodies.” Killien said, “UW Bothell and UW Tacoma faculty bodies should also look at this, if FCAS will be looking at it.” Wadden said, “Yes, they should; and now that we can communicate electronically and send information quickly, various groups should be able to work effectively in this kind of process.” Killien said, “The task force will work on this.”

President’s Tri-Campus Task Force

Wadden said, "Ross [Heath, Faculty Senate Vice Chair] and I have been considering since September 2003 what the best way is to respond to the Accreditation Report. A President's Tri-Campus Task Force was developed to respond as expeditiously as possible. The new president will need a solid appraisal of the three campuses. Certain questions will have to be answered. What are the objectives at UW Tacoma with the departure of Chancellor Vicky Carwein? I presented to the president a Steering Committee of people from all campuses. Former Dean of Undergraduate Education Fred Campbell is chair of the Steering Committee. [Ross Heath is Vice Chair. GFO Vice Chair Linda Watts from UW Bothell, former FCTCP Chair Jack Meszaros of UW Bothell, Charles Emler of UW Tacoma, Belinda Louie of UW Tacoma, Sue Hegyvary of UW Seattle, Susan Jeffords of UW Seattle, and Wadden are also on the Steering Committee.]

Wadden distributed a preamble he prepared for the Board of Regents: "Presidential Task Force to Evaluate Future Options for the Three Campuses of the UW ("Tri-Campus Task Force")." He told the council that the Task Force's work will require the president's approval. Wadden said President Huntsman asked about a timetable for the Task Force's response. Huntsman suggested the Steering Committee get the provost's approval. Wadden announced and presented the project at the January meeting of the Board of Regents. Both the president and the Board of Regents signed off on the project.

"We will work in March and April," Wadden said. "Then we'll meet late in Spring. We'll work on issues raised by Task Force subcommittees. There will be a group of Task Force members formed to identify options, and to assess them." Heath said, "That's the key: the assessment."

Decker said, "The main topic in this discussion is: What is the appropriate direction of the three-campus University?" Heath concurred: "That's the important point. Then [with options identified and with the direction of the three-campus University better understood], groups like FCTCP can have more coherent conversation." Olswang asked about the timeline for appointing the Steering Committee. Wadden said, "By the time of the Regents meeting in February. A couple of Steering Committee meetings should clarify things, and clarify what has to happen. There will probably be about 35 people in the Task Force." Heath said, "There will be a two-hour meeting of the Task Force at the retreat; then the Task Force will form subcommittees [for specifically-targeted discussions]."

Decker asked how the possible rearrangement of UW Bothell would affect these discussions. Wadden said the bill in Olympia [calling for the dissolution of UW Bothell and the creation of a four-year institution to be named Cascadia State University] has been totally rewritten. Heath noted that the bill may be turned into a "study bill." The emphasis has shifted to calling for UW Bothell to be transformed into a four-year institution.

Killien said, "I called Doug Wadden to get clarification on the relationship between the Presidential Task Force and the work of FCTCP." Heath said, "I would expect FCTCP members to be on the Task Force." Killien said, "Jack Meszaros and Linda Watts are on the Steering Committee; that's good. It will be a significant example of linkage and continuity if FCTCP members are included on the Task Force. Lack of communication *can* be an issue. The revelation of the Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force was indeed surprising." Killien said, "I hope FCTCP can help the President's Task Force. Our members have already done considerable work on various issues. We're a faculty council, and the faculty role in these discussions is important."

Wadden said, "I went on 45 interviews across all three campuses. I took the temperature of lots of people. So this wasn't hatched in a vacuum." Killien said, "We're delighted that there is *attention* being paid to tri-campus issues." Wadden said, "We need to have this conversation. *You* can greatly contribute. You can put together a list of names that you recommend for the Task Force." Decker suggested that "it would be good if Marcia Killien were involved, in her role as chair of FCTCP."

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, March 1, 2004, at 9:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor, Recorder

