

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., January 24, 2013
26 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
 - 2) Review and Approval of November 29, 2012 Minutes (see attached)
 - 3) FCTCP Review Process & Strategic Planning for new (and on-line) degrees (Marcia Killien/Robert Corbett/George Dillon)
 - 4) Tri-campus Governance –Models and planning strategies (discussion)
 - a. Tri-campus governance retreat planning
 - b. AAUP guidance and information
 - 5) Differential salary adjustments based on departmental peer institutions (discussion)
 - 6) Update on Common Application
 - 7) Agenda formation for next meeting
 - 8) Adjourn
-

1. Call to Order

Council Chair Bill Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

2. FCTCP Review Process & Strategic Planning for new (and on-line) degrees (Marcia Killien/Robert Corbett/George Dillon)

Erdly introduced the subject of process of Tri-Campus Review process, and the checklist used for this process. Questions were posed on the review process within UW Tacoma, have yet to respond to questions. After the comments are gathered, a FCTCP subcommittee reviews the comments to ensure that they are addressed. Two concerns:

- Timeliness: Need to allow programs enough time to adjust program proposal, whereas currently it is too late to change programs generally.
- With the quantity of degrees,
- It would be good to have standards for the Bothell and Tacoma campuses.

George Dillon, Chair of FCAS, described FCAS' guidelines, which are online. Are currently considering adding a guideline to distinguish between a Bachelor of Arts and a Bachelor of Sciences. The Tri-Campus Review process was characterized as simply confirming that responses are given to comments gathered. Killien was Chair of FCTCP when this process passed. She requested to know whether the process is effective or needed at this point. Originally, it was developed as Tacoma and Bothell campuses were beginning, in hopes to coordinate informational exchange between the campuses. The goal of this process is communication, not policing or planning. Historically, should responses not be appropriate, the Provost would be involved with this, to ensure collegial discussion occurred.

Killien noted that she heard concerns that this process has become a "rubber stamp" process, and potentially other mechanisms could be utilized. Is this process the correct process?

Technically, FCAS' policy should be universal, but informal agreement/practice were to allow Bothell and Tacoma their own policies.

It was suggested that this communication process was still important within the Tri-Campus Review. Erdly expressed concern that issues are raised at the end of the process, and it is often too late to deal with this process. UW Tacoma has revised the process for handling the degree proposals for graduate program proposals. Corbett emphasized that the Tri-Campus Review process was useful for the HEC Board; perhaps the undergraduate process could be modeled after the graduate process, while still focusing on keeping this “conversational”. It was suggested that making such a process administrative may risk removing the power of the faculty.

A requirement to spend time thinking about such incoming degrees; need to ensure considerations of planning and budgeting, what kinds of faculty are affected by such a proposal, and impacts across the three campuses. Many programs being proposed are self-sustaining programs, and thus there is even greater amount of pressure to review these and move these forward.

Harrington suggested that UW is moving towards, after a tri-campus administrative retreat, an idea that the faculty on each campus, and administration on each campus, design their own programs and courses. UW Curricula Committee will exist, but as a administrative committee, to verify credit counts and standardization of course descriptions. He suggested for this to happen at a campus level, gathering feedback at that level, FCAS and the two other campus committees, should be aware of the need for earlier discussion and responses. Tri-Campus review process, specifically, does not exist in the Code, but there is a responsibility for the administrators of the campuses to coordinate such programs.

Killien noted that campuses are more autonomous, and should a process be built to establish such a process at a campus level, following at a University-level. It was emphasized that

FCAS’ perspective is the process is fairly quickly, turned around within roughly two weeks. However this process occurs late, with an example of the Integrated Science degree, to actually implement changes within such programs. Dillon advocated that this process speeds up, and he will bring up this at FCAS tomorrow. Perhaps coordinating this review with FCTCP?

Killien emphasized that the interest is in having this as communication. With the Graduate School the process was described. 10 day review within the graduate school, should a proposal come from Bothell, similarly in sharing information. UW Tacoma is working on a similar process. Undergraduate degree is working on a different process, due to the removal of the HEC Board.

- 1) Current
- 2) Graduate school model
- 3) Or third option, bring to FCTCP

Corbett noted that Anderson and he are aware of such items early within the process. Could the same process be performed, with the registrar, sending out a notice of intent earlier and to all faculty? Is the goal of the process communication or approval? This would cause processes to be different. Negative comments are perhaps best resolved at an administrative level, as faculty have autonomy to develop anything that they may recommend. Administration has the final “sign-off.” What would happen when programs are considered being developed, which already exists at other campuses? What are the restrictions? What about helping to improve collaboration across the three campuses?

Suggestions were made for earlier notification of faculty to improve such communication; unsure when the notice of intent would go out; at first conception, at formalization of how many credits this would be, or otherwise? From the experience of students, who would like to take courses on other UW campuses, what can be done to improve this? Proposed degrees are specialized degrees largely, not

general degrees, and students ... How much detail goes into notice of intents, these are about 2-3 page proposals, description of program, (40?) draft of resource analysis. Would go to faculty committee before heading to the graduate school, and faculty interested are requested to become involved at this point. External input can be gathered at two different points. Documentations is gathered at each step, and confirmed prior to approval. It was requested to have this process for the FCTCP's continuation.

Seattle is different than Bothell and Tacoma; 17 degree granting entities; this happens at UW Seattle within academic units. FCAS is at a "higher level" of reviewing such processes. Are working to gather information similar to what the HEC Board required; but questions remain on the time frame and who would sign off on these proposals.

Erdly suggested that as a process is being evaluated, possible process options (at UW Seattle and Bothell) will be considered by FCTCP, not for an approval process, rather for a communication perspective. A working group could be formed to look at potential ; Erdly, Reusch, Lerum, Ginger MacDonald? Corbett should coordinate this, and would include FCAS, and potentially someone within the Provost's office, on Undergraduate program approval at a Tri-Campus level. Also may be important to convey this information to Washington State Legislators?

3. Tri-campus Governance –Models and planning strategies (discussion)

a. Tri-campus governance retreat planning

FCTCP had considered a gathering of the faculty governance across each of the three campuses. This would convene, with all representation to form a discussion of faculty related issues. Faculty Governance representatives expressed support for this idea. will coordinate, and pull together an agenda for this meeting. An administrative meeting had taken place in the past, however a long time ago; no follow up occurred after that. Chair, Vice-Chair, and two committee chairs from each campus, perhaps FCTCP levels, elected faculty councils? Killien noted that there is no financial resources available for such a meeting. She suggested to form goals, questions? Is this about governance structures? Perhaps 12 individuals? Only resource requirement would be space and someone to.

Leadership from the three campuses, will determine who will be attending, Erdly and Freistadt will coordinate the meeting/location. Hope to have this retreat before the end of winter quarter.

b. AAUP guidance and information

Erdly opened discussion on multi-campus governance structures, and the question fell who could describe this. Dan Jacobi, if either he is able to speak to this, or knows of someone who could discuss this. FCTCP could compose a "state of the University" report after considering the structure. Harrington noted that a graduate school assistant that Doug Wadden had brought on, which provided multi-campus structures in comparison. Reusch has this, and will forward this to the Council. (JAY REMIND) Jack Lee offered to reach out to Dan Jacobi.

4. Differential salary adjustments based on departmental peer institutions (discussion)

This discussion was opened on campus differences, in comparing peer institutions for salaries. Jack Lee, who is serving on the Salary Policy working group, noted that this is not being considered within these discussions. A subcommittee may be drafted to write code, and this may be considered. Currently looking at structures for raises, but not peer comparison.

Kucher noted that UW Tacoma faculty had been informed that it was needed to determine a different peer institutions, rather than UW Seattle, rural institutions with low-costs of living had been offered as potential comparison. UW Tacoma is seeking to identify urban peer institutions to use in comparison, differing by department, rather than comparing institutions completely. Initially, starting salaries were

adjusted, but this does not address the current environment with no adjustments for existing faculty. How to use peer institutions, for salary and broadly?

Killien noted where peer institutions should be considered:

- a) Promotion and tenure, when getting external reviews, who are the peers to appropriately (individual)
- b) Peer review of programs, external reviews such as being done by the graduate school (degree related)
- c) Market gap considerations on salary policies, unit adjustments

Regents had earlier discussed bringing UW up to a particular level of peers, in terms of salary. If any unit, school or program, if you were to make an argument for a unit adjustment, who would you compare to? An unofficial list could be discussed between administration and faculty. Is peer comparison, at a unit level; who are you likely to lose faculty to? Retention offers may provide this information. Every time UW hires a second or third choice, where did the first or second choice go? Harrington emphasized the need to form such a list, in order to have ideas of who to compare to; this may be program-specific, and currently this is only crucial if need to allocate unit adjustments. Lee noted that there will probably be an opportunity to authorize unit adjustments with ABB localized funds.

The need for each campus to “define” itself, to get these identities, which will influence such discussions. UW Tacoma were concerned about the change of the status quo, unilaterally. One suggestion was made that these salaries could be adjusted to a cost of living. This was considered a worthy question to consider: ‘who do you think you are and why?’ Some comparisons are actually within industry or practice, such as technology fields or medical fields. Faculty Code, for “unit adjustments is to identify the market gap of an individual unit, allocation shall go to units, with consultation from the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting.” What the faculty is being told is that you can’t use the University for salary comparisons? Does SCPB have say in unit adjustments? UW Tacoma is not a single unit, but multiple ones. This is a current issue through the SEC, this will be clarified soon.

5. Review and Approval of November 29, 2012 Minutes

Minutes from the November 29, 2012 meeting were approved as written.

6. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 10:30 a.m. by Chair Bill Erdly.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Dolšak, Roesch, Kucher
 President’s Designee: Harrington
 Ex-Officio Reps: Leadley, Lee, Sugarman, Lerum, Purdy,
 Guests: Annette Anderson, Robert Corbett, Marcia Killien, George Dillon

Absent: **Faculty:** Endicott-Popovsky, Crowder
 President’s Designee: Wadden, Jeffords
 Ex Officio Rep: Fridley, Deardorff, Elise Randall