

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY
Friday, January 15, 2010, 3:30 p.m.
26 Gerberding Hall

Chair Steve Collins called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

Meeting Synopsis

1. Approval of minutes from December 15, 2009.
2. Report from FCTCP Work Group on Tri-Campus Relations: Final reading for discussion and action.
3. Updates on FCTCP ongoing activities:
 - a. Schools and Colleges: Status of discussion and role FCTCP should be taking, if any;
 - b. Evaluation of Tri-Campus Evaluation Policy;
 - c. Residency Requirement for Distance Learning.
4. Updates on Senate and Administrative Issues
 - a. Senate
 - b. Administration

-
1. Approval of minutes from December 15, 2009.

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Report from FCTCP Work Group on Tri-Campus Relations: Final reading for discussion and action.

A motion was made and seconded for the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy to accept the report of the Work Group.

Professional Staff Organization ex officio member Rebecca Deardorff recommended a change in the language concerning distance technology communication support.

Presidential Designee Doug Wadden asked for clarification on the recommendation about the Tri-Campus policy committee and its relation to other Tri-Campus bodies. UW Seattle Senate Vice Chair JW responded by noting that business that comes before FCTCP very often deals with issues outside the Council's scope, for example, being asked to comment on the current proposal to restructure the Faculty Senate. He posed the following questions: Should FCTCP morph into a University committee? If a University committee were established, would FCTCP remain? Deardorff offered examples of topics that sometimes fall between cracks among the three campuses. These might range from issues related to animal facilities to policies concerning smoking. These go beyond issues that normally would be considered "faculty issues." But there are no other forums for these and other issues. Rule making often involves stakeholders outside university and with three campuses, this makes addressing policies challenging.

Wadden raised a concern about creating more groups than are needed. Primomo noted that there currently is no body that has all key players (students, staff, faculty, and administration, across all three campuses together. The creation of such a body is outside scope of FCTCP, but this council could make the recommendation. Wadden suggested that perhaps there could be such a group that meets quarterly. Other questions came up about who would determine whether an issue is a campus issue or a university-wide issue – and whether this would be a policy group, advisory group, or a triage group.

The discussion then turned to how such a committee would be staffed. FCTCP member Janet Primomo suggested this might be someone charged with leadership, support, and coordination of the committee. Harrington suggested this could also be someone who would track and move issues forward that have often stalled for lack of staff support. Wadden asked what kind of position this would be. What would the position title be, and to whom would this position report? Where would accountability and authority for this position lie? Primomo suggested that this position could be funded in part by all three campuses. A question was raised as to who is currently handling and coordinating accreditation. This might be a clue as to where this new position might fit. Harrington cautioned that there is concern across the state about the rate of growth of administrative staff as compared to the rate of growth of faculty.

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien asked what are the barriers to moving forward with this after twenty years? Does the administration perceive a need to change the current state of the university organization? Harrington suggested there may be advantages to not pinning down a structure, especially on smaller campuses. Primomo

added that problems generally target the specific groups on campuses: faculty, students, staff. For example, cross campus enrollment becomes an issue for advisors/staff and students. Bruce Kochis, Vice Chair, General Faculty Organization of UWB, noted that transfer limits by the Seattle campus may have a significant impact for UWT and UWB but they were not involved in the decision. Harrington added that there is currently a bill under consideration would allow Regents to have differential tuition at different campuses. He also suggested that perhaps a list of challenges would be useful to include in the report.

Killien asked the Council what it would expect to achieve by sending the report to the Senate Executive Committee. Would it be sent as educational information – or with a request for support through a Class C recommendation that would be sent from the Senate to all voting faculty?

Collins asked if there would be value to convening all three faculty bodies to discuss this report, prior to presenting it to administration? Killien suggested that FCTCP could ask Senate chair to present report to the administrative group and invite that group, along with staff and students (a smaller group) to meet. Harrington caution that the meeting be structured so as not to waste time. The goals and objectives of the meeting should be clear at the outset. Kochis suggested a list of shared issues that could lead to the goals and objectives. The Councils then came up with the following issues that might serve the purpose:

- Schools/colleges
- Distance learning and residency requirement
- Research administration: animal care issues
- Libraries (works well—why? One administration)
- Technology/Catalyst/Blackboard
- Mobility among campuses: transportation, communication
- Resource sharing/coordination (degrees, records-transcript, diploma)
- Accreditation response

A motion was made and seconded to table the motion. The motion was passed.

This was followed by further discussion about the revision of the report with the possible addition of issues on which FCTCP wants a response or additional information.

3. Updates on FCTCP ongoing activities.

- a. Schools and Colleges: Status of discussion and role FCTCP should be taking, if any.

Discussion deferred.

- b. Evaluation of Undergraduate Cross-Campus Enrollment

Primomo distributed a brief report.

- c. Residency Requirement for Distance Learning

Killien reported on the residency requirement for graduation. She will contact John Schaufelberger, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to discuss the history of that issue. She noted that the recent Class B legislation does not include this part of Chapter 14 of the *University Handbook*.

4. Updates on Senate and Administrative Issues

- a. Senate (Harrington)

Harrington briefly updated the Council on the faculty salary policy and Executive Order 64 and the proposal to restructure the Faculty Senate.

- b. Ad Hoc Tri-Campus Administrative Group (Rushing, Jeffords, Wadden)

There was a discussion on which of the above would be the “hot-topic/show-stopper” issues. The Council asked if the ad hoc tri-campus administrative group is working on these issues and expressed a need for a progress report next time.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Minutes by Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty, secfac@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Collins (Chair), Primomo
 President's Designee: Wadden
 Ex Officio Representatives: Lazzari (by phone), Meske, Deardorff, Corbett, Harrington, Kochis

Absent: Faculty: Wood, Edicott-Popovsky, Stein
 President's Designees: Jeffords, Rushing
 Ex Officio Representatives: Lord, Fridley