

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY

January 5, 2007
142 Gerberding Hall

Chair Marcia Killien called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of minutes and Chair's update.
 2. Discussion of proposed legislation related to *Handbook* changes.
 3. Cross campus enrollment (Tom Bellamy).
-

1. Approval of the minutes and Chair's update

Because minutes of the December 8, 2006, meeting were distributed only one day before the January meeting, review and approval was deferred until the February meeting. Discussion of the level of detail recorded in the minutes led to the recommendation by Chair Killien that the minutes continue to record generally the same level of detail and that more detailed notes should be kept individually by members at their discretion.

Killien reported that all the program proposals the Council had reviewed over the past two meetings had been sent to the registrar within a few days of the December 8 meeting. Alan Wood will report on HEC Board action on these programs at the February meeting.

2. Discussion of proposed legislation related to *Handbook* changes.

The FCTCP task force that was asked to draft legislation for Handbook changes produced a proposal that will be taken up by the Council in two parts. The first part deals with Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 23, Sections 23-23 (Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments: Definitions) and 23-45 (Campus, College and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure). The second part, dealing with Sections 42-31 (The Faculty Councils), and 42-46 (Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy) will be addressed at subsequent FCTCP meetings.

Based on the Task Force's work, Chair Killien drafted a version in collaboration with Secretary of the Faculty Donna Kerr and Faculty Senate Chair Gail Stygall. Gail Stygall addressed the Council and supported the decision to move forward with only the first part of proposed legislative changes at this time. The second part will be far more complicated and controversial, and the content of the first part is a much more appropriate way to open a discussion that will be on-going for quite some time (including issues raised by the second part of the proposed legislation). She also cautioned that although she supports proposed changes to Sections 23-23 and 23-45, she is not certain of its success. She has briefed the President about the content of the legislation, its rationale and its timeliness, and he has not expressed objections at this point, but it should be clear that this legislation will have far-reaching ramifications and will eventually touch many, many other areas of the Handbook.

Killien acknowledged that ambiguity of policy and procedures can lend desirable flexibility in some cases, but in the case of the Tacoma and Bothell campuses the cost benefit of ambiguity has shifted and the costs have begun to take their toll. She noted that one of the largest challenges they

face is that there seems to be no organizational structure for the University distinctly apart from the organization structure of the Seattle campus. Sorting that out will be extremely complicated.

Stygall reported that she had sent a copy of the most recent draft of the legislation under consideration to the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations for their preliminary, informal review. Formal review takes place at the second reading of the legislation.

Discussion of Section 23-23 revealed how many “snow-ball” effects can be generated by this kind of legislation. For example, a question was raised about the Milgard School and whether that should be listed among the schools listed in another section of the Handbook. (Ultimately that suggestion was dropped because schools under campuses operate differently from some of the schools on the Seattle campus.)

Council member Collins, who had worked on the initial draft of the legislation, reported that one of his intentions was to confirm a sense of the legitimacy of the Tacoma and Bothell campuses by defining their legal and official standing. He said there seemed to be some reluctance by University administration to identify the campuses as legal/official entities.

Killien said that she would mention the fact that there are no clear definitions for schools and colleges in the Code to the members of the Senate Executive Committee next Monday. This may need to be brought to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs for their consideration of a possible Handbook change.

At this point, however, most of what’s currently being considered simply codifies current practice.

Faculty tenure and flexibility to move between campuses should ultimately be addressed, and Chapter 24 will require some changes, but the legislation under consideration now should be simple and straight-forward enough to serve as a significant change – AND to open discussions that will ultimately lead to other changes further down the road.

A motion was made by David Lovell, and seconded by Steven Collins, to amend the legislation under consideration as follows:

Proposed Handbook Changes to Clarify the Definition of a Campus and Distinguish Campuses from Schools and Colleges

Volume Two, Part II, Chapter 23, Sections 23-23 and 23-45

Section 23-23. Campuses, Colleges, Schools, and Departments: Definitions

For purposes of the University Handbook:

- A. The word “campus” refers only to those listed in Section 23-11A. Campuses shall have the full range of powers and responsibilities required to serve the needs of their students and other stakeholders in accordance with their respective campus missions, including the powers to determine their curricula, academic standards, and admissions policies.

Rationale: No definition of “campus” is given in this section, in spite of its title. The wording here clarifies that the campuses are entities designed to serve different sets of stakeholders in accordance with different mission statements that were established through the Washington State

legislature and prior action of the university faculty. It thus acknowledges a greater degree of institutional complexity and autonomy than that of a school or college. Although this may not be the ideal place to enumerate powers specific to campuses, a "campus" is distinguished from a "college" or "school" in part by the additional functions required to provide seamless, self-contained graduate and undergraduate degree programs that are responsive to a student population largely distinct from that served by other campuses.

- B. The words "college" and "school" refer only to those listed in Section 23-11B.
- C. The word "department" refers to any separately organized unit within a college or school which has been established by the Board of Regents or by the President, to any department-level interdisciplinary unit which has been established by the dean of a college or school, and to any department-level interdisciplinary unit involving two or more schools or colleges which has been established by the Provost.
- D. An academic program is an area of specialization which has one or more of the following characteristics: has program as part of its title; grants a degree or a credential; has a sequence of courses with a common prefix; has been identified as a program by a distinct faculty action. Ordinarily, an academic program shall be smaller than an administrative unit such as a department and larger than the activities of a single faculty member.

Section 23-45. Campus, College, and School Faculties: Authority to Determine Organization and Procedure

- A. Subject to the provisions of Section 23-46, the faculty of each college or school other than the Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure except as stipulated in Subsection B. ~~The organization and rules of procedure of a department may be determined by the department faculty, but shall be subject to review by the appropriate college faculty.~~ The faculty of campuses, schools and colleges shall have the right to review decisions on organization and rules of procedure determined by the faculty of their academic sub-units.
- B. Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall advise the dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and advise the dean on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets. In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each school or college shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations shall review each college's or school's procedure to assure that the councils are established in conformity with the provisions of this section.
- C. The Graduate School shall determine its own organization and rules of procedure. It may directly control its affairs or may delegate to a council, executive committee, or other committees any of its powers, provided that such council or committees shall be representative of the various campuses and fields of graduate study.
- D. The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty governance organization that, in addition to the responsibilities set forth in Sub-section B, also advise their Chancellor and Vice Chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses.

Rationale: *Faculty councils at the UWB and UWT preside over organizations that are more integrated and self-contained than those of schools and colleges. They also serve student populations and other stakeholders different from those served by UWS. This section acknowledges that the "general welfare" of these campuses is not necessarily identical to that of*

UWS, and that it is the responsibility of the elected faculty councils on these campuses to uphold it.

The motion was approved unanimously by the voting members present.

Council member Alan Wood asked for advice from the Council regarding the Tacoma version of the Faculty Code. He discovered recently that it was woefully out of date and had not been updated since shortly after the creation of the campus – and asked that it be removed from the web. The Council advised that despite the fact that there is no staff to update the document, it is the governing document for the campus and should probably be returned to the website with a note to the effect that it will be updated as resources allow.

3. Cross campus enrollment (Tom Bellamy).

Council member Tom Bellamy distributed a handout entitled “Cross Campus Enrollment Policy Recommendations: January 3, 2007” and asked the Council to review it in preparation for discussion at the next Council meeting. One example of a reason for the recommendations is the fact that one cannot currently do consecutive double majors across campus. This should be possible and made less of a hurdle for students.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

Minutes by Susan Folk, Office of Regional Affairs, slfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-221-4183.

Present:

Regular: Harrington, Killien, Collins, Leppa, Neill

Ex-officio: Lovell, Luchtel, Nicoletta, Stiber

President’s Designees: Cauce, Bellamy, Wood

Members of Representative Groups: Corbett, Fleurdelys, Fugate, Weitkamp

Guest: Gail Stygall, Chair, Faculty Senate

Absent:

Regular: Barsness (excused), Stein (excused)

Ex Officio: Stiber

President’s Designees: Cauce (excused)

Members of Representative Groups: Fugate

