

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, **December 8, 2003**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Marcia Killien presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** Killien (chair), Anderson, Primomo and Stein;  
                  **Ex officio members** Cameron, Decker, Heath, James and Watts;  
                  **Guests** Carolyn Plumb, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards; Doug Wadden,  
                  Chair, Faculty Senate; and Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty; Sharon Fought,  
                  Associate Dean of Assessment and Planning and Associate Professor, Chancellor's  
                  Office, UW, Tacoma (for Jack Nelson).

**ABSENT:**     **Professor** Behler and Leppa;  
                  **Ex officio members** Campbell, D'Costa, Fugate, Nelson, Olswang and Stygall.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the November 3, 2003 meeting were approved as written.

**Executive Order Tri-Campus Legislation – Marcia Killien**

Killien said that, after the last FCTCP meeting on November 3<sup>rd</sup>, the Executive Order Tri-Campus Legislation was widely circulated and taken to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). There was "not a lot of discussion at SEC," said Killien. Vice Provost Steven Olswang presented the Executive Order Legislation at the Faculty Senate Meeting on December 4<sup>th</sup>. Killien attended the meeting.

A faculty member from UW, Tacoma asked Olswang how it was that he and his colleagues at the Tacoma campus had not heard of the legislation. Olswang said the proposed Executive Order legislation was circulated to the appropriate people at UW, Tacoma and UW, Bothell, and that those people should have distributed the legislation to faculty at their respective campuses. Olswang said, "This symbolizes the ongoing need on all campuses to communicate better." Killien said the faculty member "was not alarmed." He simply was surprised. She said, "It would be good to have the Executive Order legislation discussed in two bodies."

Faculty Senate Vice Chair Ross Heath said, "There wasn't any comment on the substance of the Executive Order." Olswang said, "This is only a transition [the Executive Order]; it is not meant to be permanent." Heath said, regarding the description of the titles, "The chief academic officer is the provost, but that wasn't mentioned. All program changes would go through the 45-60 day comment period at all three campuses. Sharing information is key."

Primomo said, "The chief academic officer of the whole University is the provost, but the chancellor can be the chief academic officer at UW, Tacoma." Decker said, "This will devolve to be the vice-chancellor." Killien said, "The language [in the Executive Order] specifies very little. The three campuses may develop their own organizational structures. The checking [process] as each campus develops will be crucial." Decker suggested that "greater clarity will come from the next half-year or so."

Wadden said, "This [document] is about how things are now: *not* about how they'll be permanently." Heath said, "The time has come to look at this: to come to grips with where we're going in the long term. Hopefully, the next six months will develop three or four options for the new president." Killien said, "My concern is that this council isn't always the first to know about these issues." Wadden said, "FCTCP has done much on this. But the Seattle campus knows nothing about it: upsides or downsides. So we are still saying: The Faculty Senate is the senate for the University."

"Hopefully," said Killien, "FCTCP's work won't be wasted. It's now been mentioned [the Executive Order]. It's out there. It will become official after the first of the new year."

## Curriculum coordination issues across the three campuses

Killien said, “We want to look at how to move this issue forward on all three campuses. We want to observe what’s working and not working.” Wadden asked: “What is the vision? The plan? This document [“Proposed Faculty Review and Approval Processes for new undergraduate degrees, majors, options, concentrations, minors (and certificates) and substantive changes to same”] is about process. But what is the ambition of all this? The growth plan has to come before the management plan. What do we want to *be*? The HEC Board has concerns as well.”

As regards the document, “Some Initial Observations on Tri-campus Issues Facing the University...On Academic Programs...On Mission and Structure,” Wadden said: “The president read my comments and modified them. This [document distributed to the council] is verbatim what I said to the president and to the Faculty Senate.” Wadden stressed: “Vision is the key. Are we trying to transform the Office of the President, however unwittingly? It’s a genuine concern: What would happen if we change ‘chancellor’ and other structural factors?”

FCAS Chair Carolyn Plumb said, “I agree that it’s premature to define the systems view, but what we tried to do last year [in FCTCP] is important: It’s about better communication across the three campuses. This should be part of *any* discussion, however large.” Killien said, “*If* we had this process in place, would it have clarified the issue [of curriculum coordination across the three campuses]?” Decker said, “The confusion was rooted in misunderstanding. Two undergraduate minors weren’t shared or discussed with anyone. They went to [Dean of Undergraduate Education] George Bridges, who signed off on them.”

Killien said, “Let’s look at this document, then look at a more formalized way of making this a template.” Wadden said, “This was shelved. There wouldn’t have been an Executive Order if this weren’t shelved.” Plumb noted that Robert Corbett [Coordinator of New Programs in the Office of the Provost] said that a two-year list [of programs being considered across the three campuses] could be published. Decker said, “There is a three-year time limit on proposed new programs: If you don’t move from the pre-proposal stage to implementation in three years, the program [proposal] is dropped.” Plumb added: “So there is a lot of time in which to comment [on proposed new programs].”

Wadden said, “It would be more effective if the document were written in neutral language, and were symmetrical. As it is now, it is very asymmetrical. It would be very helpful if it *were* symmetrical.” Plumb said, “There *were* issues with parallelism. Different campuses do somewhat different things. All three campuses have resources mentioned.” Killien asked Wadden if the principles should be addressed first, and then the specifics for the three campuses. Wadden replied, “The statement should suggest what’s important for the whole University.”

Primomo said, “In reality, we’re back to the big question: Should people just *know*, and then respond if they want?” Wadden said, “It’s not just communication, but coordination.” Killien said, “There are some things that may change, but we could – with editing – do something with this document.” Primomo said, “It would be good to have a document to look at. Sometimes, faculty are mystified by what they’re supposed to be doing.” Plumb said, “We were very focused on process; we could add *to* this document.” Wadden said, “We need to respond to the accreditation report. We need a clear set of operating principles.” Heath said, “Page four of the document would change quite a bit, and page three could be polished up.”

Decker said, “People will be in the habit of communicating, with a clear document.” Stein said, “It would also make it easier for faculty to understand and carry out their process [of curriculum coordination].” Decker said, “It would help assure that all faculty strengthen faculty governance on curriculum issues and process.” Sharon Fought [Associate Dean of Assessment and Planning; UW, Tacoma] asked, “Would there be flexibility enough?” Heath said, “If UW, Bothell has the opportunity, say, then a proposal would go from its chancellor to the president, followed by a 45-day comment period. That’s the process on all three campuses.” Fought said, “*My* question is: Would we have to post [new degrees or programs] every year?”

Wadden said, "We need to think of a larger plan of assessment. Is the Graduate School different? For FCTCP, it's best to be concerned with institutional issues: differential tuition, and a larger sense of policy and planning." Plumb reminded the council that "last year, Jacqueline Meszaros [then chair of the council] and the rest of us focused predominantly on the undergraduate level." Killien observed that "coming up are post-baccalaureate programs that do not go through the Graduate School, such as professional and clinical degree programs. Including the Graduate School process in the document would add clarity." It was agreed that the Graduate School process could be appended to the document. Decker pointed out that "at the graduate level, people have done a better job of communication in this process. The *habit* is there of cooperating across colleges, etc." Heath added that "boundaries are more permeable at the graduate level." Killien said, "We would want to highlight a best practices approach, instead of displaying a punitive attitude."

Asking once more "how to move forward," Killien said, "We should tune this up and come up with a document that will strengthen the faculty's knowledge of their role in the curriculum process, and educate faculty about the differences in the three campuses."

Killien asked for council volunteers on a "working group." Janet Primomo, Carolyn Plumb and Linda Watts volunteered to work with Killien in the working group.

Decker asked, "Do we need a more informal mechanism for people to confer in the interim period [preceding the new president]? If a faculty member has an idea for a program, where should he or she look, and whom should he or she contact?" Wadden said, "People like Tim Washburn [Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Services] need to be consulted." Plumb said, "Robert Corbett puts the list together for the HEC Board. He knows what's coming down the pike." Cameron said, "We're talking about faculty communication, but Robert Corbett and Tim Washburn aren't faculty. People would need to go to faculty as well. In *University Week*, there is dedicated space for the Faculty Senate. You could perhaps put something there." Decker said, "It has to be an issue across the three campuses." Killien said, "I'm doing an article for *University Week* on this campus; I could talk about this issue in that article." Primomo said, "Faculty need to be reminded of their rights and responsibilities regarding faculty governance."

Killien asked if there were other issues the council wished to focus on in Winter Quarter 2004. The suggestion was made to have Marsha Landolt [Dean of the Graduate School] visit the council." Wadden said, "It would be good to have a document from FCTCP in which the new President could see a larger view, and not just a curriculum view. It would be good to have a fresh document for him or her to look at."

Killien said, "Jacqueline Meszaros wrote a document for that purpose; we could prepare that document."

### **Next meeting**

The FCTCP Winter Quarter schedule is being determined. Once it is set, it will be sent to the council.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder