

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 8:30 a.m. on Monday, **November 19, 2001**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Coney, Crawford, Goren, Leppa and Schaufelberger;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Kubota, Lou, Nelson, Primomo, Silberstein and Sjavik;
 Guests Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning; and Norman Rose,
 former dean at UW Bothell.

ABSENT: **ex officio members** Ludwig and Olswang.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the October 29, 2001 meeting were approved as amended.

**Discussion of “strategic complementarities” of the University of Washington’s three campuses.
Guests: Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning; and Norman Rose, former dean
at UW Bothell.**

Friedman said the notion of “strategic complementarities” has been a powerful one “in helping us to understand how we grow as a University in distinctive ways,” and in helping all three campuses to better plan academic programs in order to become a better University academically. Strategic complementarities do not work as well as a master concept “on the administrative side,” Friedman noted.

With respect to questions of interdependence and independence at UW Seattle, UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, Friedman said the conception of the three-campus university is unique at the UW. There is no real counterpart anywhere else in the country. (Facets of the University of California multi-campus system are similar, as are facets at other multi-campus universities, but none of them is structurally similar to the University of Washington.)

Friedman said that, at the program level, “people are doing some very interesting things across the three campuses.” She noted that there are many “committed, dynamic faculty” at the Bothell and Tacoma campuses, just as there are at the Seattle campus. “The foundation at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma is strong, with a core of committed faculty and students,” she said.

Asked about the ways in which the three campuses “fit in with the community” as opposed to the ways in which a “one-campus university” fits in with the community, Friedman said, “We’ve made the claim that the UW is an integral part of the future of the state of Washington, economically and culturally.” She said the “community messages” emanating from the three campuses are not “all that distinct,” though naturally the campuses themselves provide different contributions to their own communities. “The most important thing contributed by all three campuses is the same, namely the education of state citizens.”

Norman Rose reviewed the context in which the discussions of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy will be imbedded. The first of these, found in the UW Handbook, Volume 2, Section 22-37 is that “The primary concern of the Senate is the general welfare of the university”. Because this group is a faculty council, one obvious but very important way for it to advance that general welfare is to promote ever improving opportunities for the university’s faculty. Given that UW Seattle is very well established and that the profiles of opportunities for its faculty are similarly well established (though existing now under ominous economic clouds) there may be somewhat less to be done for these faculty than for their colleagues at the new campuses, not yet mature and still quite plastic.

Another important context has to do with the State’s original impetus for creating the branch campuses. In 1989 the state legislature, along with the HEC Board, recognized that Washington State was “woefully behind” where it should be in providing its citizens with opportunities to earn baccalaureate and graduate

degrees in state supported institutions. As quoted below from Chapter 28B.45 of the Revised Code of Washington, wherein the new campuses were authorized, two of the opening paragraphs explicitly set out this impetus. (To see more of this text go to Appendix 1a of the UW's Tri-Campus Advisory Committee's August 1999 Report on the UW's web site at www.washington.edu/reports/TCAC/).

1. *Because most of the state-supported baccalaureate universities are located in areas removed from major metropolitan areas, the legislature finds that many of the state's citizens, especially those citizens residing in the central Puget Sound area, the Tri-Cities, Spokane, Vancouver, and Yakima, have insufficient and inequitable access to upper-division baccalaureate and graduate education.*
2. *This lack of sufficient educational opportunities in urban areas makes it difficult or impossible for placebound individuals, who are unable to relocate, to complete a baccalaureate or graduate degree. It also exacerbates the difficulty financially needy students have in attending school, since many of those students need to work, and work is not always readily available in some communities where the baccalaureate institutions of higher education are located.*

In summary, the branch campuses were(are) intended for citizens living in urban areas who are placebound, timebound, workbound and financially constrained

The first sentence of the institutional Objectives and Roles of the UW's Branch Campuses (below) as stated and approved by the Faculty Senate on January 25, 1990 mirrors the legislature's intent. (To see more of this text go to Appendix 1b of the UW's Tri-Campus Advisory Committee's August 1999 Report on the UW's web site).

Role and Mission of the Branch Campuses of the University
The branch campuses of the University of Washington have been established for the purpose of providing needed educational services for the central Puget Sound region.

The workbound part of the equation for UW Tacoma and UW Bothell students is certainly true. At Bothell, 59% of juniors and seniors work for wages 21 hours or more per week and at UW Tacoma, 56% do, whereas, by contrast, 39% of UW Seattle students work 20 or more hours per week.

Rose said it was an "extraordinary gesture" on the part of the state legislature to take the initiative resulting in five branch campuses for our state and that the basis of the legislature's initiative was sound. Rose said the number of students and alumni at the UW's new campuses "is now in the thousands, and most alumni are still located in this area." He said "hundreds of millions of dollars have been appropriated for new buildings and programs for UW Bothell and UW Tacoma."

Yet another facet of the context has to do with the **current** similarities and differences between the UW's new campuses and UW Seattle. The new campuses and UW Seattle "overlap in many ways" including but not limited to the facts that:

1. All serve junior and senior transfer students in the thousands.
2. All offer baccalaureate degree programs to students who, for various reasons, cannot go to private institutions, state supported institutions not located in the Puget Sound area or any out-of-state universities).
3. All offer master's degree programs.
4. A single Board of Regents has responsibility for all three campuses and there is but one President and one Provost
5. The budget driver reports from the state's Office of Financial Management list each campus separately in terms of enrollment targets for each year and the extent to which each campus achieves or falls short of its targets. (In the past, campus budgets have been reduced when shortfalls occurred.)

Differences include but are not limited to the facts that:

1. The new campuses do not have Ph.D. programs and probably never will offer programs in medicine, law, dentistry and pharmacy.
2. The new campuses have only a few baccalaureate academic programs for students to choose from. UW Seattle offers more than one hundred majors.
3. All the undergraduate students at the new campuses are transfers because the new campuses are not allowed to offer 100 or 200 level courses
4. The new campuses have a very modest infrastructure to support work in the natural sciences compared to UW Seattle.
5. The new campuses have very small non state, non tuition revenue streams compared to UW Seattle.
6. Although the new campuses are doing a great job of building tradition and excellence they simply have not yet had the time to compile a historical record of distinction comparable to that of UW Seattle.

In addition there probably is somewhat more emphasis on interdisciplinary programs on the new campuses than at UW Seattle.

When the council comes to consider the opportunities available to faculty at the three campuses it may be useful first to ask why faculty at the new campuses chose that employment. Clearly, each individual has his/her own reasons but Rose suggested that there probably are two or three factors that each new appointee regarded as meriting thought. One is the name: the University of Washington at Bothell, or the University of Washington at Tacoma. That the new Bothell campus bears the name the University of Washington Bothell, and not, say, Bothell State, made a considerable difference. Because of the rich history of the UW individuals had reason to believe these would be “good” positions even though the campuses themselves were new. Had UW Bothell been called Bothell State University there would have been no way for potential faculty members to understand anything about the institution from the name. Another factor, said Rose, is the “magnificent library facilities and information resources that were instantly available at the new campuses”. The University of Washington Libraries ranks somewhere in the top 15 in the nation among major research university libraries. Another reason has to do with the challenges and opportunities of shaping a brand new university with respect to curriculum, teaching, and local policies concerning service, scholarship, tenure and promotion.

There was/is at least one major risk factor as well. Because UW Bothell and UW Tacoma are so new and changing so rapidly it is easy to understand how a candidate for a faculty position or a current faculty member legitimately might be uncertain about “whether the campuses will develop in as positive a manner as hoped” and how that development might influence his/her chances of finding employment somewhere else in the academy. Rose stressed that “good people have taken this chance.” It is also clear that this risk is the flip side of the opportunity/challenge factor mentioned above.

Rose noted that this council might pay particular attention to giving advice about policies that present attractive opportunities for incoming and current faculty at the new campuses and that minimize the risk factor. Such policies will insure that the new campuses continue to develop in innovative ways of immeasurable benefit to students and thus to the university as a whole.

Both Rose and Friedman noted that there are “tensions and ambiguities related to the new campuses” and that, in large measure, they are “healthy and dynamic,” positive and not negative. “Everything changes all the time at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma,” said Rose. Major changes are a “way of life at the new campuses”. Some of these changes resolve old tensions and ambiguities but some generate new tensions and ambiguities. Rose suggested that it may not be a very good idea (or even possible) to “fix all these tensions and ambiguities.”

Coney said that, in her experience, “there are differences in vision and strategies not only among the three campuses, but between the administration and faculty of each campus from time to time, as well as among administrations of the three campuses. This perspective allows for a more complex understanding of the issues that we are and will be addressing.”

Rose noted some changes in the “scope of responsibilities of the leaders” of the new campuses. Originally there was one dean for the two new campuses (or “branch campuses” as they were known at first). Then the position was “split in two,” and there were deans at both campuses. The next change in title was to Dean and Vice Provost for each campus. When Rose retired from the UW Bothell leadership position the first search was conducted for a new Dean and Vice Provost “but no one was found.” President McCormick authorized a second search under the leadership title of Chancellor and Dean. That search was successful and now the top leadership position at both UW Bothell and UW Tacoma is Chancellor and Dean”. At the same time UW Bothell’s new Chancellor and Dean was named another position was created: Vice Chancellor. Now both UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have Vice Chancellors. The chancellor title occurs nowhere on the Seattle campus.

Asked what exactly he thought a “chancellor” was, in the context of the new campuses, Rose said the change to chancellor suggests “a difference between a dean and a chancellor,” but he could not say exactly what the differences are within the UW. However it is clear that differences and similarities do exist in the responsibilities associated with the position of Vice President for Medical Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine compared to those of the Dean of the College of Education compared to those of the Chancellor and Dean of the UW Tacoma, etc. President McCormick thought that incorporating chancellor into the leadership title at the new campuses was appropriate. Rose noted also that Volume 2 of the UW Handbook, Section 12-24, certainly implies some differences between the responsibilities of deans and chancellors.

Rose said the way in which a “school” or a “college” is handled financially (at the Seattle campus) is “different from the way the new campuses are handled”. He said it is “fundamentally a different scheme”.

As for the new campuses being connected to the Faculty Senate at UW Seattle, Crawford (who is a founding faculty member of UW Tacoma) said that, over the last three years, he has been trying to convince his colleagues of the value of that connection. “But faculty at UW Tacoma are cautious,” he said. “The success of our task, as faculty, has much to do with our sense of ownership. There is concern among many faculty about a relationship with the Senate that requires continual oversight and review for curriculum or other purposes. In part, it is also an issue of workload,” he said. UW Tacoma faculty fully supported the tri-campus legislation, he added.

Meszaros said, “There is some fear on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses that closer ties to the Senate could significantly increase our work loads, and that we won’t be understood by faculty and administration at UW Seattle.” She said that, at the first meeting of the Special Committee on Faculty Council Organization, the point was made expressly that representation from the new campuses is wanted on several important committees at UW Seattle.” The problem, Meszaros said, is that “we can’t send people to every committee and council.” It is simply too difficult for faculty from the new campuses to come to Seattle for meetings when their work load is as demanding as it is. (This is especially so for meetings on a regular basis.) She noted, though, that the members of the Special Committee were expressing good will in requesting representatives; they do not want to create policies that harm the new campuses.

Friedman said the largest issue is: Where are the campuses going? How do we best make decisions on future directions? The conceptual apparatus of strategic complementarities helps in that process.”

Kubota asked: “How complementary are we? Are the learning experiences different for students at the three campuses? Also, how does our relationship to Cascadia play out?” She said it must be kept in mind that “it is our charge to serve the placebound, timebound students.”

Leppa noted that, “when FTE’s drive the campus, complementarity can become difficult.”

Friedman said, regarding students who want to go to one campus only (say, Tacoma, but not Seattle), “It is not a question of drawing an absolute line, but of where the line is to be drawn. There’s anxiety at Seattle too. There are ambiguities and variation at all three campuses. We won’t win with absolutes.”

Schaufelberger said, "Faculty at the Seattle campus are trying to figure out what faculty want to do at the other campuses, and how we can be of help. It would be good to have faculty from the other campuses address, and educate, the Faculty Senate in this regard. The faculty in Seattle want no cheapening of standards at any of the campuses. We need to know the structure of UW Bothell and UW Tacoma better than we do now."

Coney reminded the council that the Tri-Campus Class B legislation allowed the Bothell and Tacoma campuses "to have a stronger say, and to be able to throw issues back to UW Seattle,"

Silberstein said complications and tensions around issues of joint governance are unavoidable, but that it is important to appreciate just how unusual it is "to be employees who, through the Faculty Code, set the terms of our own employment. Faculty are the arm that oversees the academic welfare of the University." She indicated that the fear she hears in Seattle – most often with regard to the new campuses – has to do with standards. The faculty want to ensure that "anything that goes out under the UW name has quality because it was done by the faculty."

Taking Distance Learning as an example, Friedman said that, on such an issue, "It's faculty challenging faculty. The fact that UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have tensions in certain programs is a good, healthy part of the academic way of life." She said it is "finer-grained than simply three campuses in conflict." Several members of the council corroborated this observation.

Meszaros said, "We're serving a different kind of student at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma; that makes a difference. Also, we have set up a sort of dialectic insofar as the new campuses have been asked to embrace some less traditional practices and philosophy: to innovate. The faculty we have attracted are a bit rebellious in the sense that they liked the idea of joining a well-regarded university that wanted to try things that are different. Given the tensions inherent in this, part of this council's work is to find the best ways in which we can serve all three, different campuses."

Meszaros said it is a "positive overall fact to remember that UW Seattle set up the other two campuses; that at the outset faculty came from UW Seattle." Kubota said that "to make life better for faculty at one campus should help faculty at all three campuses."

Rose said, "The application of the strategy of having the three campuses being strategically complementary is a good thing for students mobile enough to attend either campus." The application of this strategy also tends to enhance the academic scope of the University as a whole."

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting will take place on December 17, 2001, on the campus of UW Tacoma. The council will be notified of the exact location and time of the meeting once it is known.

Brian Taylor
Recorder