UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL TRI-CAMPUS POLICY

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, January 16, 2002, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: Professors Meszaros (Chair), Coney, Crawford, Leppa and Schaufelberger;
Ex officio members Cameron, Kubota, Lou, Olswang and Silberstein;

ABSENT: Professor Goren;
Ex officio members Fugate, Ludwig, Nelson, Primomo and Sjavik.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the December 17, 2001 meeting were approved as written.

Report on the results of the SEC discussion of UWT Faculty Honors – Jacqueline Meszaros

Meszaros said the Senate Executive Committee discussion of UW Tacoma Faculty Honors was excellent. There was “respect for UW Tacoma’s having done this the right way and for the idea of campus-specific honors.” Meszaros said there was also a recognition of the importance of transfer students being able to earn something like Faculty Honors in Seattle. The SEC asked the Council on Academic Standards to consider this issue, including the possibility of coordinated shared standards across the three campuses. Academic Standards has already requested some background information.

Drafting language defining a campus

Meszaros said she has received word that UW Tacoma is considering organizational and administrative changes. Most significantly, it proposes to create two colleges or schools (with Deans) within the campus, one representing Arts and Sciences, the other representing Professional Studies. (The Institute of Technology would represent a separate organizational structure.) The UW Tacoma campus may be “changing drastically,” Meszaros noted. These changes are part of what the council must consider in drafting language defining a campus.

Olswang said that “conversations” about this are under way with UW Tacoma. Olswang, Provost Huntsman, and the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of UW Tacoma have agreed that “conversations” with faculty should go ahead. Olswang said that changes similar to or different from those being proposed by UW Tacoma may take place at UW Bothell, but that no such interest has been expressed at the present time. He said the implications of specific titles and organizational structures are significant in defining what a “campus” is to be.

Olswang suggested that one solution to the definition of “campus” – for the purpose of the Faculty Code – would be to say that “campus” means what it is said to mean in the Faculty Code plus what it means at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell. “We treat ‘campus’ as an equivalent of deanship,” he noted. “If we institute ‘colleges’ with ‘deans’ at UW Tacoma this approach will no longer work.”

Schaufelberger said that one thing that is different at the other campuses is faculty organization. He said there will be colleges in time at both UW Tacoma and UW Bothell, “we should be flexible, and allow for that eventualty.” It was stressed that there are separate faculty organizations at the other campuses, apart from the faculty council structure at UW Seattle.

Silberstein pointed out that to maintain parallel structures among the campuses, there should be more faculty governance at the college level on the Seattle campus. Coney said, with respect to the administration’s openness to the “conversation” going forward on the UW Tacoma proposal [to become a two-college campus], “This represents a change in the administration’s attitude.” She added that there has already been a proliferation at the provost’s level at UW Seattle.
Silberstein said, “In this budget climate, should we be elevating administrative titles and raising salaries?”
It was noted that there are about 2,000 students each at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell, with a number of tracks and majors at both campuses. There are 28 faculty in interdisciplinary programs at UW Tacoma, versus four in Nursing and relatively few in other disciplines. These schools would be smaller than many departments in Seattle. It was asked if it is necessary to incur this expense.

It was suggested that the idea is being raised because of the maturity of the campuses and a desire to ensure that they have appropriate legitimacy. This is one argument being presented by UW Tacoma. The question was asked: Would the Chancellor surrender her other title of dean? (Vicky Carwein is both Chancellor and Dean.) The “conversation” under way, it was observed, is a programmatically driven discussion. Programs are defined as “departments.” There might be a “School of Business,” or “Business Programs,” but not a “Department of Business.”

Crawford said the UW Tacoma campus “has not yet had its own ‘conversation’ on the current proposal. This has not been a faculty-driven, but administration-driven, ‘conversation’. Faculty have some questions. I still do not know how to think about this proposal.”

Olswang said, “Faculty will be part of the discussion. ‘Campus’ being equivalent to ‘college’ may not be viable given this new discussion.” Coney said, “The other campuses may not need to be so top-heavy administratively [as UW Seattle is]. My first response is that I am somewhat dismayed. The new campuses were supposed to be less conventional and more flexible, but this looks very conventional and adds layers. Also, faculty are very concerned about expenses right now. We’re currently trying to protect salaries as best we can. If faculty and staff have to take cuts, then administrators should behave similarly. We don’t want careerism to come into this.”

Olswang said, “The implication for us is that ‘it’s out there.’ Either we defer (lacking clarity) or move forward, but flexibly. But we do need a definition for the Code.” Crawford said the next UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly meeting will address this issue. Rereading Chapter 23 of the University Handbook, he saw that, if schools and colleges were to be created at UW Tacoma, there would have to be concomitant changes in the administrative structure of that campus. “Who would review what? There would be an organizational morass. Moreover, chapter 23 may need considerable revision in order to ensure the role of the faculty assembly as an effective instrument of the faculty in shared governance at UWT.

Lou asked, “Do the campuses have to go lock-step? It does not seem to me that they do. Olswang said, “The Code clearly states that ‘the college shall----’; it does not say ‘the campus shall----’. It gets more complex with the adding of layers.” Schaufelberger said, “Now, in the Faculty Code, you can have ‘college’ without ‘department’ or with ‘department’; you could also have ‘campus’ with or without ‘colleges’.”

Asked what role faculty would have in the ‘conversation’ on the proposal, Olswang said faculty would have an important role, but he reminded the council that, when the conversation has been completed, and any subsequent action has been taken, the Board of Regents “will have the final say. (The president would have veto power.) And the Board of Regents would want something agreed upon by faculty and the administration.”

Meszaros said, “It’s a good idea to work on the idea of ‘campus’. The question here is: What should FCTCP do to contribute to this definition? We’re looking at the faculty consultation aspect predominantly, since we are a faculty council.”
Schaufelberger said, “There needs to be a central body in this effort.” Crawford said, “The Faculty Assembly at UWT is the only body that has the power to legislate for that faculty as a whole.” Coney said, echoing a theme expressed by Crawford, “An enormous amount of time must be spent at both of the other campuses on work unrelated to teaching. Another layer of activity would be even more proliferation in the direction that would not serve faculty at either of those campuses. Faculty would be given an almost impossible task.”

Meszaros said, “We will proceed by forming a team to look at defining ‘campus’ for possible legislation for the University Handbook, for the purpose of the Faculty Code.”

Meszaros, Olswang, Cameron, Coney, Schaufelberger and Goren will be on the team developing a definition of “campus”.

Discussion of the Distance Learning legislation that was approved by the Faculty Senate on October 25, 2001, and approved by the president on November 26, 2001. (It went into effect thereupon.)

Meszaros said UW Seattle – and the Faculty Council on Educational Outreach in particular – is moving ahead on Distance Learning, now that the Class “B” legislation has been passed and put into effect. FCEO will be offering suggestions to faculty (and departments) setting up Distance Learning courses. In the 2002-2003 academic year, FCEO will look at Distance Learning programs. (FCAS will participate in that effort: its Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs – SCAP – is responsible for approving academic programs at the UW.)

UW Seattle asked for participation from the other campuses, but no organized response was forthcoming. UW Bothell and UW Tacoma representation is needed. But Meszaros said, “We don’t yet have any way of coordinating with UW Seattle. The Tri-Campus Legislation created the FCTCP because we can’t practically have a representative on every council. FCTCP was formed in part to coordinate and in part to allow for an entire council to focus on tri-campus issues.

Coney said FCTCP could be “tagged.” When faculty councils address issues containing tri-campus elements, they can bring those issues to FCTCP or have someone from FCTCP visit them. Schaufelberger said a request could be made to have issues sent to FCTCP “for us to look at concurrently (or before) with the Senate Executive Committee.”

It was suggested that the FCTCP chair could look at the menu of issues and legislative proposals being dealt with by each council (the menu that is handed out to SEC members at their meetings) and determine what issues and proposals are relevant to FCTCP. Though Meszaros said FCTCP could be put in an awkward position: “We’d be a ‘hang-up’ if we had to hold up the committee’s work on Distance Learning.”

It was observed that allowing a certain autonomy for UW Bothell and UW Tacoma would be helpful as regards efficiency for those campuses, and for the University as a whole. Silberstein said she could imagine the Faculty Senate chair saying, hypothetically, “This is a central issue to higher education. UW Bothell and UW Tacoma are no different than UW Seattle on this.” The whole point, said Silberstein, is to take a difficult issue like this one and discuss it thoroughly in the proper channels and forums.

Coney said the acceptance of a University Handbook on principle does not mean that the three campuses cannot interpret the Handbook in their own way “in the spirit of the Code.” Crawford said, “UWT faculty do not want oversight and review from either the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) or its Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP). When we create new programs, including Distance Learning, as long as these are consistent with the Handbook, the key principle should be ‘collegial delegation’ to our campus faculty organizations for review and approval of such proposals. If a problem arises, from the FCAS or elsewhere, it can be resolved at the FCTCP. Such a model, it should be stressed, would not exclude ‘collegial consultation’ between senate councils and committees and campus faculty organizations.”
Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting will only involve the six members of the team designated to define “campus.” That meeting will take place on Wednesday, February 13, 2002, at 9:00-10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. The next full council meeting will take place on Wednesday, March 13, 2002, at 12:30 p.m., either in 36 Gerberding Hall or in a room in which videoconferencing can be held.

Brian Taylor
Recorder