Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Review of the minutes from February 26th, 2015
4. Report from the Chair
5. President Search Committee – Recommendations for Faculty Reps
7. Good of the order
8. Adjourn

1) Call to Order

Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

2) Introductions

Members of the council introduced themselves.

3) Review of the minutes from February 26th, 2015

The minutes from February 26th, 2015 were approved unanimously as written.

4) Report from the Chair

Tri-campus small working group

Erdly explained the Tri-campus workgroup has been very active since the last council meeting wherein it was charged, and has since held several meetings. He noted the group hopes to gain council feedback today on some of the topics in which they have taken up interest; their ultimate aim remains identifying a vision for how the three UW campuses relate to each other, and has evolved into understanding best practices for governing and creating synergy within multi-campus university systems.

Salary Policy / Norm Beauchamp

Beauchamp explained there are ongoing efforts to ready the salary policy for a vote in the Faculty Senate. He noted a vote will likely take place in the fall of 2015, as the summer will be utilized to “tighten” up the Faculty Code language by a small subset of members of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA). He noted there have been widespread efforts to gain community sentiment towards the policy, in discovering which schools and colleges are in favor of it, which have reservations, and what the concerns are specifically. He explained a known concern is that the policy now incorporates too many “off-ramps” (the option for entire academic units to opt-out of the salary policy). Beauchamp noted that the council might consider recommending members for the small group tasked to work on the code language in the summer. He explained there is special interest in individuals who have understanding of
financial feasibilities. The council recommended several names for inclusion in the process. The names were:

- J.W Harrington
- Jan Rutledge
- Ana Karaman

Erdly mentioned that the salary policy becomes very high-stakes when a majority of units on campus desire its implementation, yet some still do not. He explained the council will receive regular updates on the state of the salary policy.

5) President Search Committee – Recommendations for Faculty Reps

Erdly explained that members involved in the Presidential Search are hoping to facilitate an inclusive process, and they encourage various campus groups and constituents to provide feedback and input on a desired profile for the new university President. Erdly noted there indications that the search will be a hybrid of an open and closed process.

Dolsak recommended that a meeting be scheduled so all presidential candidates have a 30 minute conversation with the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy. While all campuses do get a chance to meet with the candidate, the members of the tri-campus policy council, however, are most attuned to the issues across the campuses, he explained.

6) Tri-campus 2015 WorkGroup – Study discussion/preliminary findings - (Tri-campus WorkGroup) (Exhibit 1) (Exhibit 2) (Exhibit 3)

Erdly explained the subcommittee has met twice and their discussions have varied in topic. He noted they have been mostly focusing on gathering existing data for analysis.

Erdly explained a new Catalyst share space has been created for collaboration between the working group, allowing them to present and share information with each other. He noted everyone on the council is a member of the shared space, and so each can upload files and links of interest.

Erdly explained that one of the most interesting discoveries the working group has made is that a Tri-Campus Retreat was held in 2005, attended by dozens of university administrators, faculty, and others (including the President and Provost), which focused solely on evaluating the effectiveness and direction of the three UW campuses. This retreat yielded a comprehensive 140-page ‘Summary Report,’ which highlights, among other things, the pros and cons of varying governance models for the three campuses. Erdly noted the report will be made available online shortly, by way of the working group shared space. Erdly explained there is nothing exceptionally definitive within the report. Though, he noted the working group will evaluate it further, and uncover recommendations of action for moving forward.

Beauchamp explained that the 2005 Tri-Campus Retreat was a massive endeavor which included nearly 100 participants. He explained that in looking at the guidance included in the report – though there are a number of ideas for promoting future efficiency and synergy between the campuses, there is no marked consensus on actions to be taken. Beauchamp noted the report will nonetheless be of use in the small group’s work in looking for guiding principles and alignments of the three campuses. He added that Interim Provost Jerry Baldasty has noted that one area or two areas could guide how the campus interacts, instead of a larger number of topic areas.
TO: Academic Senate, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
FROM: Joyce Tolliver, Chair, Executive Committee  
DATE: March 16, 2011  
RE: Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Integration of Multi-campus Universities

On Feb. 1, 2011, I asked a group of seven colleagues from this campus to research various administrative structures that have been used to integrate universities with multiple campuses. This request arose from the clear need for reliable, documented information to serve as the basis for a data-driven and extensive conversation about what organizational structures suit the University of Illinois's unique characteristics.

The Senate Executive Committee called for such a conversation in its Statement on the Campus and the Chancellor. In his February 18, 2011 letter to me, Chair Kennedy agreed, noting that "we need to position the University for success in the future, and it may be worth entering into a University-wide dialogue about the future of the University. To have that discussion with all of the University's constituents would be an ambitious task but one which I think will ultimately be necessary. . . ."

In composing a team for this project, I approached widely-respected faculty leaders whose knowledge of this campus and of the broader context of public U.S. research universities was extensive. The members of this blue-ribbon panel were Debra Bragg (Education), C. K. Gunsalus (Business), George Gollin (Engineering), Sarah Projansky (Media), Wojtek Chodzko-Zajko (Applied Health Sciences), Matthew Wheeler (ACES), and Paul Diehl (LAS), who graciously agreed to chair the committee. These experts, in addition, interviewed several national leaders in higher education, some of whom have a close familiarity with this university and its traditions. I asked the committee not to make any specific recommendations about the best structures and practices for the University of Illinois, but rather to gather, organize, and present a cogent data base upon which such recommendations might ultimately be made. The final report of the committee is attached.

While the committee members scrupulously avoided recommending any specific course of action, the report makes the following crucial observations:

I. Scholarly studies in higher education distinguish between multi-site universities, which usually feature a single flagship campus with smaller regional campuses; and multi-campus universities, which comprise several campuses with different missions and profiles. The University of Illinois is clearly more like a multi-campus university than a multi-site university. Moreover, it differs from multi-site universities in the small number of its campuses and in the heterogeneity of the mission profiles and size of its campuses, each of which
exists and is accredited as a discrete university, rather than solely as a part of a single university.

2. There is greater centralization of functions at multi-site universities (such as Penn State and Ohio State, for example) than at multi-campus institutions. Furthermore, where this centralization is beneficial, it more concerns the "administrative shell" functions, as opposed to "core academic" functions. The outside consultants interviewed by the committee were consistent and clear in their comments about this organizational principle.

3. Academic and research excellence is more strongly correlated with decentralization of academic functions, and decision-making that is held closer to the site of these core activities. Again, our consultants, from a variety of different kinds of institutions, were strongly consistent on this point.

With deep gratitude to the committee members, I offer this report to the University community in the expectation that it will serve as the foundation for a much-needed University-wide conversation about what administrative structures best position us to thrive in the decades ahead. Let the conversation begin.

c: Christopher G. Kennedy, Chair, Board of Trustees
   Michael J. Hogan, President
   Robert A. Easter, Interim Vice President and Chancellor
   Richard Wheeler, Interim Provost and Vice Chancellor of Academic
   Affairs
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Prof. Paul F. Diehl, LAS (Chair)
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Introduction and Summary of Process

The Executive Committee of the Urbana-Champaign Faculty Senate commissioned our group to identify different models of governance for public universities that have multiple campuses under a single university system. This assignment was made in light of President Hogan’s ideas for, and potential Board of Trustees consideration of, centralizing some structures and functions of the Chicago, Springfield, and Urbana campuses.

The Working Group identified six university systems to explore different institutional arrangements. These are listed below.

- University of Illinois
- The Ohio State University
- Indiana University
- Pennsylvania State University
- University of Texas
- University of Maryland

The University of Illinois was selected as the baseline case, given the group’s focus on current arrangements there and the possibility of change. The group also selected three other institutions within the CIC (Ohio State, Penn State, and Indiana respectively), peer institutions of comparable academic quality; two of these (Indiana, Ohio State) were specifically referenced in a media interview by President Hogan as, in his view, structured similarly to Illinois. In addition, the group selected two other systems with peer institutions (Texas, Maryland) that offer potentially innovative arrangements and that were among those singled out for additional scrutiny by the Rich Report (see below). Beyond these university systems, the Working Group also considered specific arrangements in certain other systems, as appropriate to the dimensions analyzed below, noted in the Rich Report, or reflecting individual knowledge of the group members. Consideration was also given to insights offered by those interviewed by the group (see below).

For each of the university systems above, a designated member of the working group gathered basic information according to a template of questions (these are given in Appendix I). Information was obtained primarily from publicly available sources, notably web-based information and public documents. This was supplemented by informal interviews with selected faculty and administrators at the university systems under scrutiny.

The group was also informed by several preexisting reports. As Interim President, Stanley Ikenberry directed Robert Rich, Director of IGPA, to examine the organizational structure of university systems in other states. His 2010 report “Review of Organizational Structures in Higher Education” (hereafter the “Rich Report”) analyzed the administrative structures of 51 public university systems based on organizational charts and how senior administrative positions were arrayed in such charts. Rich graciously made the report and associated data and materials available to the working group, and he was also interviewed by a member of the working group. In addition, Associate Provost for Enrollment Management Keith
Marshall graciously supplied his report “Admissions at the Top 15 Public Universities” (hereafter the “Marshall Report”) on admissions and recruiting practices of select peer institutions. Finally, the 2010 report of the Administrative Review and Restructuring Working Group (hereafter the “ARR Report”) assessed the organizational structure and delivery of administrative services at the University of Illinois and recommended a set of reforms and changes to improve performance as well as reduce costs.

The charge to the working group was focused more on informational tasks rather than evaluative ones. Indeed, a full evaluation of various system arrangements would require extensive study by educational researchers, and is certainly beyond the scope of what the group could accomplish in less than six weeks. Nevertheless, the Working Group explored some initial steps toward understanding and assessing how multi-campus university systems are organized. We report, without our own comments or opinions, any consensus on matters from either of two sources. First, one member of the group reviewed the relevant literature in higher education administration, governance, and related fields, with an eye toward uncovering what systematic findings bear on the issues addressed here. Second, the working group interviewed a series of distinguished individuals who have held senior administrative positions at major universities, including the University of Illinois (the interview protocol and questions are given in Appendix II). The purpose of the interviews was to gain insights, based on direct experience, of effective organizational practices and general guidelines for university organization. The following individuals were interviewed (with a representative administrative position for each):

- Larry Faulkner (President Emeritus, University of Texas-Austin)
- Robert Bordahl (President, American Association of Universities; Chancellor Emeritus, University of California-Berkeley)
- Stanley O. Ikenberry (President Emeritus, University of Illinois)
  - Terry Sullivan (President, University of Virginia)
- Jesse Delia (Provost Emeritus, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

**Contextual and Conceptual Distinctions**

In understanding the findings below and interpreting their application to the University of Illinois, there are two vital distinctions that must be kept in mind. First, the education literature makes a distinction between “multi-campus” and “multi-site” or branch campus systems. The former is characterized by campuses that have distinct missions and goals and which function largely in an independent fashion. In contrast, multi-site systems differ in terms of centrality of leadership, geographic distribution, independence and equality of institutional heads, and faculty governance bodies; these are essentially single universities that operate in multiple locations. These are best understood as ideal types, as some systems exhibit characteristics of both models. Nevertheless, Illinois is often cited as an example of a multi-campus system, whereas Ohio State and Penn State respectively are close to the multi-site model. The University of Illinois system evolved over time to its present configuration. Nevertheless, there has never been the expectation that the Chicago or Springfield campuses would feed students to or otherwise

---

1 The Working Group wanted to interview several other individuals, but arrangements could not be made prior to the deadline for completion of this report.
depend on the Urbana campus for any academic functions. In contrast, in several other university systems studied (Ohio State, Penn State, and to a lesser extent Indiana), smaller campuses were created as conduits to serve the main campus, with many students transferring after a year or two of coursework. These states often lack a comprehensive community college system, and thus branch campuses in Indiana and Pennsylvania, for example, perform many functions that are carried out by Illinois’ community colleges. The term “main campus” is used deliberately in these systems, but it has never been used in association with the University of Illinois system. This is not to pass judgment, but rather to clarify the nuanced relationships among institutions within different higher education systems. Structure is linked to mission in subtle, yet critically important, ways.

Several features of the University of Illinois follow from the distinction above and other factors, and ultimately bear on issues of consolidation and centralization as well as the applicability of any lessons drawn from the experiences of other universities. First, the University of Illinois system consists of only three campuses and covers only a small portion of state institutions of higher education, whereas those under detailed study range from 6-22 campuses and generally encompass a greater percentage of colleges and universities in their states. Second, the ratios (largest campus to smallest) for undergraduate and graduate enrollment respectively are smaller (in some cases much smaller) in the Illinois system compared to the other five institutions. Third, and in a related fashion, the range of missions is also narrower for the Illinois campuses than in other systems. Most notably, most other university systems do not have more than one research-oriented campus; typically, the systems are composed of one so-called “flagship” institution and several smaller campuses that primarily support undergraduate teaching missions. Put another way, other states do not have universities that have institutions that share as many similarities as do the Urbana and Chicago campuses.

A second distinction is between the different functions of a university system. These can be distinguished by core or academic functions on one hand and administrative and business functions on the other; the common nomenclature in the education literature is “academic core” and “administrative shell” respectively. The former are typically associated with the missions of research, teaching, and service; a wide range of functions generally fall into this category (e.g., faculty recruitment and research, tenure decisions, and course planning and delivery). In contrast, administrative functions encompass a different set of services, frequently characterized in terms of business and management (e.g., business services, procurement, government relations, and legal services). This distinction proved to be central in virtually all the information gathered by the working group, including centralization patterns, consolidation efforts, interviews, and analyses in the academic literature. Much of the discussion below is framed in terms of such a division. Nevertheless, the distinctions between academic and administrative areas are not always clear, and that changes intended as only administrative can impact the academic core. Although we encountered some anecdotal examples of unintended impacts on academic aspects, a full analysis of this kind of interaction is beyond the scope of this report.

---

2 Note, for example that “human resources” in a university involves hiring civil service personnel, faculty, and academic professionals, the latter of which might fall on either side (or in some cases both sides) of the administrative/academic divide depending on responsibilities.
Senior Administrative Overview

As evidenced in the Rich Report and in our own more targeted review, there are a wide range of administrative structures and duties in public university systems, in part reflecting the multi-campus versus multi-site distinction noted above. Furthermore, one cannot infer position in the hierarchy or responsibilities based on title alone, as these vary tremendously across systems.

All six systems had one individual at the top of the administrative hierarchy, but this individual’s role in the system varied, as did the administrative arrangement beyond her/him and its relationship to campus heads. The presidents of the Indiana and Penn State systems also serve as head of the main or flagship campus of the system; the Rich Report notes that such an arrangement was evident in a third of public universities studied (17 of 51), but was not common in systems with comprehensive research universities. The other four universities examined, under various titles, had an individual designated as chief executive officer for the system without a role specific to a given campus.

Below the position of system head, university systems generally have some type of Vice-President or equivalent position in the area of academic affairs (Indiana is an exception). Yet the roles and responsibilities of the positions vary greatly. For example, the Executive Vice-President and Provost is the chief academic officer for the Penn State system, a line position, whereas the Vice-President for Academic Affairs in Illinois has historically been a staff position. Consistent with the broader set of institutions in the Rich Report, the six universities studied have senior positions (e.g., Executive Vice-Presidents, Vice-Chancellors, Associate Vice-Presidents) charged with responsibilities on the administrative and business (as opposed to the academic) side of the system; although under different labels, these can be classified as falling under the issue areas of health, business/finance, investment and property, human resources, legal services, and external relations. Fundraising and foundation arrangements varied. Multi-site universities, such as Ohio State, have structures for additional functions, some of which involve academic elements such as research. Finally, some systems have additional system level structures associated with particular priorities, such as environmental sustainability and minority affairs, although these are not necessarily near the top of any organizational chart. It is not always clear whether all these positions can be best characterized as “line” or “staff” positions in the systems examined.

There is similar diversity at campus levels and in campuses’ relationships to the university systems. As noted above, two system presidents (Penn State, Indiana) also head the flagship campuses of their systems. In those two instances (and nationally according to the Rich Report), the system also has someone who serves as the chief academic officer for the flagship campus. Indiana has different titles and reporting lines, depending on the designation of the campus; the Indianapolis and Bloomington campus heads report directly to the system president, whereas regional campus executives report to a system vice-president in charge of regional affairs, planning, and policy. Similarly, Penn State campus chancellors report to the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses, who in turn reports to the Executive Vice-President and Provost at the system level. Illinois has vice-president/chancellor and provost positions for each
of its campuses, and the Rich Report finds no instances in which these positions are combined into what has been called a "super-provost" position. Maryland and Texas have presidents for each of their campuses who report directly to either the system head or the vice-president of the system in charge of academic affairs. Leaders in Ohio State University’s system vary substantially, as campuses are led by individuals with various titles -- President, Executive Vice-President, or Dean -- some of whom also hold OSU system level positions because the individual campuses have different missions and relationships to the main campus.

Even given time and resources, it would be difficult to determine which system is “best,” given the heterogeneity of the different systems along a wide variety of dimensions. Interviews indicated that several factors affected system operations across different types: clarity of roles and lines of authority, communication across different levels, and the personalities of those occupying leadership positions. Generalizations are more evident in considering how university functions are centralized (or not), as described in the next section.

Centralization and Decentralization of Different Functions

As might be evident from the organizational configurations described above, centralization across campuses is found most frequently in administrative and business functions (such as procurement, payroll, investments, benefits, and union contracts). Similarly, there is also consistent practice that external relations with state and federal legislators, boards of trustees and regents also benefit from a single coordinated message; therefore, these functions are often consolidated at the system level. Indeed, the seven areas identified by the ARR report for cost savings reflect these and similar functional areas, and these functions are also mentioned frequently in the literature as part of the administrative shell. In fact, interviewees cited reducing the size of the bureaucracy at the system level in California (by some 20-50%) as an important accomplishment. Thus, consolidation does not necessarily produce an increase in the size of the university administration. The purposeful diminishing of the size of bureaucracy has been a trend in higher education for at least the past decade, according to a series of reports issued by the Kellogg Commission on the future of state and land grant universities.

In contrast, there is almost complete consensus that academic or core functions do not benefit from centralization across a multi-campus system, particularly when there is diversity across campuses with regard to academic mission and scope. Support and regulatory oversight for faculty and student research are also most commonly provided at the campus level, with relatively little centralization of research activities at the system level (see discussion below of research administration). Several administrators noted in their interviews that the closer you get to the laboratory or classroom, the better that decentralization works and the more likely that high quality research and instruction will result, including attracting external funding for those activities. Indicative of one approach to decentralization is the pending proposal to decouple the Madison campus from the rest of the University of Wisconsin system, based on the former’s research orientation and goal of greater self-reliance.

Few consolidation efforts with respect to academic functions were evident in other systems because of the desirability of campus autonomy noted above or state political
constraints. Some efforts at streamlining course descriptions across campuses have been made at Penn State to facilitate transfer credit (as branch campuses in the Penn State system have a central role in transferring students to the main campus). Maryland has promoted some joint programs, but has not consolidated programs across campuses. Indiana is conducting a broad review of its academic programs, including possible mergers, discontinuing programs and units, and creating new programs and units in selected areas, especially those that are multidisciplinary.\(^3\) As is evident from all these efforts, consolidation does not necessarily equate with greater centralization at the system level.

As might be expected, the areas in which the least consensus exists are those that lie at the boundary of administrative and academic concerns. Most reflective of this is research administration. The coordination of research-related discussions with federal and state agencies and foundations sometimes occurs at the system level, but can equally well be situated at the campus level. The Vice Presidents for Research (VPR) at Indiana, Ohio State, and Penn State are responsible for research development, research compliance, and research administration for the system. They work system-wide with faculty, campus leaders, and deans. These Vice Presidents work to increase and diversify research and creative works, attract external funding for these activities, and develop public-private partnerships, technology transfer, graduate education, and inter-campus research opportunities. The Vice Presidents for Research at Maryland and Texas are responsible for their campuses only. The Vice President for Research at Illinois (a new position with responsibilities not yet clearly defined) is purported to have a coordinating role for large research initiatives, as well as responsibility to increase and diversify research and creative works, attract external funding for these activities, and develop public-private partnerships, technology transfer, graduate education, and inter-campus research opportunities.

The roles of the VPRs in setting the research agenda is difficult to ascertain. Any gatekeeping in terms of assessing multiple proposals from faculty at different campuses seemed to be applicable only for limited submission competitions. Nevertheless, such “competition between campuses” is unlikely when the system is composed of divergent institutions and only one major research campus. Practice varied somewhat in the degree of centralization of grant and contract services. Ohio State and Indiana had central grant offices, but this usually meant that the processing and administration of grants were done in one location. Other systems, including Illinois, do not centralize such services. Whether overhead rates were the same for each campus or variable was split among the six systems. The Working Group could not easily determine how much ICR was allocated to the system level versus the campus level under these different configurations.

Another area in which no clear pattern emerged pertains to marketing, media relations, and “branding.” Some institutions see a benefit from centralizing these functions (e.g., common website configuration and university colors), whereas others focus their efforts around individual units (usually the flagship institution) within the system. The third area in which little consensus can be found pertains to fundraising, alumni relations, and advancement. Some institutions coordinate these efforts across multiple campuses while others do so to a much lesser degree.

\(^3\) The report of Indiana’s New Academic Directions Committee was not available as of this writing.
The clear consensus in the interviews and the education literature is for consolidation and centralization in the administrative sector and for decentralization and autonomy at the campus in academic matters; national trends are consistent with these recommendations according to the Kellogg Commission. All those interviewed favored centralization of "business" functions as a way to improve efficiency and to secure cost savings. Yet they were equally adamant that the core missions of the campuses be left in the hands of campus leaders and the faculty. Several cited the University of California system as a model, in which significant autonomy is granted to individual campuses even as they are integrated into a three-tiered system structure. One interviewee noted that a university campus is not equivalent to a corporate division, and that the unit of value is in the campus, not the system itself. Another respondent indicated that the experiences of the most important stakeholders generate loyalty to where they work, teach, study, and donate: faculty are hired and hold tenure on one campus and are immersed in the mission and value system of one campus; students in most universities study and graduate from one campus; alumni are tied to the campus that they attended; and donors are connected to specific campuses and particular programs.

Similarly, the education literature tends to favor decentralization in general and portrays the University of Illinois as a preferred model of leadership for the multi-campus system. This is one characterized as having a president that serves at the system level and performs a number of administrative functions, especially maintaining relationships with the board of trustees, government leaders and other external constituents, whereas campus level executive leadership has primary responsibility for administration of each institution. Nevertheless, several of the interviewees noted that the Illinois system has not always served the best interests of the Urbana campus, although it was not always clear whether the respondents thought the problems were structural, those related to leadership, or some combination thereof.

Some studies note the potential for system leaders to enhance higher education, and these thereby suggest the kinds of value-added that are best contributed at the highest levels (and, by implication, that are not): synergy (enhancing institutional performance through coordination), strategy (fulfilling individual missions while contributing to common purposes), efficiency (reducing redundancy in business functions and reallocating administrative resources), accountability (meeting the needs of the state and other constituencies), and integrity (resisting intrusions from outside groups in educational affairs). In contrast, higher education researchers caution against centralization of functions that run counter to collaboration and innovation. Centralized structures can diminish opportunities for collaborative work and dampen personal commitment to partnerships within and between campuses, and they can threaten appropriate levels of transparency and disclosure of necessary administrative processes. Scholars urge senior executives to model collaborative leadership and reject top-down plans in favor of developing networks to open up communication and make the core work of higher education more transparent and better understood by its many constituents.

Enrollment Management

Each of the six systems studied includes at least one campus identified as a major research university whose graduating seniors will be competitive applicants in the job market
and for admission to graduate programs at first-tier universities. This imposes practical, and obvious, constraints on admissions and intra-system transfer policies; students are not well served by admission into programs that are too difficult, or for which they are insufficiently prepared. Centralization patterns in enrollment management are reflective of the academic/administrative and multi-campus/multi-site distinctions.

Admissions

Reflecting the difference in admissions standards across their constituent campuses, all six systems have separate admissions standards for first-time students. Typically, admissions are more competitive at the leading research university than at the smaller campuses. This practice is consistent with the finding of the "Marshall Report," which found that: "There was consensus among those surveyed [at the U.S. News and World Report top 15 public universities] that admissions is viewed as a core academic function on their campus and that admissions, particularly recruiting, must be tied to the unique curricular and co-curricular opportunities that define each campus."

Two of the systems—Ohio State and Penn State—use a common application for freshman admission, reflective of the multi-site system model. In these applications, the prospective student indicates the target campus or campuses. Campuses in the other four systems use separate application processes. Of course, many of these systems and campuses allow the "Common Application" that allows students to provide basic application information to hundreds of schools across the country with one form. According to the Marshall Report, the University of California hires the Educational Testing Services (a private vendor) to verify certain aspects of all applications, and calculate high school ranks, and to conduct a yearly verification of selected applicant information. Each of the 10 campuses, however, processes the majority of the applicant information, even if the student has applied to multiple campuses.

Joint or recruiting efforts across campuses are rare and extremely limited in our sample of universities and in the broader set of institutions examined in the Marshall Report. Some geographic restrictions in recruiting are reflected in the Penn State system.

Concurrent Enrollment in Courses away from the Student’s Home Campus

The policies for enrollment in courses taught away from the student’s home campus vary from system to system. Not surprisingly, Ohio State’s policy is the most liberal, permitting enrollment across campuses. Other state systems allow the practice, but often with restrictions or conditions: Maryland (only for courses not offered at the home institution), Texas and Penn State (only for the summer term), and Indiana (student must enroll for a semester as a “non-degree student” at the non-degree campus). Illinois does not privilege students from within the system, but does have special agreements with Parkland College that reflect fairly recent developments tied to a grant with the Lumina Foundation for Education. The shortest distance between any two of Illinois’ campuses is greater than the other systems studied, making simultaneous enrollment in classes on multiple campuses less practical than in some other state systems. Nevertheless, concurrent enrollment policies reflect traditional classes requiring the physical presence of students, and are likely to be subject to change as online course availability, and accompanying student demand for it, proliferates.
Inter-Campus Transfer Policies

System transfer policies tend to take into account the institution-to-institution variation in academic rigor of programs across the system’s campuses as well as how well integrated the system is designed to be. Maryland guarantees state residents transfer admission to a system campus as long as the student meets the institution’s minimum standards and there is room in the target institution for the transfer student. Texas has a “conditional acceptance” program intended to facilitate intra-system transfer. Applicants are required to have completed at least 30 credit hours at the time they transfer to the new institution; admission is competitive given enrollment pressures in certain programs of study. For transfer to the main Columbus campus, Ohio State includes unit-to-unit differences in requirements. These are probably similar to the different minimum GPA requirements that Urbana campus imposes for transfer into its various Engineering departments. Students in Indiana must go through a formal application process, with three of the largest campuses exercising greater control (with separate application forms) than the smaller campuses that employ a common application.

Penn State is unique in our sample: students are assigned to a campus during the admissions process with the understanding that after declaring a major, a student may need or desire to request a “change of campus” in order to complete their degree. Each of the campuses offers basic courses appropriate for entering undergraduates. The specifically designed “2X2” program is predicated on a large number of students transferring to other campuses in their third year.

Course articulation procedures and policies exist at all the institutions to handle transfer students from within and outside the system. The Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI) has been in place for well over a decade, and this system includes all of the institutions in the University of Illinois system as well as over 100 colleges and universities in Illinois. This system facilitates transfer of students throughout the state, which is important to maximizing student transfer statewide. Compared to Ohio and Pennsylvania, Illinois’ system of transfer is considered by higher education scholars as a more robust system. Because of its system, Penn State has undertaken greater coordination in assuring that basic classes are uniform and available across campuses. Yet, evident in the discussions with administrators from the other five universities, articulation procedures do not necessarily solve problems arising from differential grading and skill level standards employed in purportedly comparable courses.

Identification of the Constituent Campus on Diplomas

Ohio State-Lima and Ohio State-Columbus graduates receive the same diplomas, even though Lima has an open admissions policy—“any Ohio resident who has graduated from high school (or earned a GED) and not attended any other post-secondary school... will be admitted” while Columbus “has a competitive admission process in which students are considered for admission based largely on their academic performance and credentials.” Penn State awards system-wide diplomas, but those might include a specific college name that is located on a particular campus (e.g., Behrend College and the Érie campus). The other four systems award diplomas that are institution-specific.
Appendix I: Template of Questions

1. Descriptive Overview
   • How many campuses are covered under the university umbrella?
   • What are the graduate and undergraduate enrollments of the individual campuses?
   • Do those campuses explicitly or implicitly have different missions?
   • Any distinctive features (e.g., medical schools) of those campuses?

2. Senior Administrative Structure
   • What is the array of senior administrative officers (President, Chancellors, Provost, Vice-President, etc.)?
   • What are the duties (broadly) associated with each other and how to they relate to each other and to individual campus governance?
   • When central administration structures exist (e.g., what we call UA or University Administration)?

3. Centralization and Decentralization of Administrative Functions
   • Which (if any) administrative functions are centralized across campuses?
   • How are governmental relations handled – centrally or individually according to campus?
   • How are issues of “branding” and public image managed – “one” institution, by individual campus, or some hybrid?

4. Academic Integration
   • Is there a single diploma or do diplomas distinguish by campus?
   • Is there a single application and admission process or is this distinguished by campus?
   • What is the policy for students taking courses across campuses?
   • What is the policy for students transferring across campuses?
   • Has there been any consolidation (e.g., elimination of “duplication”) of colleges, departments, or programs across campuses?

5. Faculty Research
   • Are grants and contracts offices and processes centralized?
   • Does the central administration perform any gatekeeping function or otherwise restrict competing grant proposals across campuses?
   • Does the central administration accrue ICR or other overhead for grant or contract administration?
   • Are overhead costs billed the same across the university or does it vary by campus?
Appendix II: Interview Protocol and Questions

We are part of a working group appointed by the UI Senate Executive Committee to identify different models of governance for state universities that have multiple campuses under a single university system. This assignment was made in light of President Hogan’s vision of “one university” and potential Board of Trustees’ consideration of consolidating some administrative structures and functions of the Chicago, Springfield, and Urbana campuses.

As part of the information gathering exercise, the working group is interviewing select individuals who have familiarity with the Illinois system and higher education generally. Obviously, as XXXXXX, we think that your insights can help us prepare a report that will inform the Senate, the President, and the Board on future changes in the structure of the University of Illinois.

We would like to ask you a series of brief questions. We expect that most of your responses will be used by committee members only, and no quote or information would be attributed directly to you in any report, except with your permission. Indeed, we will share our notes with you and ask you to sign off on their accuracy. Your name will be listed in the report as one of the individuals interviewed.

1. How much does structure intersect with leadership? Are there some structures that enhance the best leaders (or exacerbate the worse tendencies of bad leaders)?

2. In your experience, are there university functions that, if centralized or consolidated, generally improve institutional excellence in core missions? We are interested in administrative, business, and academic functions.

3. In your experience, are there functions that, if centralized or consolidated generally detract from core excellence?

4. Are there effective structures to maximize educational quality and research productivity across multiple campuses in a single system when those campuses serve different constituencies in different ways in different parts of the state?

5. Are there organizational structures that improve outcomes with legislative support?

6. If financial constraints call for serious cutbacks/reductions in programs/offerrings, what organizational structure is likely, in your view, to lead to the strongest decisions, using future viability, excellence and serving designated constituencies, as the metrics of success?

7. Are there other state universities that you believe are good (or bad) models to dealing with this situation? Why?
8. Are there any other thoughts you would like to share about the “one university across multiple campuses” dynamic, including those specific to Illinois?
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APPENDIX A
Sample Solutions from the UW and at Peer Institutions

Please note that there are many examples of successful collaborative educational initiatives resting on strong commitment, structures, and funding models. The list below is meant to provide sample solutions and is by no means exhaustive. If you would like to add other examples to this list, please send them to mnickle@uw.edu

Examples of Commitment to Supporting Collaboration at the UW—

1. **Committed Champions:** College of Arts & Science Dean Bob Stacey made it clear to A&S chairs that supporting the Honors program is important, a strategic priority that provides chairs with clear guidelines for decision-making. Other champions include College of the Environment Dean Lisa Graumlich, who established a Cross Unit Teaching Incentive Fund; former Engineering Dean Matt O’Donnell, who championed the creation of the Molecular Engineering and Sciences Institute and the joint EE and CSE curricula; and Provost Ana Mari Cauce who championed cluster hires in data-driven discovery as part of a provost initiative. There are a number of other champions across campus in various schools and colleges and at all levels.

2. **Faculty-led, bottom-up collaboration:** The Synthetic Biology core sequence is an example of a faculty-led, bottom-up collaboration. It involves a partnership of Electrical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Computer Science & Engineering, and BioEngineering faculty. Each quarter, faculty from one of the departments teaches a Synthetic Biology course, open to all students and listed in all 4 departments. In this way, each department gets a share of the tuition revenue, and each contributes teaching effort. Each department values the curriculum, as it helps attract top students. (vetted)
   Another example is the creation of the Design-Use-Build cross-disciplinary unit with faculty from Design, HCDE, CSE, and the iSchool. Based on student demand and the rising importance of the area, a faculty member used start-up funds to host a monthly seminar lunch that grew from 7 participants to 70; an annual retreat with 300 students, faculty and industry partners; successful faculty and student recruiting efforts that increased the quality and reputation of all departments involved; and now a fee-based professional master degree that will help fund the group’s ongoing collaborative work and provide access to this growing field to more students.

3. **Inclusion of Collaborative Work in Promotion & Tenure Considerations:** The Law School makes an effort to address collaboration in promotion and tenure considerations, appointing non-Law, interdisciplinary faculty members to promotion and tenure committees to evaluate collaborative work.

4. **Resources for the Pedagogy of Collaborative Teaching:** Sara Breslow of Environmental Anthropology and Emma Flores from Education developed detailed recommendations for collaborative course elements based on their experience teaching an iGERTs course.

Examples of Structures that Support Collaboration at the UW

1. **Clear Guidelines for New Programs:** Plans are under way to establish clear process to set up collaborative, interdisciplinary programs in the Graduate School and publish guidelines fall 2013.

2. **Interdepartmental Steering Committee to Coordinate Collaborative Instruction:** In recognition of the changing nature of healthcare delivery in the US, which is transitioning to a more team-based approach to patient care, the six Health Science schools at the UW have embarked on a major collaborative initiative to implement a common Interprofessional Education (IPE) curriculum that spans all six units. Under the IPE
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paradigm, each school’s professional program will contain elements that are taught jointly by faculty from appropriate schools, both in classes and through practical simulations that are designed to better prepare students for practice in a team-based environment. A steering committee with representation from all participating Health Science schools is coordinating this effort, currently in a pilot stage.

3. **Dean-level Negotiations of Equitable Arrangements**: Faculty from the College of the Environment routinely teach introductory Biology courses in the College of Arts & Sciences. These courses are large and attract significant ABB revenue; however, there is no structural way to compensate the College of the Environment for their work. The respective deans’ offices negotiated a mutually beneficial arrangement in which Biology pays a portion of the faculty members’ salary at the COE rate based on a percent per-credit-formula.

4. **Building Co-teaching into the Program/Budget from the Start**: The Design-Use-Build cross-disciplinary unit built faculty buy-outs for co-teaching into the budget of their new Masters in Human-Computer Interaction + Design program. The additional cost was deemed essential to the curricular aims of the program. Core courses are co-taught from two intellectual perspectives: design (art) and human/computer interaction (engineering and cognitive psychology), advancing student learning as well as providing the program with a competitive edge over peer institutions in recruiting quality faculty and students.

**Examples of Funding Models at the UW**

1. **Mechanisms at the school or college level to launch collaborative efforts**: The College of Environment provides central funding for joint teaching efforts through a Cross Unit Teaching Incentive Fund. The one-time funding, capped at $35k per project, aims to expand interdisciplinary, cross-unit offerings in creative directions that are attractive to students and thus sustainable under the rules of ABB. The college provides detailed criteria in an RFP. Funds have been awarded for:
   - a TA so a course can be expanded to serve another unit that requires it
   - a part-time student services person to promote a minor or certificate that will return enrollment and/or major funds through ABB
   - a skills or in-practice short course for grad students that will create interest in moving a degree or certificate program forward
   - summer program for gifted high school students linked to an existing or to-be-developed major

2. **Mechanisms at the department/center level to launch collaborative efforts**: The Simpson Center for the Humanities provides modest “collaboration” grants—one course release each for up to four faculty—to jumpstart faculty collaborations. (Buyout is pegged at the cost of a graduate student to teach a course; faculty may elect to take summer salary at that scale instead). The collaborations may involve submitting a large-scale grant proposal to national agencies, planning a major international conference, co-editing a substantial publication, and/or developing courses. Faculty may apply to the Simpson Center for follow-up funding. For example:
   - In 2011-12 two faculty members received a collaboration grant for the study of feminist art in Asia; they submitted a conference proposal to the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) and planned two new courses. When their ACLS proposal for an international conference was funded, it was supplemented by further funding and administrative support from the Simpson Center in 2012-2013.

3. **Creative Unit-to-Unit Cost and Revenue Sharing Agreements**: Sociology, Statistics, and the Center for Statistics in Social Sciences joint list courses under an agreement for cost and revenue sharing. For example, the Sociology graduate methods course is open to students from the other two units, which compensate Sociology by funding a Sociology TA every few years.
4. **Cluster Hires**: A provost-initiative to support data-driven discovery is providing up to 50% funding for 4-5 new faculty hires, with the remainder of funding supplied by the faculty’s home departments. These faculty have a teaching and outreach obligation to the eScience Institute—the campus-wide “home” for this Initiative—proportional to the fraction of salary provided under the Initiative. The model is similar to that employed by the University Initiatives Fund to create units such as the Astrobiology program, the Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences, and the Center for Nanotechnology. Another example is the cluster hiring of four faculty in Freshwater Sciences by the UW Seattle Colleges of the Environment and Engineering together with UW Tacoma’s Environmental Science.

**Examples of Funding Models at Peer Institutions as a Target for Advancement Efforts**

1. **Incentives and Seed Funding (University of Michigan)**: The MCubed program at the University of Michigan creates an incentive structure for collaborative work. A two-year $15m pilot provides incentive and seed funding for faculty-led collaboration. Any three faculty can submit a proposal for anything (teaching, research, service). When three researchers decide to “cube,” they register the project and receive $60,000 to hire one graduate student, undergraduate student, or postdoctoral researcher. Cubes can join other cubes with similar focus. For example, if 30 faculty members coalesced around one idea, they could open a new large-scale research center with 10 funded positions quickly. Funding comes from a $5m central commitment and 2-to-1 match by the schools, colleges, or investigators. Thirty-three cubes have been created as of May 2013. *Learn more:* [http://www.ur.umich.edu/update/archives/120509/mcubed](http://www.ur.umich.edu/update/archives/120509/mcubed)

2. **Cluster Hires (University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign & University of Michigan)**: The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign plans to hire 500 new faculty over the next five to seven years, many in clusters with an eye to diversity and interdisciplinarity. The cluster hires will take place in the six areas identified by their Visioning Excellence at Illinois, a 2y2d-inspired initiative that resulted in focus groups prioritizing six areas for future investment based on society’s most pressing issues and the distinctive role Illinois might play in addressing them. *Learn more:* [http://apicciano.commons.gc.cuny.edu/2013/04/25/university-of-illinois-urbana-champaign-to-add-500-new-full-time-professors/#sthash.zsK1FZ61.dpuf](http://apicciano.commons.gc.cuny.edu/2013/04/25/university-of-illinois-urbana-champaign-to-add-500-new-full-time-professors/#sthash.zsK1FZ61.dpuf)

The University of Michigan’s Interdisciplinary Faculty Initiative created 100 new tenure-track positions for faculty with interdisciplinary research or teaching interests. From 2008-2011, UM created new positions in 25 interdisciplinary clusters in topics ranging from human health, environmental sustainability, the alleviation of poverty, digital environments in the humanities, to learning from massive datasets. *Learn more:* [http://president.umich.edu/init/init1.php](http://president.umich.edu/init/init1.php)
What does the UW’s most recent Self-Evaluation Accreditation Report from Sept. 2013 to the NW Commission on Colleges and Universities say about the Tri-Campus relationship?

- **Under Mission Statement (pg. 49):**
  “The Seattle campus is made up of 16 schools and colleges whose faculty offer educational opportunities to students ranging from first-year undergraduates through doctoral level candidates. The UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses, each developing a distinctive identity and undergoing rapid growth, offer diverse programs to undergraduates and to graduate students.”

- **Under Governance (pg. 69):**
  “The Seattle campus of the University of Washington was established in 1861, and UW Bothell and UW Tacoma were created by state legislative action in 1990. The University governance system was revised to acknowledge the addition of these two campuses. The Chancellors of UW Bothell and UW Tacoma are responsible to the President and the Provost for all academic and educational matters on their campuses. The Faculty Code was revised to provide for equivalent faculty representation from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma in the Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee.”

- **Under Faculty (pg. 71):**
  “UW Bothell and UW Tacoma faculty are actively involved in shared governance at each campus. At UW Bothell, the General Faculty Organization (GFO), represented by an elected Executive Council and other councils, serves as the faculty’s deliberative body. UW Tacoma has a similar body, known as the Faculty Assembly. The GFO and Faculty Assembly Executive Councils work closely with the chancellors and vice chancellors on matters of shared responsibility, in accordance with the GFO and Faculty Assembly bylaws.”

- **Under Staff (pg. 71):**
  “All UW Tacoma staff—classified and professional—are also members of the UW Tacoma Staff Association, which serves to facilitate communication and unify staff. At UW Bothell, the campus has an active General Staff Organization, consisting of professional staff, classified staff, and librarians.”

- **Regarding Administration (pg. 79):**
  “The chancellors report to both the President and the Provost and are responsible for representing the campus to the Board of Regents, the central administration, the Washington State Student Achievement Council, and to the state legislature. The Chancellors are also responsible for representing the campus to the local and statewide community and for campus development and fundraising. The Chancellors are directly responsible for campus administration and management.”

- **Regarding Communication — following a discussion on Office of External Affair’s role (pg. 93):**
  “Other resources available to External Affairs include communications directors in each of the schools and colleges and at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell. These professionals work within the University’s established brand and content standards and are available to advise and collaborate on developing strategic communications and marketing to internal and external audiences.”

*All excerpts are from the University of Washington Year Seven Self-Evaluation Report submitted to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and University, September 3, 2013.
Communication about important University issues is distributed regularly by the President and Provost’s offices, as well as by other leadership offices, via email to all students, faculty, and staff. In addition, UW Tacoma and UW Bothell develop promotional materials and messages that both reflect unity as part of the UW and highlight each campus’s distinctive characteristics. Communications activities, when focused on campus-specific audiences, are managed at the campus level.”

- Regarding contractual agreements (pgs. 99-100):

“The Seattle Procurement Services Office has the delegated authority from the Board of Regents to enter into contracts on behalf of the UW. It has delegated this authority on the Tacoma campus to the senior contracts manager, with a technical reporting line to UW Seattle Procurement Services. This position maintains continuous and clear communication with the Seattle Procurement Services Office to ensure that all agreements are in compliance with University policies and procedures. Purchase transactions over designated limits are reviewed by the senior contracts manager to ensure compliance with all University policies and procedures.

At UW Bothell, researchers must obtain the approval of their school or program director and both the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Administration and Planning before research grants and contracts can be submitted to an external sponsor. This includes requests for foundation funding as well as government funding. In all cases, gifts are reviewed for their fit with the institution’s mission and goals prior to acceptance.”

- Regarding budget decisions (pg. 103):

“UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have created budgeting structures that include strategic budget committees. At UW Tacoma, this committee regularly disseminates information to the campus. At UW Bothell, the Chancellor’s Cabinet assumes the role of the budget committee. Units make budget requests to their division head, and requests are reviewed by the Chancellor and other appropriate personnel.”

- Regarding professional development (pg. 109):

“In addition to the all-faculty resources provided by the Seattle campus, UW Tacoma offers promotion and tenure workshops for assistant professors, associate professors, and full-time lecturers eligible for promotion. UW Tacoma also has a Faculty Resource Center, created to bring together the research, teaching, technology, and faculty development services at UW Tacoma. For the past two years, UW Tacoma has hosted an iTech Fellows Initiative in Innovative Course Redesign, a Chancellor’s Fund partnership with academic units, created to advance innovative practice in teaching and learning with technology. UW Tacoma iTech Fellows work in disciplinary teams over the summer to rethink and redesign online innovation using research-based best practices. The Office of Research and Scholarship Support assists faculty and students identify grant and funding support for academic research and sponsors a Research Boot Camp in the summer for faculty needing assistance in grant writing.

In recognition of a higher teaching load, UW Tacoma has established a program of research support for junior faculty members, providing released time of one quarter with no teaching and no service in order to pursue research. A faculty member may apply once for release time for research during his or her third or fourth year (on the tenure clock cycle). Release time will never be granted for the first or sixth year.
UW Bothell’s Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) and Office of Research offer additional opportunities for professional growth and development. The TLC provides individual consultations, assistance with curriculum assessment design, funding for teaching-related conference travel, and support for service-learning and laboratory courses. Other faculty development programs include institutes, such as the Hybrid Course Development Institute and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Symposium.

Since 2008, UW Bothell’s Office of Research has focused increasingly on research development efforts. These include creating opportunities for faculty to present research to potential collaborators in weekly research-in-progress seminars, to receive substantive feedback through participation in research interest groups, and to practice their pitches to sponsors in an annual event called Discourse. UW Bothell also provides opportunities and support for professional growth of staff in conjunction with central UW HR’s Division of Professional & Organizational Development.

- **Under New Academic Program Planning (pg. 128):**
  
  “For graduate programs at UW Seattle, the Graduate School Council reviews new degree programs as well as new interdisciplinary degree and certificate programs after review and approval by the responsible unit and college or school. The GSC is an elected faculty body that advises the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School and acts on behalf of the graduate faculty. For graduate programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, the appropriate faculty council reviews and approves the proposal after it has been approved by the responsible unit.”

- **Regarding capital budgets (pg. 219):**
  
  “UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have developed campus master plans for their respective campuses along with infrastructure master plans and other planning documents specific to each campus that help guide decision making for future campus development. The University’s mission and goals also guide all operating and capital budget decisions for the Tacoma and Bothell campuses. In addition, short- and intermediate-planning documents have been developed to ensure progress toward campus objectives. Each campus regularly reviews, schedules and funds the systematic renewal of campus infrastructure and facilities, along with program-specific furnishings and equipment, using the total cost of ownership format for decision making and fund allocation. All major UW Tacoma and Bothell capital projects are reviewed by the Board twice a year through the Capital Projects Office.”

- **Regarding auxiliary enterprise units (pg. 221):**
  
  “The Tacoma campus operates a small number of auxiliary enterprise units. These units include a convenience store, copy center, housing, motor pool, parking services, real estate office, and vending revenue. The units’ financial statements are monitored on a monthly basis to ensure the overall financial stability of the auxiliaries. Consideration for investment in any one unit that exceeds its revenue is weighed against the ability of the other units to support the investment and ensure ongoing stability.

UW Bothell operates an auxiliary enterprise that includes student housing, transportation services (parking), food services, and event and conference services in support of the institution’s operational goals. These enterprises are entrepreneurial in nature and are expected to contribute to the University’s mission. UW Bothell separately budgets for each auxiliary as a cost center and actively monitors revenues and expenses for each auxiliary unit.”
• Regarding campus master plans for physical development (pg. 230):

“UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have each developed and maintained a Campus Master Plan, an Infrastructure Master Plan, and other relevant planning documents specific to their campus. Each of these planning documents was developed through a campus-wide effort that included participation from students, staff, faculty, and the local community and provides consistent guidance to ensure compatibility with the University’s mission, core themes, and financial plans.”

• Regarding equipment (pg. 230):

“UW Tacoma and UW Bothell manage equipment budgets to ensure that they are sufficient to fulfill the University’s mission, goals and objectives.”

• Regarding IT (pg. 236):

“Information Technology is the central IT organization at UW Tacoma charged with providing high-quality infrastructure and related technology services to the different constituencies on and off campus, such as the Center for Urban Waters. Headed by the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology, the unit’s mission is to deliver systems and services that contribute to successful campus-wide learning, teaching, research, and operations.

At UW Bothell, Information Technologies (IT) addresses teaching, learning, research, administrative, and operational technology needs specific to, and consistent with, the Bothell campus mission and its 21st Century Campus Initiative.

IT at UW Bothell is divided into four subunits. Learning Technologies works with faculty and students to incorporate technology into the teaching and learning environment. IT Services manages desktop computers, computer labs, classroom presentation technologies, and user support. IT Operations manages backend infrastructure that supports the campus website and content management system, local databases, the learning management system, faculty research, printing, file management, email, and consultation with third party technology vendors. IT Administration and Planning manages IT budgets, project portfolios, hardware and software inventory, and campus technology purchasing.”

• Regarding strategic plans (pgs. 245-246):

“At UW Tacoma, enrollment growth (through admissions and retention) is an important element of campus planning as it fits the access mission of the campus and allows the development of more comprehensive academic and academic-support programs, even with stagnant or declining state operating fund support.

In Spring Quarter 2012, the Tacoma campus launched the Strategic Enrollment Management Team as a forum for developing long-term enrollment goals, coordinating admissions and enrollment plans across academic programs and the campus as a whole, and communicating enrollment targets and progress...

Thus far the team has focused on:
• understanding the sequence of consultation and goal-setting, recruiting, and admissions, and the improvements that are being made in these processes;
• receiving and understanding admissions and enrollment reports;
• working toward enrollment goals by type (level, resident, nonresident) based on programs’ goals,
student demand, and likely economic demand; and
• understanding the reasons for student retention.

In 2008, UW Bothell completed a year-long strategic planning process to create a vision to expand access to excellence in higher education, in keeping with the mandate set forth by the legislature when it founded the campus in 1990.

Led by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and involving faculty, staff, advisory board members, alumni, students and external partners, the planning process was designed to build on the strengths developed during the founding years and create a vision for the future grounded in the UW Bothell mission. The mission states, “The University of Washington Bothell holds the student-faculty relationship to be paramount. We provide access to excellence in higher education through innovative and creative curricula, interdisciplinary teaching and research, and a dynamic community of multicultural learning.”

The process resulted in the 21st Century Campus Initiative strategic plan, outlining seven priorities to guide campus growth in size and excellence: growth, resourcefulness, diversity, student-centered, community, innovation, and sustainability.

Since that time, the plan has guided all institutional planning through a period of extraordinary growth, during which enrollment doubled, the number of degrees offered tripled, student housing was established, industry and community collaboration deepened, and campus facilities expanded.”

• Regarding resource allocations (pg. 262):

“UW Tacoma resource allocations are driven and defined by its mission as an urban serving university. Investments have been made that will:
• increase access to education for our community,
• support research initiatives that will help inform strategies and actions to address community issues and opportunities, and
• support the economic revitalization of downtown Tacoma as a mixed use living, learning, and business community.

Furthermore, resource allocation must be sustainable so that all program investments are supported by faculty ambitions and interests, student’s interests, and garner the support of the broader community. New programs must also be sustainable primarily from growth in the student population.

UW Bothell’s resource allocations are guided by the 21st Century Campus Initiative and informed on an annual basis by specific implementing principles and goals developed by the Chancellor’s Cabinet. Through broad engagement of the campus community, UW Bothell has established clear growth goals and aligned resource allocations toward achieving these goals.”

• Regarding the Royalty Research Funding (pg. 273):

“UW Tacoma also participates in the University-wide RRF program. Additionally, UW Tacoma research-supported activities include:
• staffing for pre- and post-research award support,
• summer support for assistant professors who participate in a mutually-supported grant proposal writing activity, and
• the Chancellor’s support for three new research centers.
UW Bothell utilizes the RRF application and review process to fund meritorious but unfunded RRF proposals with research cost recovery dollars. This is called the “second chance RRF” competition. Over the past three years, the average success rate for RRF applications has been 26 percent, leaving many promising proposals unfunded, despite having demonstrated a high probability of generating important new scholarly materials, resources, significant data, or information. Consequently, and to as great an extent as possible, indirect cost dollars received on current UW Bothell grants are re-invested in faculty research agendas through this internal “second chance RRF” competition.”

Regarding student learning goals (pg. 308):

“At UW Tacoma, a substantial improvement in the use of learning goals has occurred since 2008-09. At that time, when baseline data was collected, four out of seven school/programs had program student learning goals, four of seven had established learning goals for their various majors, and one unit had implemented the practices of the major or degree learning goals appearing on faculty syllabi. By 2011-12, seven out of seven school/programs had student learning goals for the program, seven out of seven had learning goals established for all majors and had posted these on their websites, and six out of seven had majority compliance with faculty placing the major’s student learning goals on their syllabi.

At UW Bothell, all of the individual course and degree programs include learning outcomes, which have been developed by the faculty and vetted by the curriculum committees in schools and programs, the campus faculty approval bodies, and the University. In addition, schools and programs have established learning goals, which are posted on their websites. The exception is the new School of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), created in March 2013 through consolidation of the existing Computing and Software Systems Program and the Science and Technology Program. Within the School of STEM, learning goals are currently at the division or degree level. Academic units assess their learning goals on a regular basis. Now that campus-wide undergraduate learning goals have been adopted, the campus is developing a comprehensive assessment plan to ensure that there are well-documented assessment efforts.”

Various summary statements compiled from the report by:
Rebecca Goodwin Deardorff, April 22, 2015.
Lazzari explained she was an invited participant of the 2005 retreat. She noted she had felt there was not a great deal of guidance from top administrators during the retreat, especially concerning its decisive aims. She explained that though the retreat was held with good intentions, ultimately, it did not largely affect change in the tri-campus model that she was aware of.

Erdly mentioned that since 2005, the branch campuses have grown substantially in size and scope. He explained that as a result, the campuses have numerous differences, and to a greater degree than a decade ago. He noted that identifying these differences has been one aim of the small group.

Erdly explained that Crowder, Nelson, and other small group members are looking at multi-campus university system models for evaluating how they operate, and identifying which schools are most successful. Nelson noted she had begun locating literature on this topic. She explained the UW is classified as a multi-site system, and that one element of this model is that the campuses retain the same vision, but operate in sometimes wholly different ways. She noted that traditionally, state governments are the bodies who fuse together numerous campuses into a single system. She noted the definitions of varying multi-campus models are important, and explained that those definitions will be available next month on the group’s shared space. She noted there does seem to be precedent for problems within multi-campus university systems. Nelson noted that the University of Illinois has a document which explains how they go about operating their multi-site university system (Exhibit 1). She noted this document is on the working group shared space. Erdly added that this document is very informational, and members should read it at their leisure.

Erdly explained he has found that Bill Ayer and other members of the UW Board of Regents are interested in the council’s review of this topic, and they may have interest in learning of the council’s findings and suggestions in going forward. Erdly explained that there are strong implications that if the council is to tackle this topic effectively, there may be an opportunity to present findings to the Board. Erdly explained anything the council suggests must be backed up by relevant data, and created with a high degree of thought.

Crowder mentioned he is struck by the strong sense of ambivalence around this topic. He explained he finds there is ambivalence surrounding each relevant issue, and this will be one of the obstacles for the council to grapple with. He noted a big challenge will be in identifying the best ways forward in uncovering useful information for this topic. He explained the working group’s ultimate goal is to come up with some philosophical approach for productively moving forward within the tri-campus system. He added there are two courses of action the small group and council should consider:

1) A call to action – take one aspect of the FCTCP report to be created, highlight the problems associated with not having a strong philosophy behind making decisions related to this aspect

2) Offer a philosophy – to be charged for guiding decisions related to the topic

Erdly explained Adams has been doing a review of all of the council’s archived minutes from years past, looking at the issues the council has taken on throughout the years. Erdly noted the council should pick three things; these might include a key operational issue, a key curriculum issue, or other issue, that are representative of the council’s concerns, and use them as a basis for different groups to join the council and offer their input. Erdly explained this exercise may inform the process on how the council might collaborate with other groups, and aid in implementing a structure for how the council may deal with a variety of issues in the future. He noted that attempting to come up with answers for a number of questions all at the same time is not advisable, as the task would be too large. Lazzari added that the 2005 Tri-Campus Retreat did not include follow-ups (actions to be taken subsequent to the retreat) that she knew about. Erdly explained the report will be useful in its identification of areas of concern, many
of which may still be relevant. He added that the FCTCP report should recognize the positive aspects of the tri-campus system at the UW as well, and that it should not seek to be a critical review.

Beauchamp explained that the council should consider choosing one course of action, and suggested using the existing literature the working group is uncovering to find one or two items of possible synergy, as a starting point.

Erdly noted he imagines the FCTCP report to be succinct and focused, comprising a maximum of two pages (not including citations). He explained he would like something to be ready in very early fall, 2015. He explained after question that the report should look into two or three issues of alignment between the campuses. Members of the council agreed this to be a good starting point.

Tennis noted that at the beginning of the current academic year, the council had discussed challenging administration to come forward with ideas for the improving the tri-campus model. He asked if there was any follow-up on this subject. Erdly noted there has not been notable follow-up that he is aware of. Though, Beauchamp explained he has found a document titled “Statement of Collaboration Endorsed by the Board of Deans and Chancellors, May 2014” (Exhibit 2). This document includes commitments to supporting four main points, which are in a basic description ideas for collaboration within the university. Beauchamp noted he will post the document to the small group’s shared space.

Deardorff explained an advantage of the multi-site university system is that each campus is handled with the same kind of functions, and thus there is some uniformity. She noted a distinction was made in the past that the administrative side of the university may benefit from being handled locally at each campus. Deardorff noted that she has compiled a document titled “Tri-Campus Notes-2013 Accreditation Report,” which shows the sections wherein UW Tacoma and Bothell are mentioned in the 2013 Accreditation Report of the University of Washington (Exhibit 3). She noted within the report, the UW refers to itself as one university and seemingly as one campus, though she noted the report does mention certain activities/achievements at the Tacoma and Bothell campuses. She noted there was a not an exact philosophy for the three campuses included in the report, but the activities of the branch campuses and their independent deeds are highlighted. She noted this is the flavor she got from reading the report.

Erdly noted that the council should consider also evaluating the Faculty Code and its application across the three campuses. He noted that this could be a possible “Phase II” of the council’s studies. After some discussion, Moy explained the UW 2Y2D report is another document which should be considered by the council for analysis. Erdly noted getting these resources available will be important for the council to go forward, and that the 2Y2D report will be made available on the shared space, as well.

Erdly noted the small working group will continue its work. He explained any member or guest of the council is welcome to join their meetings. The meeting are biweekly on Wednesdays from noon to 1pm, and any member may be added to the distribution list for the group to receive notifications for upcoming meetings. He noted the next immediate steps will be identifying focus areas.

7) Good of the order

This item was missed due to time constraints.

8) Adjourn

Erdly adjourned the meeting at 10:35 a.m.
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