Chair Marcia Killien called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:
1. Approval of minutes
2. History of UW campuses (N. Rose)
3. Three-campus review of UWT program proposals
4. Status of draft legislation (Stein, Bellamy)
5. Announcements/new business

1. Approval of the Minutes
Minutes from the October 23, 2006, minutes were approved.

2. History of UW Campuses (N. Rose)
In introducing Professor Emeritus Norm Rose, Alan Wood reiterated the Council’s hope that they could work toward a Faculty Code revision that would better and more accurately reflect the current practices, structures and processes that have evolved on the new campuses. He said there is a renewed interest in bringing the Code up to the reality of the relationship among the three campuses – the crux of that question being what is the reality.

In response, Professor Rose suggested that the reality of the relationship must be defined by what works best for the students. The Bothell and Tacoma campuses were founded by the state legislature to address the needs of place-, time-, and work-bound students in those areas north and south of Seattle, who would otherwise have no access to state-funded higher education. Although the percentage of Bothell and Tacoma students who are employed is about the same as that of Seattle students, the Bothell and Tacoma students work on average significantly more hours than Seattle students. There are some very real differences among the students at the three campuses. Within the University there are Schools and Colleges that function (because of their size and internal complexity) like universities in their own right. There are others that function more like a medium-size department. The new campuses benefit from Seattle’s world-class library system and internet infrastructure. But they are also hindered in some regards by their association with the larger institution. The complexity of determining a course of action, including “defining reality,” is very difficult. The important thing is to focus on the students and what they need. This too will be extremely complex, and the only way to succeed to any extent is to practice flexibility and nimbleness. If students have different needs within or among the three campuses, those needs must be taken into account. Professor Rose challenged the Council to consider issues raised about the 3-campus relationship in terms of student needs rather than issues of power and control.

Rose suggested the Council consider reading The Founding Brothers, by Joseph J. Ellis, which chronicles the difficulties in crafting the documents needed for the establishment of this country. Similar skills and sensitivities will be required from the work of the Council as it addresses these questions.
In response to a question about faculty research at the new campuses, Professor Rose suggested that although this requires a careful balancing act because of the many demands on new campus faculty, this too depends in part on what’s best for the students. If a professor stops developing intellectually, his/her effectiveness as a teacher diminishes over time. Faculty at the new campuses in general need to exhibit evidence of intellectual growth for their students’ sake, for its positive impact on their faculty colleagues and most of all, for the affirmative feeling of growth they experience themselves. Their research and scholarship should be commensurate in quality with that of their Seattle colleagues, but not necessarily at the quantity of Seattle faculty.

He suggested that there is tension within the campuses, not just among them. All three campuses are under-enrolled now, due to an improving economy. Chair Marcia Killien suggested the Council acknowledge the struggles experienced during the beginnings of the new Council, but encouraged members to consider the direction these campuses should take moving forward. With nimbleness and flexibility, the Council’s action may be able to avoid the tendency to pit campuses in competition with one another.

Steven Collins (UWB) emphasized that for an integrated model of the University to work, trust is also needed among faculty at a deeper level when it comes to budget discussions. Budget discussions should be considered by the faculty as a whole – not as representatives of three separate (and competing) entities.

Further discussion will be continued at the next meeting. Tom Bellamy and Marcy Stein were asked to come prepared with draft proposals for changes in the Faculty Code to meet the concerns of UWB and UWT. This will be discussed at the next meeting in preparation for sending a recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee in January.

3. Three-campus review of UWT program proposals
Prior to the meeting, Chair Killien distributed a collection of requests via e-mail for three campus (final) review of a set of changes submitted by UWT for changing concentrations to majors. She asked teams of members of FCTCP to do a pre-review of these materials prior to the meeting.

After discussion, the following three proposals were approved for forwarding to the Registrar’s office by a unanimous vote:

A. Arts, Media and Culture (TIAS-20050726A)
B. American Studies (TIAS-20050726B)
D. Communication (TIAS-20050726D)

Action will be taken on the remaining proposals via e-mail and at the next (December 8) meeting.

4. Status of Draft Legislation (M. Stein, T. Bellamy)
Discussion deferred until the next (December 8) meeting.

5. Announcements/New business
There were no announcements, and no new business was brought up.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.
Minutes by Susan Folk, Office of Regional Affairs, slfolk@u.washington.edu, or 206-221-4183.
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