Report on Tri-campus Retreat: A Strategy for Decision Making

- 1. Retreat Agenda.
- 2. Membership.
- 3. Working Group Assignments.
- 4. Core Assumptions.
- 5. Example of Benefits and Disadvantages from 3 Working Groups.

Tri-campus Task Force Retreat October 29-30, 2004 — Agenda

Friday, October 29, 2004

7:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Registration and Continental Breakfast.
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	 Plenary Session. Welcome – Provost David Thorud Introduction, logistics – Doug Wadden Historical and political context – Fred Campbell SHB 2707 Report summary (Bothell) – Chancellor Warren Buck SHB 2707 Report summary (Tacoma) – Interim Chancellor Steve Olswang Steering Committee background for the retreat – Doug Wadden Components of a three-campus university – Ross Heath Working Group Discussions – Campbell, Heath, Wadden Final Charge and Concluding Comments – Thorud and Wadden Brief assembly of Working Groups – Group Chairs
11:30 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.	Lunch.
12:45 p.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Working Groups assemble in breakout rooms.
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.	Working Group discussions; select issues for plenary session presentation.
3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Break.
4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Plenary Session — Working Group Reports - Part I; Groups 1, 2 and 3.
5:00 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Time Off. (Pick up room keys – bags will be delivered to rooms.)
5:45 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.	Social Hour.
6:45 p.m. – 8:15 p.m.	Dinner.
8:30 p.m. – 8:50 p.m.	President Emmert.
8:50 p.m. – 9:30 p.m.	Plenary Session — Working Group Reports - Part II; Groups 4 and 5.

Saturday, October 30, 2004

6:30 a.m. – 8:00 a.m.	Continental Breakfast Buffet.
8:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	Plenary Session – Working Group Reports – Part III; Groups 6, 7, 8 and 9.
9:30 a.m. – 9:45 a.m.	Break.
9:45 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	Working Groups — Incorporate Suggestions, Finalize Reports.
11:15 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.	Break.
11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.	Plenary Session (Working Lunch) — Consider Working Group Drafts and Agree on Final Instructions to Steering Committee.
1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.	Steering Committee Meeting.

Saturday times will be adjusted according to the conduct of Friday's meeting.

Tri-campus Task Force Web Site: http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/tri-campus/

Working Group Assignments

1. Management (11) Atrium Room

Gerry Philipsen, Chair	David Thorud	Adam Grupp*	Steven Olswang
Kim Johnson-Bogart, Coordinator	Weldon Ihrig	Randy Hodgins	Warren Buck
Jack Faris	Fred Campbell	Daniel Evans	

2. Campus Integration (9) Vintage Room

Gail Stygall, Chair	Robert Jackson (T)	Jane Decker (B)	Bruce Bare
Susan Jeffords, Coordinator	Rusty Barcelo	Shelly Yapp	David Notkin

3. Finance/Staff/Human Resources (11) Falls Terrace Room

Alan Wood (B), Chair	Patti Carson	Connie Kravas	Gary Quarfoth
Marilyn Cox, Coordinator	Vanessa Chio (T)	Richard Startz	Pamela Stewart
Charles Chamberlin	Key Nuttall		

4. Academic Programs (10) Board Room

Gail Dubrow, Chair	Tom Bellamy (B)	Marcie Lazzari (T)	Susan Woods
Paul Lepore, Coordinator	Donald Janssen	Robert Stacey	Carl See*
George Bridges	Thomas Lee		

5. Baccalaureate Options (8) Potlatch Room

Donna Kerr, Chair	Belinda Louie (T)	Jack Nelson (T)	Susan Franzosa (B)
Carol Niccolls, Coordinator	Steve Holland (B)	Wendy Cook (T)*	Andy O'Connell*

6. Faculty (9) Salish Ballroom

Lea Vaughn, Chair	Marcy Stein (T)	Michael Kalton (T)	Dan Jacoby (B)
Robert Corbett, Coordinator	Ashley Emery	Kevin Laverty (B)	Daniel Luchtel
Constantin Behler (B)			

7. Students/Access/Enrollment Policy (10) Salish Ballroom

Pete Dukes, Chair	Tim Washburn	Enrique Morales	Ernest Morris
Deborah Wiegand, Coordinator	Kelsy Knowles*	Dan Garcia (T)	Monte Spencer (B)*
Becky Rosenberg (B)			

8. Support Services (9) Potlatch Room

Tana Hasart (B), Chair	Charles Lord (T)	Craig Murphy (B)*	Betsy Wilson
Phillip Hoffman, Coordinator	Sarah Leadley (B)	Edward Lightfoot	Carol Van Natta (T)
Becky Etheridge (T)			

9. Research Models (10) Falls Terrace Room

Malcolm Parks, Chair	Betty Feetham	Lawrence Snyder	Ilene Schwartz
Charles Emlet (T), Coordinator	James W. Harrington	Cherry Banks (B)	Andrea Kovalesky (B)
Connie Proctor	Margaret Spearmon		

*Student

Tri-campus Task Force Retreat Nine Working Groups

Considering 3-campus organizational models that range from highly integrated to completely independent, what are the options for the areas assigned to your group (a few are listed to get you started) and what are the benefits and disadvantages of each? The benefits and disadvantages need not be the same for all three campuses.

Working Group 1: Management

- Board of Regents.
- Office of the President.
- Office of the Provost.
- Mission.
- Federal and State Relations.

Working Group 2: Campus Integration

- Highly integrated (UW).
- Coordinated (UW).
- Autonomous (UW).
- Independent (UW).

Working Group 3: Finance/Staff/Human Resources

- Operating budgets.
- Capital planning and construction budgets.
- Contracting.
- Human resources/professional development.
- Risk management.
- Environmental health and safety.
- Tuition and revenue.
- Ect. . . .

Working Group 4: Academic Programs

- Organization of colleges, schools, departments.
- Academic programs.
- Instructional models.
- Academic honors.
- Undergraduate degrees.
- Graduate degrees.
- Professional degrees.
- Accreditation.

Working Group 5: Baccalaureate Options

- All campuses 4-year with CC transfers.
- Some campuses upper-division only.
- Some campuses upper division with limited lower division offerings to meet program requirements.

Working Group 6: Faculty

- Faculty Code.
- Faculty governance.
- Faculty tenure.

Working Group 7: Students/Access/Enrollment Policy

- Student government.
- Student activities.
- Student admissions.
- Course transfers between campuses.
- Allocation of students FTEs between campuses.

Working Group 8: Support Services

- Library services.
- Information technology.
- Development activities.
- Management of investments.

Working Group 9: Research Model

- All campuses evolve to research universities.
- Some campuses emphasize research with a regional focus.
- Some campuses focus primarily on undergraduate education with subordinate research.

Working Group 1: Management Mission Preamble

- **Core assumption I.** As we proceed with tri-campus discussions and decisions, we should regularly revisit the questions of what is best for students, what is in the public interest, and what will maximize the public good.
- **Core assumption II.** Discussion of a tri-campus future must always consider the place of the UW in the larger context of higher education in the State of Washington.
- **Core assumption III.** The UW Board of Regents has a statewide responsibility to articulate how UW will contribute to higher education in the State.
- **Core assumption IV.** Decisions about mission must shape discussions about a three-campus management structure.
- **Core assumption V.** Because what is good for students and the public interest will change over time, programs and management structure must evolve to meet that good.
- **Core assumption VI.** To have a common brand, UW needs to balance centralized authority and control with localized needs and interests.

Tri-Campus Task Force - Group 1 - Management

Topic: Office of President

Option: Single President, who is also CEO of UW-S

BENEFITS

- No question who is in charge
- One voice, single institutional spokesperson
- Does not require change from status quo
- Simpler, therefore more elegant
- Less expensive
- Management model fits functional difference
 among units
- Current moment—need flexibility over time

DISADVANTAGES

- Too big a job for one person
- Confusion of roles
- Conflict of interest; issues of preference in favor of Seattle

Tri-Campus Task Force - Group 2 – Campus Integration

Topic: Campus Integration

Option: Compact

BENEFITS

- Term agreements that allow opportunities to check in on progress towards goals
- Allows ability to focus on specific issues and not all aspects of campus
- Clarity of differentiation
- Create more thoughtful models of change
- Deliberate determination of future
- Customized to each campus
- Could be more responsive to changing student demographics
- Enable university to better articulate how it contributes to overall needs of state

DISADVANTAGES

- Need to re-identify at end of term
- Cannot renegotiate faculty contracts
- Difficult to return to earlier model
- Could affect recruitment if faculty perceive that rules may change
- Change may not take place except in terms of compact
- Time-consuming process
- Will require institutional resources to re-visit compacts on a regular basis

Tri-Campus Task Force - Group 9 – Research Models

Topic: Research models

Option: Emphasize research with regional focus

BENEFITS

- Respond to specific community needs
- Better accountability
- Increased local industry involvement for funding
- Allows clear campus identity
- Stronger relationship with stakeholders (local/regional)
- Greater potential for political support
- A given campus could become a magnet for research on a given topic
- Richer student opportunities/experiences (assuming mobility)
- Potential for complementary multi-campus research
- Opportunity to see and apply results of research (research accountability)

DISADVANTAGES

- Might not take advantage of broader national and global implications of research.
- Might de-emphasize regionally focused work at other campuses
- May limit faculty who are attracted, and what they work on
- May reduce global sensitivity
- May limit funding
- Potential for changing view of quality of faculty (at regionally focused campus)