

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES FORUM
TUESDAY, February 5, 2008
CARWEIN AUDITORIUM
12:50-2pm

In Attendance: Elizabeth Alexander, Orlando Baiocchi, Isabelle Bichindaritz, Erin Casey, Donald Chinn, Sam Chung, Sian Davies-Vollum, Linda Dawson, Tom Diehm, Marjorie Dobratz, Denise Drevdahl, Ehsan Feroz, Laura Feuerborn, Jerry Finn, Sharon Fought, Michelle Garner, Teresa Holt, Michael Honey, Diane Kinder, Bill Kunz, Janice Laakso, Karen Landenburger, June Lowenberg, George Mobus, Stern Neill, Julie Nicoletta, Mark Pendras, Janet Primomo, Marcy Stein, Christine Stevens, Cathy Tashiro, Riki Thompson, Larry Wear, Dan Zimmerman

Assistant to the Faculty Assembly: Jamie Kelley

Guests: Dan Luctell, David Lovell, Gerry Philipsen, Beth Rushing, Renee Smith-Nyberg, Pat Spakes

The meeting was called to order at 12:55 pm

Marcy Stein introduced Renee Smith-Nyberg to the faculty. Renee facilitated the Schools and Colleges discussion.

Members of the UW Seattle Senate were invited to UWT to attend the meeting. They met with members of the UWT administration, Marcy Stein and Janet Primomo prior to the Schools and Colleges discussion.

Gerry Philipsen was introduced and gave the UWT faculty a brief history of RCEP and its process. In the past, a UW Dean made decisions without proper consultation, after which the UW faculty decided to create a procedure to be followed if reorganization, consolidation or elimination were being considered. This is now Chapter 26 in the Faculty Code. Revisions are currently underway to make this chapter more user-friendly. RCEP intervenes close to the end of a process, after faculty recommendations have been made and the campus has decided what they would like to do.

Stern Neill asked Gerry how the creation of new programs is addressed, if Chapter 26 and RCEP mainly deal with the elimination of programs. The Program Identification Committee (PIC) consists of outside campus members, which does not work as effectively for creation and growth as it does for elimination. Gerry said that PIC would respect the local unit and provide a check on process by asking if the Dean followed the proper procedures.

Ehsan Feroz feels that it is important to address the larger issues beyond the Faculty Code, such as the issues surrounding the management of growth. He does not feel that

this is adequately addressed by the code, and suggested the formation of a Tri-Campus council for growth management.

Gerry reiterated that UW has one code and one central government. RCEP is more about regulating change, and gives creation power to the President and Board of Regents.

Beth Rushing circulated the following document generated by the UWT administration to articulate how the administration sees this process:

Guide to schools and colleges discussion at UWT
2/5/08

We developed this guide in preparation for campus discussions of how we might organize into schools and colleges at UWT. While the details of the final structure remain to be established, the information here may be helpful in thinking about the issues we need to consider for any organizational changes we might propose.

- Pat Spakes, Beth Rushing, and Jim Coolsen

Responsibilities of Parties:

1. The Chancellor's responsibility is to determine what planning parameters exist in the view of the President, Provost and Regents, and to communicate that internally, thus setting the parameters for the internal discussion. The Chancellor is also responsible for seeing to it that all University policies and procedures are followed.
2. Consistent with the principles of shared governance and the Faculty Code, the primary responsibility for *how* Academic Affairs is organized belongs with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the academic leaders, and faculty.
3. Consistent with the principles of shared governance and the Faculty Code, the responsibility for determining what the structure of a particular College will be (how it will be organized, what its mission will be, how its budget will be handled) is a shared function, but with approval required by the Chancellor.
4. Establishment of new schools and colleges requires recommendation of the Chancellor and agreement by the Provost. The President recommends to the Regents. The Faculty Senate also makes a recommendation to the President prior to consideration by the Regents. Therefore, the Vice Chancellor, Chancellor, and Faculty Assembly leadership at UWT would be working closely with the Tri-campus Committee and Faculty Senate to ensure that appropriate consultation and review occurs. IF we determine that we wish to move ahead, there will be lots of opportunity for faculty and administrators to work out the details of the plan together and follow an appropriate timeline.

Parameters:

- (1) Our first School at UWT was established with a major gift and Regents' approval. So, the precedent for having a School or College established at UWT exists. That School currently has about 35 faculty, staff and administrators.
- (2) With only 2650 students and 133 full time faculty, it is clear that the UW administration and Regents will not approve 7 deans and schools/colleges.
- (3) Bringing any proposal forward will require us to have a plan for the organizational structure of Academic Affairs that clarifies the status of all 6 existing academic programs.
- (4) A small university of our size would typically have three or four schools and colleges.
- (5) While we need a plan for the whole, there is no requirement that all of our future schools or colleges (if indeed they ever exist) must be established simultaneously. As long as we have an approved plan with a solid rationale and we follow it, we could be creative in what we propose in terms of timing. For example, we might propose that one new College be established in the short run, and a timeline could be established for the future implementation of the remainder of the plan when certain "milestones" are reached. Such milestones might be based on a set of growth indicators such as number of faculty, number of students graduated, number of degree programs offered. Or, the milestone might be a related to other factors, such as establishment of a new set of disciplines, consistent with our academic plans.
- (6) Outside of the requirements of the Faculty Code, there is no prescribed administrative structure, and one College can be organized somewhat differently from another.
- (7) We will not make organizational changes that jeopardize professional or regional accreditation.
- (8) Staff in Academic Affairs will need to be kept informed and involved (as appropriate) in the discussions and planning for any reorganization we undertake.

Definitions

In some institutions, the terms "School" and "College" indicate whether the academic programs contained within the unit are primarily professional in nature (i.e., "Schools" of Social Work, Education, Nursing, Dentistry, Business, Engineering) or are instead oriented toward the liberal arts, sciences, and humanities fields ("College")

of Arts and Sciences, Fine and Performing Arts, Humanities.) Naming our Business Program the Milgard “School” follows this general tradition.

In Seattle this distinction tends to exist. But, there are also exceptions. Architecture and Urban Planning would be a “school” at many institutions, but is a “college” at UW. Such differences, when they appear, often relate to the historic origins of the programs. And sometimes, exceptionally large institutions use the term “school” to refer to subunits or divisions within one extremely large College, such as Arts and Sciences.

While there are general and customary practices, expediency and the unique needs of widely varying institutions have blurred the distinctions over time.

Internal (Campus) Process:

In the event that one or more units wish to consider exploring the possibility of a joining together to create a new college, there inevitably is a list of potential concerns that need to be addressed. In this circumstance, each unit usually wonders whether budget autonomy and/or staff would be lost, whether promotion and tenure will change, whether staff could be reassigned to another unit, etc. Here, we expect to work these matters out through a series of meetings between the concerned faculties and/or their leadership. Each faculty might want to work out in advance a list of “non-negotiables” that would need to be protected. Then administrators and faculty can work together, with the Faculty Code as one guide. With a certain amount of commitment and creativity on all sides, university structures usually have enough flexibility in them that a model can be designed that addresses needs and meets established goals.

In any case, there will need to be some time given to working out what each new School or College will look like, what it will be called, what its mission will be, and how it will function – again within the Faculty Code.

Some Pros and Cons of Schools and Colleges v. Academic Programs

PROS

- Encouragement of Interdisciplinarity and Improved Communication – Schools and colleges would promote and facilitate both concepts which are integral and fundamental to the UW Tacoma Strategic Plan. They would also structurally encourage consensus building and campus culture.
- Enhancement of Shared Governance – Schools and colleges would enable a more “representative” structure by creating a larger pool of faculty for service on university committees, freeing small programs from the need to provide members for every group. This, in turn, would allow more individual faculty time for research and concentration on teaching.

- Possible Improvement of Promotion and Tenure Processes – Schools and colleges would offer the potential for these recommendations to be made by faculty at that level, rather than campus-wide. This can assist with the problem of individuals from very separate disciplines judging accomplishments of individuals in disciplines unfamiliar to them.
- Financial Benefits – Deans are hired partially as and are expected to be fundraisers. Alternate funding sources for the campus are generally going to be increasingly necessary, and one particular area that deans can assist is with grant funding for research. In addition, economies of scale from consolidation of duties can occur with schools and colleges, particularly if professional staff is assured there will no job loss.
- Visibility and Stature with the External Community – This benefit is not only the well-know recognition factor, but schools and colleges will also have real benefits for recruiting faculty (even deans themselves) and students at all levels.

CONS

- Needless Additional Level of Bureaucracy – Administration would become more “remote,” and costs associated with new structure might offset any economies of scale.
- Change in Relationship with UW Seattle – There would be possible adverse effects on current direct relationships of many programs with their Seattle (and Bothell) counterparts.
- Uncertainty about Accreditation – Concerns have been expressed about professional accreditation issues. While examples exist at other institutions, the details for how to manage and address these concerns on this campus and within programs will need to be worked out.
- Uncertainty about Staff Employment – Concerns have been raised about how reorganization into schools and colleges would affect staff members’ jobs.

Many questions and concerns were raised in this meeting. The following have been summarized and posted on the Faculty Assembly website.

Faculty questions/concerns that need to be answered in order to make a decision regarding whether or not to continue the Schools and Colleges discussion:

What are the thresholds and criteria that would allow a program to become a school or college?

What happens if Nursing and Social Work do not meet the thresholds/criteria in X amount of time as laid out in a proposed plan to convert to schools and colleges? What is the backup plan if this happens? What is the faculty's role in this process?

How will the strategic plans that individual programs are working on mesh with the process for moving to schools and colleges?

How does the schools and colleges process at UWT intersect with RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Programs, Chapter 26 of the Faculty Code)?

What is UWT trying to achieve with this schools and colleges reorganization? What is the purpose? Why are we having these discussions?

What is it exactly that needs to change within IAS? If IAS wants to become a college, why not let it go forward on its own? IAS should not be the driving force for other programs.

If the faculty vote on schools and colleges, how can we ensure that one large program does not influence what happens with smaller programs? Can smaller programs be consolidated against their will? Can IAS be prevented from becoming a college by one or two smaller programs that do not want to reorganize into schools and colleges?

Should IAS be used as an example in the S&C reorganization learning curve?

What is the purpose of a Catalyst vote? Would the result be binding? A Catalyst vote should be considered in the context of the program votes already taken.

What happens if there are both directors and deans running units? How does the administrative structure address this issue?