Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from May 21, 2020
3. Suggested changes to Notice of Proposal curricular process – Guests: Scott Fallgren, Ann Huppert (Chair-FCAS, Menaka Abraham, Tina Miller, Grace Lasker
4. Review last year (See 2019/20 FCTCP report)
5. Plan this year’s scope of work (See 2020/21 Charge Letter)
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from April 30, 2020

The minutes from May 21, 2020 were approved as written.

3. Suggested changes to Notice of Proposal curricular process – Guests: Scott Fallgren, Ann Huppert (Chair-FCAS), Menaka Abraham, Tina Miller, Grace Lasker

Scott Fallgren (UW Curriculum Office) shared a presentation about proposed changes to the notice of proposal (NOP) process (Exhibit 1) and the written changes (Exhibit 2).

A member asked for clarification about changes made without a NOP, which are usually handled internally without tri-campus review. They noted that two of the three campuses currently have activity-based budgeting and are concerned this could lead to issues when changing their curriculum. Tina Miller noted this proposal is for program changes, not curricular changes. The NOP process addresses programs wanting to create something or alter their program offerings, which would impact enrollment on another campus. This proposed change would eliminate the more common needs for NOP’s, such as when a major is wanting to add credits to their program but does not usually raise cross-campus concern.

The suggested changes have a broad definition for ‘substantive’ to provide the curriculum office the ability to prepare for new or unusual submitted changes. About 80% of the current NOPs would be separated from this process, reducing the annually received from 65 to around 6-8. The NOP processes are now sent out to the Office of Planning and Budgeting to flag for additional concerns or comments.
FCAS Chair Huppert requested campus advisors to receive notice as well. Advisors would need to be formally added to the recipient list through a FCTCP policy change. Miller and Fallgren will consider condensing the first review process of single page NOPs from 4 weeks to 1 week, also through a policy change. They will return to the council with comments from advisors and written policy amendments.

A member noted their faculty have mentioned the process of developing a new program is very cumbersome and the faculty service load is high. Anything to simplify the purpose would be appreciated.

A motion was made to approve the current proposed changes. The council voted to approve the proposed changes.

4. Review last year (See 2019/20 FCTCP report)

Chair Montgomery shared the councils 2019-2020 annual report (Exhibit 3). The chair asked council members to review the report to determine topics of most importance.

Administrative Structure: Campus/Schools, Chancellors/Deans/Provost:
The council chair and senate vice-chair met with the Provost and President last week. It was decided campus vice-chancellors will be added to quarterly meetings with UW leadership. A member noted as there is now an avenue by which the president/provost can discuss with vice-chancellors it should be a lower priority. They expect significant progress on major services at UW Tacoma, specially an administrative change. Members emphasized that faculty should focus on code changes. The council will consider editing major services. FCTCP will address revision recommendations to the code to accomplish a change in the administrative structure.

Academic HR and EFC's - promotion, tenure, and merit:
Chair Montgomery will request more clarity of the promotion, tenure, and merit review process from the Provost. The UW Bothell campus has been pleased with their current system, but UW Tacoma would like to overhaul their system.

Academic/ Curricular Planning and Coordination:
FCAS has a history of focusing on academic issues in Seattle, but they are not code defined as explicitly a Seattle or tri-campus council. A member noted concern about the policy flexibility each campus has and that each campus has different learning goals and definitions. There was emphasis on the need for coordination across all UW campuses. The previous year, FCTCP was tasked to work with FCAS because changes made by FCAS typically have tri-campus implications. The council will continue their work with FCAS for 2020-2021.

Financial Relationship:
There are ongoing discrepancies between campuses based on need-based financial aid. A member suggested the council consider researching more of the issue before developing working plans.

Another member suggested adding tri-campus research issues to the charge letter.

5. Plan this year's scope of work (See 2020/21 Charge Letter)
The council made changes to the 2020-2021 charge letter and defined their priorities for this year (Exhibit 4):

**Code changes:**
FCTCP will work to bring the faculty code in alignment using Executive Orders. The council will discuss specific code sections at their December meeting.

**Academic standards:**
The council will operate in conjunction with FCAS on policy changes for all three campuses.

**Financial aid:**
Council members considered inviting guests to discuss major services related to financial aid issues. They suggested Kay Lewis (OSFA Director, UW Seattle), Scott James (UW Bothell), and Victoria Ouhi (UW Tacoma)

**Research equity:**
The council will also coordinate with the Faculty Council on Research to discuss research equity.

6. **Good of the order**
Vice-Chair of the faculty senate Chris Laws introduced themselves to the council. They noted the senate is concentrating on tri-campus concerns this year and thanked everyone for the council’s hard work.

7. **Adjourn**
The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 a.m.

---

Minutes by Alexandra Portillo, xanport@uw.edu, council analyst

**Present:**
- **Faculty Governance Section 42-32 A:** Antony Smith, Cinnamon Hillyard, Lawrence Goldman, Wes Lloyd, Lauren Montgomery
- **Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:** Jason Naranjo, Chris Laws, Turan Kayaoglu
- **Faculty Code Section 21-61 C:** Jacob Vigdor, Suzan Parker, Janet Primomo, Clara Coyote, Larry Knopp
- **Invited Guests:** Scott Fallgren, Tina Miller, Ann Huppert (FCAS chair), Menaka Abraham

**Absent:**
- **Faculty Governance Section 42-32 A:** Antony Smith
- **Faculty Code Section 21-61 B:** Annette Anderson, JoAnn Taricani

**Exhibits**
- Exhibit 1 - Proposed_NOP_process_revision
- Exhibit 2 - undergraduate_curriculum_coordination_uwco_proposed_revisions
- Exhibit 3 - FCTCP Report 2019-2020
- Exhibit 4 - FCTCP Charge Letter 2020-21
Notice of Proposal (NOP) Process Change

Issue

- Substantive change NOP review requirement adds at least one month of review time to the undergraduate program proposal review process when almost none (97%) have generated tri-campus review comments
  - Since NOP process implemented in March 2019, 89 NOPs have been submitted (24 new; 65 substantive changes)
  - Of 65 substantive program change proposals, only 2 NOPs had tri-campus comments (one was supportive, the other was a suggestion)

Request

- Update current process so an NOP is only required for new program proposals and the following substantive program changes:
  - Program name change
  - Change of delivery method
  - Change of admission type, for example, from minimum requirements to capacity constrained
  - Changes at discretion of the Office of the University Registrar
1. Notice of Proposal (NOP) completed by academic unit, approved through academic unit approval process, and sent to UW Curriculum Office (UWCO)

2. UWCO reviews NOP, prepares for Tri-Campus review

3. NOP electronically posted for review; email notification sent to: (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) Office of the Provost, (3) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs, (4) the Chair of each academic program review committee, and (5) Chair of FCTCP

4. After 15 business day review period ends, UWCO documents comments (if any)

5. UWCO notifies academic unit
   - No comments (or comments of support), proceed to step 6
   - Significant comments to be resolved shall be reviewed by the University Registrar

6. Academic unit moves forward with developing a 1503 undergraduate program proposal and following the approval process for their campus

---

**Notes:**
- Reported to ICAPP as “Idea.”
- Sent to ICAPP as a “Notice of Proposal.”
- IRC FYI occurs at this stage, if necessary.
- Sent to ICAPP for “30-Day Review.”
- Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU) approval may not be required depending on the type of substantive change (does not apply to non-substantive changes); if not, no advertising or enrollments are permitted until UW Presidential approval has been received. If necessary, No advertising or enrollments are permitted until NWCCU approval has been received.
University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination

Updated February 19, 2019 TBD 2020

Introduction

Executive Order IV, Policy Directory, Faculty Code and Governance, Chapter 13 Section 13-23.C: Legislative Authority of the Faculty (3 February 2004) requires the President to refer the following types of undergraduate program changes to the Faculty Senate for coordinated faculty review by all three campuses:
undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, or other transcriptable programs, or substantive changes to the same, regardless of campus of origin. The purpose of this process is to enhance the quality of undergraduate course offerings through peer review, promote coordination and communication among the colleges, schools, and campuses, and to promote faculty collaboration that can lead to greater quality and optimal use of resources. This memo describes the process for carrying out the University Campuses Review Process. Please note, however, that no campus has the power or authority to veto a program or program change proposed by another campus. Finally, this review is designed to generate feedback at a point in time where the proposals are developed but not approved so that the originating campus can make full use of any feedback that is provided.

Process

Stage 0: Notice of Proposal
Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals
Stage II

Stage 0: Notice of Proposal

1. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. In order to facilitate coordination of substantive changes to their curriculum, a unit planning to offer a new undergraduate degree, major, minor, option, or other transcriptable credential or substantive change\footnote{To any of these, should prepare a Notice of Proposal (NOP). If a unit is uncertain whether or not a change is substantive, they should contact the campus-specific curriculum review committee.} to any of these, should prepare a Notice of Proposal (NOP). If a unit is uncertain whether or not a change is substantive, they should contact the campus-specific curriculum review committee.
2. Once a unit has drafted an NOP, and had it approved by the appropriate administrators in its School or College, the document should be sent electronically to the University Curriculum Office. Staff will conduct a preliminary review to assure that appropriate information and approvals have been included. Once that review has been completed, the Curriculum Office will inform the appropriate campus academic program review committee that an NOP has been submitted.

3. The NOP will be posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days before it can be submitted to the campus-specific curriculum review process.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Curriculum Office shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) Office of the Provost, (3) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs, (4) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee, and (5) the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

5. If there are no significant comments to be resolved, or if they have been resolved, the unit may go forward with developing the proposal. A record of the NOP will be kept electronically that is password protected, including comments made during the early notice period.

6. Once a full proposal has been developed, the NOP will be included in the official university-wide full tri-campus review.

**Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals**

1. Following the university-wide NOP review and after a campus unit develops and approves a curricular offering, it should be forwarded to the appropriate academic program review committee for that campus.

2. The academic program review committee of each campus shall make an initial determination that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit academic program review. It shall also determine whether the proposed change meets the guidelines for tri-campus review. If a campus academic program review committee has questions about the applicability of the Tri-campus review process, they should consult the University Registrar.

   a. If the proposal meets this threshold, it shall be forwarded immediately to the University Curriculum Office. Materials to be forwarded to the University Curriculum Office must include, in electronic form:
      i. A completed university curriculum Form 1503
      ii. The rationale for the proposal
b. If the proposal is not complete, it shall be returned by the University Curriculum Office to the unit of origin for further development.

3. When the University Curriculum Office receives the completed program proposal, it will be immediately posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Curriculum Office shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs and (3) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

At the end of the comment period, the University Curriculum Office shall compile all comments made on the proposal and forward the comments to the Chair of the academic program review committee at the originating campus. That committee shall then consider all comments as part of their academic program review process, and shall provide a summary of responses to the comments received from all campuses.

Stage II

1. The originating campus academic program review committee will obtain final campus approvals on the final proposal.

2. When final campus approval has been received the proposal will be forwarded by the appropriate campus official to the University Curriculum Office.

3. The University Curriculum Office will forward the final proposal to the President for final action and transmittal to the appropriate dean/chancellor and Chair of the Faculty Senate. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

Substantive changes requiring an NOP include, but are not limited to:

a. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript, for example, new or changed degree titles, minors, or options, etc.

b. Changing admission type, for example, from minimum requirements to capacity constrained.
c. Any change in a program on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses, for example changing the format of a program to distance learning or fee-based offering.

d. Any change, at the discretion of the Office of the University Registrar, warranting tri-campus review.

The originating campus’ academic program review committee will review its own proposals, and should consider the following elements, using its own processes and criteria:

- Fit with campus and university mission
- Academic quality
- Need
- Effects on students
- Effects on other programs
- Feasibility/operational viability
- Adherence to University and Campus policies

As stated in the Executive Order, tri-campus review is required for new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, or substantive changes to the same of a non-routine nature. This includes, but may not be limited to:

a. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript, for example, new or changed degree titles, minors, or options, etc.
b. Changes in pre-requisites that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students admitted to the major, minor, or option.
c. Changes in graduation requirements that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students completing the major, minor, or option.
d. Any change in a program on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses, for example changing the format of a program to distance learning or fee-based offering.

The Registrar may grant a 5-business day extension of this deadline to any individual who submits a written request to the Registrar prior to the end of the original comment period.
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy  
2019-2020 Annual Report  
Submitted by chair Lauren Montgomery

Summary:

During the 2019-2020 academic year, the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met six times in regular meetings, conducting its routine business of relevance to all three UW campuses (UW Seattle, UW Tacoma, UW Bothell). Details of these actions can be found in the meeting minutes, which are located on the council’s page on the UW Faculty Senate website. In addition to the routine business outlined above, the following non-routine business was conducted.

Major topics the council worked to address and/or completed during the year include:

❖ Tri-Campus Administrative Structure Evaluation

In our October meeting we identified six areas of focus for evaluation of tri-campus structure:

1) Administrative Structure: Campus/Schools, Chancellors/Deans/Provost
2) Academic HR and EFC’s - promotion, tenure, and merit
3) Major Services: Registration/Student Management, Enrollment, Financial Aid
4) Legislative Affairs - work with state government in Olympia
5) Academic/ Curricular Planning and Coordination
6) Financial Relationship

In November and January, we held conversations on administrative structure and in January arrived at some preliminary recommendations that were sent via email on January 30th to the President, Provost & Chancellors, with request for feedback.

Preliminary recommendations for administrative structure:

(a) Remove Chancellors from the Board of Deans and Chancellors (BoDC) and add the Chairs of the Board of Deans (or another dean representative) from Bothell and Tacoma. If travel proves prohibitive, the representatives from Bothell and Tacoma on BoDC can utilize Zoom and other high-quality online options to participate in these biweekly meetings. Note that this does not increase the size of the BoDC.

(b) Create an upper administrative group that comprises the President, Provost, Chancellors, and Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs that meets regularly (perhaps quarterly).
After these recommendations were sent a concern was raised about the short term-length of the chairs of the boards of deans at Bothell (1 year) and Tacoma (2 years). This rapid turnover may result in a lack of continuity of campus representation on the BoDC.

Then, in late March, because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Bothell and Tacoma VCAA’s were invited to attend the Seattle BoDC meetings. They both found the meetings highly instructive and useful, as did the faculty and deans on their campuses, and would like to continue to be included in those meetings. However, they are not currently sure of their formal role on BoDC nor its duration and are requesting clarification on this as we move forward. They have noted that not all of the agenda items are relevant to tri-campus interests, and it was suggested that perhaps subgroups meet for certain agendas, or some other configuration such as ordering the agenda to designate time for Seattle-campus business to support efficient but effective meetings.

❖ **Promotion & Tenure**

In February and April, we addressed academic P&T across the three campuses and identified issues of timing, labor, process, and the nature of P&T reviews (substantive or procedural) on the three campuses.

In terms of the timing of reviews, Bothell and Tacoma are similar and both are distinct from Seattle. However, Bothell differs from Tacoma in the role the deans play in the reviews, and in the degree to which labor equity issues are identified and addressed as a result. Here is a brief outline of these differences in how PT committees function:

a. **Bothell**: School PT Committee – Dean – Campus PT – Chancellor – Provost

   Deans present cases to campus PT committee, CCPT functions as oversight on labor equity issues and circles back with Deans to improve equity across campus.

b. **Tacoma**: School PT committee – Dean – Campus PT – Chancellor – Provost

   (Deans send letters to campus PT)

c. **Seattle**: Department/School PT committee – Dean – Provost

   New process being created for non-departmentalized schools.

In our **May** meeting we continued the academic P&T conversation and concluded that:

- Bothell is largely happy with their process but wish to adapt the Faculty Code to be consistent with Executive Orders in terms of the relationship of the campuses and their schools.
• The code changes needed center around the role of Chancellors. Currently the code language (Chancellors function as deans) is different from the Executive Order (once schools formed then deans function as deans), and these need to be brought into alignment. This would resolve a number of other issues arising from this discrepancy.
• Tacoma may want to change their process and will undergo a full review of their P&T process as part of their Faculty Assembly work in 2020-2021.
• While the final decision authority lies with the Provost on academic P&T, all three campuses would like to have more clarity on the considerations taken in the decision-making process on P&T cases at that level.

Council membership 2019-20 academic year

Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Lauren Montgomery (Chair), Cinnamon Hillyard, Antony Smith, Lawrence Goldman, Joseph Tennis, Wes Lloyd, Keith Nitta, Robin Angotti, Sarah Hampson, JoAnn Taricani
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Suzan Parker, Sam Akeyo, Annette Anderson, Janet Primomo
Presidential Designees: Sharon Jones, Patricia Moy, Jill Purdy
October 16th, 2020

Professor Lauren Montgomery, Chair
Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy

Dear Professor Montgomery:

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy is charged with responsibility “for matters of academic and non-academic policy between and among the campuses of the University of Washington” (Faculty Code, Sec 42-46). Activities historically performed include conducting tri-campus review as part of the approval process for proposed curriculum changes, analyzing possibilities for synergy among UW campuses, and advising and informing key administrators from all three campuses on the issues and interests of the others.

Our recommendation is that the council identify specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2020-21 academic year.

The Senate office did a background review to help identify goals for your council. This included review of minutes from last year’s meetings, review of discussions at Faculty Senate meetings, and selected outreach for topics. Recommended goals and/or topics for discussion include:

- Identify code changes that would create clear and consistent relationships, roles, and processes across the three campuses
- Engage in the process to craft the code change recommendations with the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Executive Committee
- Reconsider the remaining tri-campus structure issues identified last year and seek additional topics:
  - Major Services related to Financial Aid
  - Research equity with the Faculty Council on Research
- Work with Faculty Council on Academic Standards on policy changes that impact all three campuses

After your first council meeting, we will be available to discuss the goals your council identified. Thereafter, we will post your council’s goals on the Faculty Senate website to communicate the important work you are doing.

Many thanks to you and the members of your council, on behalf of Senate Leadership and the faculty of the University, for all your time and work this coming year. I wish you all the best and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Robin Angotti
Chair, Faculty Senate