

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**

April 21st, 2016

9am – 10:30am

Gerberding 26

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order & Introductions
 2. Approval of the minutes from February 25, 2014
 3. Report from the Chair
 - a. Update on Revised Faculty Salary Policy – Class A (Exhibit K) and Class C Proposed Faculty Senate Legislation (Exhibit L) as proposed for consideration by the Faculty Senate (April 21)
 4. Tri-campus Workgroup/Discussion Panel – Graduate Degree Development/Approval Process
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order & Introductions

Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

2) Approval of the minutes from February 25, 2014

The minutes from February 25th, 2016 were approved as written.

3) Report from the Chair

Erdly began by noting there have been changes to the UW's designation for Distance Learning (DL) courses, which apply to all three UW campuses. He explained the DL designation was formerly set so at least 51% of a course had to take place online to receive the designation. Now, the policy has been changed so that a course must be held 100% online (or off-campus) to receive the designation. He noted at UW Bothell, the modification to the policy has been reviewed and there was support for the change. He mentioned that members of the UW Bothell community hope that the Office of the Registrar will be better equipped to provide information to students on whether or not a listed course is offered DL or in-person. A member clarified after a question that a DL course is not defined as such on university transcripts.

Update on revised faculty salary policy

Erdly explained the proposed Class A legislation on the faculty salary policy (FSP) was voted down in its second consideration in the most recent faculty senate meeting, with the idea that the policy would return to the senate after implementation of a quick set of modifications. Erdly explained a revised version of the FSP was approved by the Senate Executive Committee, and will go to the faculty senate for consideration in the upcoming April 21st meeting.

Erdly noted also that a Class C resolution will also be considered at the April 21st faculty senate meeting, which requests that an alternative (to the currently proposed FSP) salary structure be drafted and introduced to the faculty senate in fall of 2016. Barsness gave some background on the resolution, explaining it was developed and proposed to further discuss the substantive issues pertaining to creation of a new faculty salary policy. Erdly noted that the Class A legislation on the faculty salary policy is undergoing considerable evaluation at UW Bothell, though it would have been advantageous to have an increased duration of time to review the latest iteration.

4) Tri-campus Workgroup/Discussion Panel – Graduate Degree Development/Approval Process

Erdly explained the FCTCP identified a goal of generating more focused meetings earlier in the academic year, with the first topic of discussion to be the development and approval process for UW graduate programs. He explained Rebecca Aanerud (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs & Planning, Graduate School), David Canfield-Budde (Director of Academic Affairs & Interdisciplinary Programs, Graduate School), and Mayumi Willgerodt (Graduate Studies Director, UW Bothell) are to provide information and support discussion as necessary.

Graduate degree approval process

Canfield-Budde explained he would like to first begin with an overview of the graduate degree approval process. He used a handout to provide a thorough explanation (Exhibit 1). New graduate degree proposals originate from graduate school units, with certain stakeholders initially included depending on the nature of the proposal (if it is interdisciplinary, fee-based, etc.). The Graduate School is generally not involved in this stage. It was noted the unit proposing the new program must have conversations with its faculty during development of the initial proposal.

The next stage includes a Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI), wherein the faculty lead on the project contacts the Office of the Academic Affairs and Planning (OAAP) in the Graduate School for proposal guidelines. Information given includes justification for the program, the proposed degree title, who will house the program, and if it is fee-based. It was noted detailed curriculum is not required at this point in the process.

During the PNOI Comment Period, anyone across the three UW campuses who will have ties to, or be impacted by inception of the new program is consulted with. It was noted this stage is also useful for marketing the new program. The comment period lasts for 14 days, and also includes UW Libraries, the Registrar's Office, and GEMS.

Canfield-Budde noted that during the next three stages of the process (External Review, Full Proposal Development, Graduate School) significant discussions take place concerning the proposed program, and all the necessary related documentation is completed, and the full proposal preliminary draft is sent to OAAP for review and comment.

At the Graduate School Council (GSC) stage, UW Bothell and UW Tacoma proposals are forwarded to their respective graduate program review bodies. After a question, Aanerud explained at UW Tacoma, this is the Academic Policy Curriculum Committee, and at UW Bothell, it is the Executive Body of the GFO. Canfield-Budde explained once the Graduate School Council (an elected body that advises the Dean of the Graduate School on graduate education policies, related issues, and recommendations from

program reviews) approves of the program, a formal proposal is then sent to the UW Board of Regents for a final approval. If approved by the Board of Regents, a new program code is created by the Office of the Registrar, and the program is permitted to begin admitting students. Canfield-Budde explained that during the program's launch, a 5-year Degree Program Review begins. This review is designed to check that the program is functioning as originally proposed relating to student FTEs, curriculum, and other elements.

Council discussion

The council then held some discussion. There was a question of how a degree or new program for all three campuses would be approved. It was noted it would have to be approved by all the separate processes and relevant campus bodies. Canfield-Budde explained all collaborations between units have to be housed by a single unit for oversight purposes. He explained interdisciplinary programs are sometimes housed in the Dean's Office.

Mann explained a member at his campus expressed that a PNOI should include curriculum in it, for review. He asked what aspects of a program should be evaluating during the PNOI comment period. Canfield-Budde explained the PNOI is designed to make sure units, campuses, individuals, etc., are informed of a program proposal so if there are issues, they can be brought up before the program is further developed. After a question, it was noted programs at other campuses do not necessarily need to be distinctive from similar programs offered at another campus, however, the burden is on the proposal generators to explain and justify why the program's existence is warranted.

Barsness explained some issues might arise over time between two similar programs on different campuses. She explained she is interested in knowing where there are opportunities for collaboration early in the program approval process. Aanerud explained that useful information is gained after program launch takes place, and this is often the problem in designing collaborations. She noted the Graduate School does ask that generators of new programs collaborate with other programs of a similar nature, if they exist.

A member brought up a question related to when a program is under development: what kind of shifts occur, and how are they initiated? Do real shifts only appear during the 5-year review process, after a program has launched? The answer was no. It was noted a tri-campus check-in occurs on the first Wednesday of every month, and during this check in, all degrees and certificates in development across all three campuses are reviewed, to track their development. These check-ins are designed to facilitate conversations with broad representation. ICAP was also mentioned, as body meets every six months to check on and plan new program development. There was some discussion of interdisciplinary programs.

A member asked if Activity-based Budgeting (ABB) has had any impact on collaboration in graduate programs. Aanerud explained empirically they have not seen evidence of this, and have made efforts to track it. She noted it was a concern early on, though a mutual benefit still seems to reside that is shared within academic collaboration.

It was noted DL programs are under the same mechanism for approval as all others. It was noted if there was overlap in a proposed DL program, a conversation is to occur between the affected bodies. It was noted at the Provost review level, a program might be disallowed due to severe duplication (without justification).

Aanerud noted after a question that there are no tuition waivers for fee-based programs, and the whole cost of employing TAs must be absorbed by the housing unit.

It was noted after a question that UW Educational Outreach (UW-EO) has certificates that are not transcribed (placed on student transcripts). When something is transcribed, it has to go through the outlined process normally, and be approved by the UW Board of Regents. It was noted during the monthly check-ins mentioned above, only transcribed programs are discussed.

Takeaway points

Erdly explained he would like to know the perspectives of guests in how the FCTCP might be useful in the graduate degree approval process. A guest noted helping faculty evaluate PNOIs at the Tacoma and Bothell campuses (Graduate School facilitates this at UW Seattle) is her main takeaway. She noted it is always helpful to the Graduate School to hear when issues “fall through the cracks” during the approval process.

There was some discussion of facilitating and encouraging discussions between faculty of the three campuses when academic programs are similar. A council member noted that the late stage comment period for other stakeholders to offer their concerns/ideas is not as helpful as it would be during the formation stages.

Erdly explained he would like to receive briefs on PNOIs in the FCTCP, if possible.

Council members thanked the guests for attending, and they left the meeting.

5) Good of the order

Erdly explained he would like to invite UW graduate school staff/members to FCTCP meetings to give intermittent briefs on items of interest.

6) Adjourn

Erdly adjourned the meeting at 10:31 a.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, councils support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Bill Erdly (chair), Joseph Tennis, Margo Bergman
Ex-officio reps: Casey Mann, Zoe Barsness
President’s designees: Patricia Moy, Bill Kunz, Susan Jeffords
Guests: Rebecca Aanerud, David Canfield-Budde, Mayumi Willgerodt

Absent: **Faculty:** Kyle Crowder, Ann Frost
Ex-officio reps: Mark Pendras, Sarah Leadley, Freddy Mora

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – New graduate degree proposal – UW Seattle .pdf

New Graduate Degree Proposal – UW Seattle

