

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy  
November 20, 2014, 2014  
9:00 am – 10:30 am  
Gerberding 26

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
  2. Introductions
  3. Review of the minutes from October 23, 2014
  4. Report from the chair
  5. Tri-campus Review Subcommittee activity report
  6. Revisions to the tri-campus review process
  7. Good of the order
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Erdly at 9:00 a.m.

**2. Introductions**

Member introduced themselves to the council.

**3. Review of the minutes from October 23, 2014**

The minutes from October 23, 2014 were approved as written.

**4. Report from the chair**

Erdly reported that the focus of the meeting will be on understanding and reviewing the process for approving new, or making changes to, university degree programs. This process should be looked at strategically in how the university creates degrees and how they are funded. Most of the decisions are made at the individual dean/chancellor level and discussions are currently being held to streamline processes that can benefit all campuses. Erdly noted that more information would be available in Winter Quarter and the council will be able to address this later as well.

Erdly explained that he is still looking for opportunities to meet with the UW Bothell General Faculty Organization and UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly. Several issues that will be important to discuss include the new salary policy, changes to the payroll system to bi-weekly checks, and the lecturer issue.

**5. Tri-campus Review Subcommittee activity report**

Erdly reported that the subcommittee has received four proposals already this year and has identified several issues that will continue to be a concern. While the subcommittee approved all the proposals there were several that indicated a need for a new process. Erdly presented a spreadsheet provided by

the Registrar's Office which detailed the new, or changes to, degree programs for all UW campuses since 2008. A total of 547 degrees have either been created or changed in the last 6 years which emphasizes the amount of changes that occur at all three campuses. Erdly mentioned that there is no clear distinction on what triggers a tri-campus review and the criteria to make the decision. Erdly noted that as campuses continue to grow there are more degrees offered and they are becoming more specialized. Additionally, as graduate degrees continue to increase, become self-funded and delivered in hybrid formats, they will ultimately impact tri-campus issues.

A question was raised asking if new degree proposals can be denied if they create redundancies between campuses. The tri-campus review process is not an opportunity for campuses to deny other campuses' proposals. Rather, the process is simply a mechanism to provide feedback on new proposals. Concern was raised that each campus needs to offer programs that can support student career paths, and by preventing a campus to offer a certain degree it would be disadvantageous to students. A comment was raised explaining that it is very common for faculty to express concern about competition and comparability during the tri-campus reviews. The impression is that the university departments should be having these conversations earlier on in order to address the needs of students and faculty on different campuses and how to share resources. Members discussed their personal experiences in developing new programs and the lack of coordination early in the proposal process. A comment was raised expressing interest in a notification process that could allow for this communication to occur between schools, colleges and campuses. A comment was raised that a process used to occur when the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HEC Board) was in existence. A suggestion was raised to draft a senate resolution requesting the provost to provide clarity on the process.

## **6. Revisions to the tri-campus review process**

Erdly distributed recent guidelines for new and online major and degree proposals developed by the Faculty Council on Academic Standards. The guidelines would apply to 1503 degree approval forms and Erdly would like to amend the regulation requiring a pre-notification process. The early notification process would require three stages for the review: notification of intent (NOI), proposal, and tri-campus review. Members discussed how the NOI would be implemented and what may be included in the process. The steps within the early notification process would be different than what was required by the HEC Board since UW would be able to review internal opportunities to solicit feedback and identify shared resources.

### Proposal outline

- Stage 1: NOI
  - Faculty proposes new major
  - Department/college/campus process to support development of NOI
  - NOI completed with datasheet and 1-2 narrative
  - FCTCP initiates an early notification to all interested faculty and students
  - NOI is posted on a website for external comments or suggestions for a minimum 10 days
- Stage 2: Proposal
  - NOI developed into full proposal by the faculty unit
  - 1503 form addresses program requirements, admissions, general education requirements, impact on other programs, funding, etc.
  - Review by the school/college and the 1503 is signed by the chair, college curriculum committee, or the dean.

- Campus faculty academic council reviews and approves the 1503 for tri-campus review
- Tri-campus review (facilitated by curriculum office)
  - Approved 1503 posted on the webpage for comment for 15 working days
  - Faculty unit responds to comments and feedback
  - The campus faculty academic council reviews the proposal, comment and unit responses resulting in approval.
  - FCTCP review tri-campus review comment and response process within 14 working days.
  - 1503 receives the president's approve, incorporated into the catalogue/student database/DARS, and ICRC is notified.

Erdly explained the NOI could be posted for longer than the minimum 10 day requirement in order to incorporate all feedback into the proposal. Erdly hopes that by providing an opportunity for more stakeholder input during the early stages the approval process can be more streamlined. Discussion ensued about the notification process.

Concern was raised that some new degree programs are not always pushed by faculty and campuses, but rather from partnerships with government agencies and businesses that want the university to generate new degree programs around their activities. It is possible that these conversations are happening outside the university before faculty have an opportunity to participate in the discussions. Discussion ensued about how departments and units develop new programs and the processes required before formally submitting a 1503. Concern was raised that the university needs to improve its communication methods in order to effectively reach out to faculty and students. Currently, it is up to the Registrar's Office to distribute the 1503 forms and solicit feedback during the tri-campus review. A suggestion was raised that as part of the changes to tri-campus review process the 1503s could also refer to the comments/reviews during the NOI period in order to show that the department consulted with relevant stakeholders prior to submitting the 1503 proposal. A comment was raised that many reviewers during the tri-campus review ask for data supporting the need for a new degree when it is proposed, something which could be done during the NOI process. Along with the 1503s the department could attached a 1-2 page narrative along with a data sheet.

Members discussed who at the university has the authority to implement these changes. Barnes explained the decision is not easy and the university is still trying to determine how to move this through the process. It is possible FCTCP could make a recommendation and draft a proposal which may require further involvement by the Faculty Senate. Members discussed the timing of sending the proposal through the senate. Erdly noted that this issue ties in with the university's moratorium on approving new online degrees and he will report back on the status.

A comment was raised that this issue is a continuation of the debate about whether UW is a system or three separate entities. By not directly addressing the problem students and faculty are confused about how each campus is related to each other. Additionally, faculty who are developing new curriculum are nervous about whether these new degrees are overlapping others at other campuses. A comment was raised suggesting that the changes to the NOI process will be a catalyst in forcing the university to address these long standing questions. Members discussed their personal experience developing new programs and the feedback they receive as part of the tri-campus review process. Erdly noted that he may bring this up when discussing the moratorium with the provost.

A question was raised asking if significant traction can be made once students begin to ask the administration about tri-campus concerns. Members agreed that a student effort to push the issue would be an effective approach at starting the conversation.

## 7. Good of the order

Members discussed the Common Application form and the criminal background history questionnaire. Erdly noted that there has been a recent push from Ivy League institutions to revise, or replace, the Common Application and suggested this be a future agenda item to determine if UW should weigh in on the issue.

A future agenda item will include a discussion of part-time/full-time lecturer issues, especially as a result of a recent report showing the proportion of lecturer appointments amongst various ranks and faculty. Erdly commented that he would like UW Tacoma and UW Bothell's perspective on the issue.

Members discussed the benefits of holding meetings in rooms that support video conferencing in order to better facilitate discussions with members who are not located on the UW Seattle campus.

## 8. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Erdly at 10:30 a.m.

---

*Minutes by Grayson Court, council support analyst, gcourt@uw.edu*

Present: **Faculty:** Bill Erdly (Chair), Kyle Crowder, Luther Adams, Joseph Tennis  
**President's Designee:** Patricia Moy  
**Ex Officio:** Rebecca Deardorff, Jennifer Sundheim, Eli McMeen, Norm Beauchamp, Marcia Lazzari  
**Guest:** Bonnie Becker (substituting for Bill Kunz)

Absent: **Faculty:** Nives Dolsak, George Mobus  
**President's Designee:** Susan Jeffords, Bill Kunz  
**Ex Officio:** Alexis Nelson, JoAnne Taricani