

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY**

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, **November 4, 2002**, in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Meszaros (Chair), Killien, Leppa and Primomo;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Decker, Fugate, Krishnamurthy, Nelson, Sjavik, Wadden
 and Whitney;
 Guests Sandra Silberstein, Chair, Faculty Senate; Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty;
 Carolyn Plumb, chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

ABSENT: *Professors* Schaufelberger and Stein;
 Ex officio members D’Costa, Olswang and Stygall.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the October 14, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

Selection of FCTCP vice chair for the 2002-03 academic year

Marcia Killien was nominated by Carol Leppa for vice chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy for the 2002-2003 academic year. The nomination was approved unanimously by voting members of the council.

Status of legislative draft defining campus

Meszaros said that John Schaufelberger will present the legislative draft defining campus to the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting on November 18th. The Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations is looking at the draft and will make whatever suggestions it deems appropriate.

Discussion of the proposed changes to the academic calendar

Meszaros said she sent the proposed changes to the academic calendar to all faculty at UW Bothell, and received extremely positive responses. It is seen as a definite advantage to that campus. It would prove particularly advantageous to older students, who would have a weekend following their initial class meeting to prepare for their second class. Also advantageous would be the extra Thursday and Friday in Autumn Quarter that the calendar would create. (In the present calendar, the long Thanksgiving Day holiday removes one Thursday and Friday from Autumn Quarter.)

Primomo said she has received equally positive feedback from faculty at UW Tacoma. And Don Whitney said the PSO (Professional Staff) feedback also is positive.

Discussion of cross-campus coordination on curriculum proposals

Meszaros said the “working group” met in two phases: Tim Washburn, Janet Primomo, Steve Olswang, John Schaufelberger and Meszaros met in one session, and Meszaros and Carolyn Plumb met in the other.

Meszaros distributed two charts: one showing “Current Faculty Review and Approval Processes for new undergraduate degrees, majors, options, concentrations minors (and certificates) and substantive changes to same (SCAP ‘non-routine’ submissions only”); and the other, a flow chart, showing the draft of the “Process for 3-campus Faculty New Program Consultation.”

In the chart showing the “Current Faculty Review,” the first of the three processes is worded similarly for each of the three campuses: “Development and approval by appropriate program faculty.”

In the second review process for UW Bothell, there is “Review and approval by Executive Committee of GFO (General Faculty Organization),” with “Review for: Fit with mission, Effect on other programs, Opportunities for synergy, Viability/resources, and Process.” In the second review process for UW Seattle, there is “Review and approval by College Curriculum Committee,” with “Review for: Rationale, Demand, Curriculum, and Resources.” In the second review process for UW Tacoma, there is “Review and approval by faculty associated with RAPP (Review and Approval of Program Proposals Committee).”

In the third review process for UW Bothell, there is “Review and approval by Curriculum Committee,” with “Review for: Level of courses, and Syllabi.” In the third review process for UW Seattle, there is “FCAS approval (through SCAP),” and “Review for: Editorial Clarity, and Operational Viability.” In the third review process for UW Tacoma, there is “Review and approval of courses through Curriculum Committee.”

In the flow chart of the “Process for 3-campus Faculty New Program Consultation,” the process begins with an “Idea” [that a department or other unit has for a new or revised academic program]. The “Idea” is submitted to the Dean of the department [or other unit]. From the Dean it goes to the Provost. From the Provost it goes to SCAP, to the UW Bothell Executive Committee, and to the UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly, and to the College Curriculum Committees. Also, at this point in the process the “Idea” is posted for comment [in University Week or some other organ to be determined]. The “comment” period is 30 days [or some other period to be determined].

In this phase of faculty review, considerations will include: Concerns about duplications / ensuring distinctiveness; Opportunities for coordination / synergy / efficiency; Ideas for strengthening / improving; and Lessons from other faculties’ experience.

The “Idea” then goes back to the department [or other unit] for Development. After the department develops the “Idea,” the proposal goes out for major faculty review: to SCAP [or SCAP-like equivalents at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma], to the UW Bothell Executive Committee, to the UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly, to the College Curriculum Committees, and to other pertinent curriculum review committees.

In this phase of faculty review, considerations include: Fit with mission, Need / Demand, Effect on other programs, Resource issues, and whether the Proper process has been followed.

It is noted, below the flow chart, that “It is expected that most faculties will *not* comment on most proposals. Faculties are to comment when they have important concerns or insights to offer because the new program is similar to or related to their own program(s).”

Following major faculty review (and faculty editorial review, insofar as it is needed), the proposal is sent back to the Dean.

This is the “Process for 3-campus Faculty New Program Consultation” that Meszaros presented to the council as a working draft.

Meszaros said the working groups looked at the current approach, and discovered a basic “similarity at all campuses.” The faculty look at the proposal first. Meszaros said, “It is at the stage of the more substantive review that we want to get the faculty from the three campuses involved. The truly substantive review, in the present process, does not go on in SCAP, but before SCAP receives the proposal.”

Meszaros said the flow chart emphasizes the importance of posting the “Idea” of a new or revised program proposal *early on*, throughout the three campuses, for a 30-day period [or a period not much longer]. And she emphasized the importance of comments being acknowledged, even if they were not acted upon. And she said it is important that “all relevant curriculum committees” see the proposed “Idea” early in the process, at the time it is posted, and when SCAP and the UW Bothell Executive Committee and the UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly first see the “Idea.”

Secretary of the Faculty Lea Vaughn said she would like to see University Week serve as the “University Registrar,” where the “Idea” for a new or revised program could be posted for comment. Vaughn noted that there are still many faculty who do not have E-mail, and would be left uninformed if the posting were sent via E-mail. “We’ll use University Week for many kinds of notification,” said Vaughn. Cameron noted that through the accreditation process we have learned that the Libraries seek to be more involved in the development of new programs because of the resource implications. Cameron urged that “libraries and other units also be alerted” to such postings.

Vaughn said, “I’ve submitted something to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs to make the faculty voting code method-flexible. We want to have people move to electronic voting eventually, to get a better information system.” But for the time being, she reiterated, there are still faculty without electronic access, thus the wisdom in using University Week as a University Registrar. Meszaros said, “That sounds fine. But timeliness is very important in this process. So we would want to keep the posting period to 30 days, or not much longer, if at all possible.” And Decker noted that “things have to get on the HEC Board list in a timely fashion. There is no reason not to have wider faculty and staff access to information as early as possible, to have them receive the list, and to have wider faculty distribution.”

Decker said that, at UW Bothell, “The proposal is floated, then worked out by the department; then sent to the GFO; then passed on to the Chancellor. It’s posted only after it goes to the HEC Board list.” She said, “After the ‘Idea’ is on the HEC Board list, that’s an ideal time for formal comment. That’s done in the Fall. It has to be *in* by January for the HEC Board.” This “pre-proposal” notification precedes the timeline suggested on Meszaros’s draft diagram. Meszaros offered to revise the diagram to include notifications when HEC Board lists are drawn up.

Vaughn said, “In terms of notifying people, you could do it at two different times: one being more informal, the other, more formal.” Meszaros said, “Our priority is to have something [a process] that insures both notification and comments, and full faculty vetting. Something that states explicitly, “The following proposals have gone to the HEC Board.” Or, as Leppa said, “We want to make known the ‘early wish list’.” Cameron recommended inviting Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs in the Office of the Provost, to an FCTCP meeting to discuss this entire process. [Corbett also serves on SCAP and participates in all FCAS meetings.]

Carolyn Plumb, chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, said, “Your diagram has the right spirit. We want the information to come as early as possible out of the Provost’s Office.”

Decker said that, at UW Bothell, “Ideas come from various places, and are routinely discussed by the General Faculty Organization (GFO); particularly, to determine which ideas are most responsive to the mission. Those ‘Ideas’ are then developed and sent to the Executive Committee for their reflection. It then goes to the Curriculum Committee.”

Faculty Senate vice chair Doug Wadden said, “When it gets to the Dean, it’s not a proposal. It would have to have been approved at the departmental level. The HEC Board list is outside of the spirit [of the process] you’re after.”

Decker said, “Because of the importance of timing, we go to the HEC Board list as early as possible.” Wadden asked, “Would the Provost have authority over a new program?” Several council members asserted that the Provost would have that authority. Cameron noted that “at the time it arrives on the HEC Board list, there is a two-year period for consideration.”

Killien said, “Consolidation is a significant part of the process, not just expansion. Proposals coming through could be a subtraction, an elimination.” Wadden said, “FCAS [Academic Standards] would have to be aware of any consolidation. The Provost has a specific role in that process, as does the Secretary of the Faculty, and others. It’s good to look at both additive and subtractive parts of the process.”

Vaughn said, “We don’t want people thinking that their comments were just dropped. There needs to be a way to show response that acknowledges the comments that are sent in.” Leppa asked, “Is there a check

list to show that whoever developed the 'Idea' has checked with all programs to ensure that no toes were stepped on?" Such a check list, she said, would be invaluable. Meszaros said, "We would want a form verifying that proper notification had been done throughout the process."

Meszaros said, "The College Curriculum Committees would be involved earlier in the new process than in the current process." Plumb said, "The 1503 form [the "New or Revised Undergraduate Admission or Program Requirement" form] isn't filled out until the 'Idea' has gotten to the HEC Board list. There is not much information shared here [at UW Seattle] as early as at the other campuses."

Meszaros said, "In the final section [of the flow chart], not everyone does the review, but all are contacted. Only the campus-specific group actually approves. Then, the proposal goes to the Curriculum Committees at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma, and to SCAP at UW Seattle. Thirty days may not be long enough for this phase of review; that will have to be determined."

Wadden said, "If this plan works, why have FCAS at all? Why would it be needed?" Meszaros replied, "FCAS is the only place where faculty come together for an overall picture. That's where our policies are set." Primomo said, "That's FCAS's issue to determine. Our purpose as the FCTCP is to address issues across our three campuses, not to set policy for UW Seattle." Meszaros said, "We could not find anything to speak to FCAS having *approval* of programs in the Faculty Code." Plumb, echoing an earlier observation, said that, when FCAS gets a description of a program, "it's fairly well developed." Meszaros said, "We go through the same extensive review that the Seattle campus does. Our curriculum committees review our programs. We want to make sure that the right review process occurs."

Wadden said, "All departments have to feed through FCAS. Otherwise, why have FCAS? The answer is that faculty needs its own approval body." Cameron said, "This group is saying that there hasn't been an open process, a formal mechanism for cross-campus conversation at an early level in the process." Cameron suggested that the council might ask Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, to attend an upcoming meeting, because of her role in academic planning.

Plumb said that FCAS has discussed the issue of cross-campus coordination on curriculum proposals, but that "it is still in the discussion mode." She said, "I think this [developing plan and flow chart] is better than what we've had. Maybe something 'in the middle' could be tried first. Some small, good-faith changes may be the best way to start."

Primomo said, "In Nursing, early communication has worked well. Knowing what's going on; that's what this is about: early information sharing. It will move us forward better than in the past. It's out there for everybody. This could also help other kinds of cross-campus coordination at the undergraduate / graduate level."

Leppas said the onus "should be on the person who's making the proposal, and who has had consultation." Killien said, "So the real focus is on the early phases. The difficulties come mostly at later stages." Plumb said, "The crux will be whether we have to change the Faculty Code." Decker said, "We should be able to *consult* without legislation having to take place." Decker said that, "historically, Tim Washburn and Fred Campbell (former Dean of Undergraduate Education) have had a large say on standards. Now, it is up in the air since Campbell's departure. And the Provost's Office has variously assigned responsibility for issues of standards on new programs."

Nelson said, "I don't see the need of faculty at UW Seattle coordinating with UW Bothell and UW Tacoma faculty. The separate campuses should do their own approving [of programs]." Meszaros said, "I *have* seen advantages from cross-campus conversation. Information sessions *are* helpful. Faculty actually can support each other."

Decker said, "We couldn't have developed our programs without the help of faculty at UW Seattle, especially with new programs. We needed help from our colleagues in Seattle. Though that's *not* the approval part of the process. Rather, that has to do with consultation."

Killien said, "It's good to have campuses with shared accreditation coordinate and discuss with each other. And it's cross-*program* comment, not just cross-campus communication."

Plumb said, "It's good to do *something* soon, to have some kind of cross-campus conversation." Killien added, "Nothing prohibits it." Plumb said, "The possible new University Council on Undergraduate Education could include FCAS, and could affect what we're discussing here, but we should still do something soon anyway."

PSO representative Don Whitney said, "Cross-campus communications on proposals and voting might be considered by linking the University Week section and electronic voting ideas of Lea Vaughn's with a spot on the UW Web pages. All members of the UW community would be able to review proposals with timelines at a distinct Web location where comments may be made electronically. When it is time to vote, votes also could be done electronically at the central location. As Vaughn noted, many staff are involved in implementation of new proposals and they may have feedback too."

Next meeting

The next FCAS meeting is set for Monday, December 9, 2002, at 9:00 a.m., in 26 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder