

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 p.m. on Monday, **October 14, 2002**, in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Meszaros (Chair), Killien, Leppa, Primomo, Schaufelberger and Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Fugate, Nelson, Olswang, 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: *Ex officio members* D’Costa, Decker and Krishnamurthy.

Introduction of new and returning members

FCTCP chair Jacqueline Meszaros welcomed new and returning members to the 2002-03 academic year. Council members introduced themselves and identified their departments and disciplines. Guests Sandra Silberstein, chair of the Faculty Senate; Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty; and Carolyn Plumb, chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, were also welcomed.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the June 10, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

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

Council members who are interested in serving as FCTCP vice chair for the 2002-03 academic year are encouraged to contact chair Jacqueline Meszaros (meszaros@u.washington.edu; 425-352-5282).

Status of legislative draft defining campus:

Review of Content

Meszaros said that, though no vote was taken, there seemed to be agreement among council members on the language of the draft defining campus. “We solved the ambiguities of earlier drafts, such as the difference between chancellor and dean. We also had differences of opinion about the proposed policies. Those differences could be voiced here,” she said.

Meszaros asked the council, “Was there was anything we missed?” Primimo referred to Section 23-23, C. “Would a chancellor have the power to create a department?” Olswang said, “Only the Board of Regents can create a department.” He said there is “no change here between the current code and the proposed legislation.” Olswang did say that “departments can operate independently (on promotion and tenure, for example), but a program cannot.” He said that, though only the Board of Regents can create a department, a chancellor can create a program. “A program, however, can have a department-like function; it can even be a department-like program.”

Olswang said, “This proposed legislation does not address curriculum issues that are still on the table.” But he praised the proposal overall.

Meszaros said, “We would like to move the proposed legislation forward. We could vote as a council on the recommendation to move it forward to the Senate Executive Committee.”

A MOTION was made by John Schaufelberger to approve the proposed legislation defining campus, and to have the chair or vice chair present the legislation to the Senate Executive Committee for its consideration. Marcia Killien SECONDED the MOTION.

THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED LEGISLATIVE LANGUAGE DEFINING CAMPUS, AND TO HAVE THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION PRESENTED TO THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT ITS MEETING ON NOVEMBER 18, 2002.

Discussion of cross-campus coordination on curriculum proposals

The following “Proposed Principles for Coordination re: New Programs, Majors, Minors and Distance Degrees” was distributed to the council:

1. Each campus shall have a designated “SCAP” which reviews new program proposals for curricular integrity and affect on other units.
2. Each campus SCAP will be provided with copies of new proposals from each campus and a reasonable time in which to offer comment. (This can be coordinated through FCAS? Through the Curriculum Office? Other?)
3. Before approving any proposal, the home campus SCAP shall ensure that the comments of other campuses have been addressed, and the responses returned. (Again: need assistance with the paperwork logistics through FCAS or Curriculum Office or ?)
- ?4. If a campus is not satisfied with the responses of another campus, they may request further hearing through: FCTCP? FCAS? An Administrative Body?

Doug Wadden, vice chair of the Faculty Senate and 2000-01 and 2001-02 chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS) – responsible for assessing and approving new and revised undergraduate degree programs – was asked about FCAS’s program approval process.

Wadden said that FCAS approved a process in 2001-02 whereby the Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) would be able to designate proposals submitted to the subcommittee as either “routine” or “non-routine.” Routine proposals involve technical or “housekeeping” changes in already existing programs, or an addition to an already existing program consistent with that program’s components and direction. Programs deemed routine by SCAP are reported to FCAS, but are not discussed at the council’s meetings. (SCAP is comprised of three regular FCAS faculty members and several administrative members who work closely with curricula and existing and new undergraduate programs.) Wadden said, “A new degree program, or a new minor, would *not* be routine, and would be discussed by the full council at the next FCAS meeting [usually one week after the SCAP meeting].”

Schaufelberger said, “The intention is not that all three campuses would have to review, and comment on, everything that is submitted to SCAP, but that, if no response is received in 30 days – or whatever number of days is determined to be appropriate – from the three campuses, after the proposal is made known, the proposal could go forward to FCAS.”

Wadden pointed out that proposals “have gone through substantial revision before they even reach SCAP.” They have been signed by the chair of the department, by the college dean, and by the college committee, before they are submitted to SCAP. Meszaros said, “At UW Bothell, the Executive Committee first approves a new proposal; then it goes to the Curriculum Committee.”

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, said she is inclined to use University Week to give notice of new curricular programs to different parts of the three-campus community. “People would check the column in University Week set aside for this purpose. It would be the ‘University Register’ approach.”

Wadden said, “There are some other parts to this that still should be discussed. Some courses don’t come through a council; they just go to the University Curriculum Committee. The system works, but it makes some assumptions. And it requires great insight on the part of a non-faculty group. This concerned former Faculty Senate chair Brad Holt. If you think about streamlining, you have to ask: Could faculty be more directly involved in the process? It should be possible to come up with a more structured process; to have certain people, or groups, referred to in the process. And still have a 30-day period for responses. Some mechanism should be possible to create a more effective and structured process.”

Faculty Senate chair Sandra Silberstein said, "Part of the Rose Report discussion will concern possible curricular mechanisms." Vaughn said, "We need more creative use of University Week; the use of the column that I mentioned would be one example."

Killien asked, "When does the public know [about new proposals]? Is this an issue? Sometimes comments come in so late in the process." Meszaros said, "That's been the center of our concerns. I would like the mechanisms to include the three-campus faculty early, so as to be constructive." Wadden said, "We need some check-off method."

At present, FCAS and the Faculty Senate look only at programs, not at courses. Carolyn Plumb, FCAS chair, said, "Currently, the faculty in each school and college look at the courses, usually through a college-level curriculum or educational policy council; we [FCAS and SCAP] look at programs." Leppa said, "In Nursing, we have cross-campus curriculum coordination on anything that comes forward." Meszaros asked, "Is there something analogous on all three campuses? It's a time-consuming process. Often, much of what we review is not particularly relevant. I think that overall, however, the curricular process *works*."

Primomo said, "The Rose Report *will* affect this process. How do we let people know what's happening? Our missions are different at the three campuses. We're *for* centralization of standards, but we're *not for* centralization of program proposals. It's not in our interest."

Meszaros said, "With respect to procedure, we need a subgroup to put together an outline." Plumb and Primomo volunteered, and Tim Washburn, Executive Director of Admissions and Records, and a longtime member of SCAP and FCAS, was recommended. Meszaros will contact Washburn.

Stein said, "Accreditation is an issue." Olswang said, "I think this is more concerned with policy than with legislation."

Proposed change to the Faculty Code: an additional President's Medal award to a transfer student with an Associate of Arts degree from a community college in Washington State

There has been great difficulty in selecting the President's Medalists because of the different weight accorded the records of transfer students from community colleges vs. students who have attended the University of Washington throughout their four-year undergraduate career.

The President's Medal has always gone to a student from the latter group: a student whose entire baccalaureate career has been at the University of Washington. But it is hard to compare the records of transfer students and four-year UW students.

The following is a description given by Tim Washburn at the October 11, 2002 FCAS meeting, speaking for the FCAS Honors Subcommittee, whose proposed changes these are.

The proposed change would occur in Volume Four, Part III, Chapter 11: Grades, Honors, and Scholarship: Section 3. "Honors Awards". The change would allow for four Present's Medals to be conferred at the annual commencement ceremonies.

In the proposed change, a medal would be conferred, at the Seattle commencement, "upon the graduating senior who has completed at least three-fourths of his or her degree requirements at the University and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students."

Also at the Seattle commencement ceremony, "a medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior who entered the University with an Associate of Arts or Sciences degree from a Washington community college and who has the most distinguished academic record among such students."

And lastly, "at each of the Bothell and Tacoma commencement ceremonies, a medal shall be conferred upon the graduating senior with the most distinguished academic record."

Washburn noted, at the FCAS meeting, that it has “gotten so complex to select the President’s Medalists.” He said it has seemed to many people that transfer students have always been at a disadvantage in the selection process of President’s Medalists, with the medals invariably being awarded to students who have spent their entire four years at the University. He said those selecting the medalists came eventually to feel that the University would do well to honor its partnership with the community colleges in Washington State by having a President’s Medal specifically for a student who had come from a community college to the UW with an Associate of Arts or Sciences degree.

Washburn said UW Bothell and UW Tacoma confer medals as well, honoring their best students. “We select UW Seattle’s medalists, and UW Bothell and UW Tacoma select their medalists.”

Washburn said that Section 3, A., iii reads as it does “because UW Bothell and UW Tacoma have upper division students only.”

Washburn said, at the FCAS meeting, that to qualify for a President’s Medal a student must graduate *summa cum laude*, and grades must be earned at the University of Washington. He noted that different departments have “different standards for Honors.” He also said, “We do look at everything, in making our decision, including the quality of high school that a student comes from, and his or her qualities of leadership and participation at the University.” This is necessary in part because, purely on the basis of students’ grades, several candidates might be equally deserving of a President’s Medal.

Olswang said, at today’s FCTCP meeting, “Our transfer agreement does not require a separate degree; it honors our agreement with the community colleges. 50% of transfer students do not have an Associate of Arts degree.” Primomo said, “We have not, as faculty, been able to talk about this. I like the way the wording *is now*: generic. We could have our Executive Committee look at it.”

Olswang said, “My comments were not negative; I just want everyone to be able to compete (*all* transfer students, for instance). The four awards are terrific.”

Plumb noted that it is difficult to separate out these students’ accomplishments: transfer students, for instance, do not have Honors classes, and are thus left out on that particular score.

Washburn spoke with the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma chancellors about the proposed change to the Faculty Code. Both chancellors approved of the idea. FCAS also approved the proposed change at its October 11, 2002 meeting.

Working committee on changing academic calendar (beginning Autumn Quarter earlier)

There is a proposal, led by Tim Washburn, to change the academic calendar. Autumn Quarter would both begin and end earlier than it does now. It would end three days earlier than at present, though of course this would be subject to variation, depending on a particular year’s calendar.

In the “Proposed Handbook Text,” Section 1, Number 1 would read: “The autumn quarter shall begin on the fourth Wednesday of September, except when the 1st of September falls on Wednesday, in which case the quarter shall begin on the fifth Wednesday. The quarter shall end on the twelfth Friday thereafter.”

Meszaros asked, “Does this look good to us?” Plumb said, “There are some concerns. It would affect the orientation process. And it would create less time for faculty between the end of Summer Quarter and the beginning of Autumn Quarter.” Meszaros and Primomo agreed to take the proposal back to their campuses for comment.

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting has yet to be determined. Once the date is set, the council will be notified.

Brian Taylor
Recorder