

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 p.m. on Monday, **June 10, 2002**, in 142 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

**PRESENT:**     **Professors** Meszaros (Chair), Coney, Crawford, Leppa, Schaufelberger and Stein;  
                  **Ex officio members** Cameron, Fugate, Futrell, Kubota, Loustau, Nelson, Olswang and Silberstein.  
                  **Guests** Bradley Holt, Chair, Faculty Senate; Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.

**ABSENT:**     **Ex officio members** D’Costa, Lou, Ludwig and Sjavik.

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the May 13, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

**Report on FCTCP members’ visit to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards: May 31, 2002 - Carol Leppa, John Schaufelberger and Marcy Stein; and discussion of tri-campus curriculum coordination options**

Leppa said questions that remain unresolved with regard to possible collaboration between the three campuses include: “How do we make certain that the collaboration is open and clear?, and: Who has authority to review courses and programs?” Leppa added, “We did coordinate through earlier versions of this council.” She said the meeting with FCAS resulted in a “good discussion.”

Leppa said one suggestion that came from the discussion was to have three separate versions of SCAP (Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs), one at each of the campuses. The suggestion was made that each SCAP would have the opportunity, if it so desired, to review any proposal of a new degree program, or program change, coming from any of the three campuses.

Schaufelberger said, “The Faculty Senate represents the entire University of Washington. The faculty councils represent the Faculty Senate. The three SCAP’s, under one scenario, would all be subcommittees of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). All programs would be reviewed by all three SCAP’s.”

After 45 days [or whatever length of time was agreed upon], if no objections were raised, a proposal would be considered to have been approved by SCAP, and would be sent on. [At present, proposals approved by SCAP and FCAS are sent to Tim Washburn, Executive Director, Admissions and Records, and finally to the President for his approval and signature.]

If a problem were to arise with a particular proposal, at any of the three SCAP subcommittees, then it would be directed to FCAS, said Schaufelberger, on whose SCAP subcommittee there are long-standing UW experts in assessing new programs and program changes (particularly, Tim Washburn and Richard Simkins, long-time advisor in Undergraduate Education). Schaufelberger said the main point is that there would be a coordinated review among all three campuses, and that with e-mail and other means available for inter-campus communication – including videoconferencing if necessary – it should be possible to carry out this kind of review without undue chaos or confusion.

Crawford said that, from his reading of the minutes of the May 31<sup>st</sup> FCAS meeting, it is not clear who the ultimate authority would be as regards the review process. He said it is not clear at UW Tacoma how SCAP would be structured. That is yet to be resolved. “We [Crawford and Janet Primomo] appreciate the idea that each campus would have its own SCAP subcommittee. And we consider that a move in the right direction.” Schaufelberger said, “Yes, the implementation of the idea was left open. We could avoid FCTCP having to house this.”

Meszaros said that she and Mary Coney discussed the possibility of SCAP's at the three campuses. They agreed that criteria for review of SCAP programs at the three campuses would be, chiefly, to ensure that consultation takes place with the right programs affecting, or that would be affected by, the proposed degree program, and to carefully assess the academic standards of proposed degree programs and program changes.

As for disputes over particular program proposals, Meszaros said that, currently, these are conducted "through administrative channels." Coney suggested they could best be addressed by FCAS, and that a member from each of the other campuses be added to the FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs to make the assessment of disputes thereby equitable to all campuses of the University. Coney pointed out that the FCAS SCAP subcommittee possesses the expertise in assessing degree programs to which Schaufelberger alluded, and that they have long experience in resolving disputes among UW Seattle schools and colleges.

Meszaros said that she, on the other hand, would prefer that FCTCP be the body to address disputed programs, as FCTCP is specifically a tri-campus faculty council. Representatives from each SCAP subcommittee would be invited to participate in the resolution of such disputes over approval of new programs or program changes. Meszaros said this would be consistent with the legislation that brought FCTCP into being in the first place, with the idea that Bothell and Tacoma would not need to join other councils. Such an FCTCP body as Meszaros imagines would include representatives from the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma Executive Committees that currently review new degree programs.

Another possibility Meszaros and Coney imagined would be "to design a dispute resolution committee."

As for courses (SCAP does not review courses, only programs), Meszaros said one possibility would be to supplement the University Curricular Review Committee with a faculty process designed to assess individual courses.

Meszaros said Penn State University has an interesting structure something like this. They place proposed degree programs on a Web site. Anyone can go to the Web site and comment on the proposal. Final proposals are to address important comments from all courses. Meszaros said, "This might be a good base, but we also need to decide how we ought to handle hard cases."

Coney reiterated what Meszaros had reported her saying in their discussion: that if a disagreement arose at the SCAP level, it could be moved to FCAS, with one member each from UW Tacoma and UW Bothell. Schaufelberger said, "Only 'routine' proposals would be reviewed by all three SCAP subcommittees, and if there were concern at FCTCP with a SCAP proposal from any of the SCAP subcommittees at the three campuses, that proposal would be addressed by the FCAS SCAP subcommittee, with representation from all three campuses."

Bradley Holt, chair of the Faculty Senate, said the SCAP subcommittees from the three campuses would be subcommittees of FCAS, and the ultimate appeal would be the Senate Executive Committee. He suggested a disputed proposal could be sent to FCTCP for special consultation, then sent to SEC from FCTCP.

Meszaros reiterated that, in another model, program proposals would come to FCTCP, and the council would invite members from each SCAP subcommittee on the three campuses. And again, Meszaros stressed that this would be "consistent with the tri-campus legislation."

Meszaros said, "Our faculty would be more comfortable if FCTCP were the home council for a program review process affecting all three campuses." She added: "Our Executive Committee [at UW Bothell] *does* look at disputed proposals."

Olswang said, "I do not understand the original concept: that of having each SCAP subcommittee review *everything*. Why? And why *three* SCAP's? History would say that SCAP – the current SCAP subcommittee under FCAS – would be the right body for the University-wide review process of new

degree programs and program changes. Why *three* separate bodies? Would UW Bothell and UW Tacoma *want* to see proposals from all 16 colleges at UW Seattle?"

Coney said, "This would not be creating *new* committees, but simply giving new names to already existing committees. And those bodies could readily look at other proposals. This would be closer to President McCormick's 'One University.' It would be the same process and the same review if this were to happen. And parity would exist among the three campuses."

Olswang said, "But then each campus would look at it from the campus perspective, *not* from a whole university perspective. This *could* be the wrong approach."

Crawford said, "Another model is this. From the campus perspective, faculty believe we should develop, and have control over, our own curriculum. We believe, in other words, in a *decentralized* curriculum review. We cannot have autonomy if 'one University' dictates curriculum at the campus level. It must start with the 'local'."

Olswang said, "Yes. The University level is the *final* decision. At some point, before the institution gives approval, there needs to be University-level approval. That's what SCAP does under FCAS."

Meszaros said, "The advantage of a *decentralized* model is that, with e-mail and other available means of communication, we *can*, at UW Bothell, or at UW Tacoma, hear easily from UW Seattle. The idea of having *more* people comment *is* good. The reality is, at this time, if a new program comes, and we approve it (at UW Bothell), then the University can approve it. That's how it works. The Faculty Code sets standards that we don't contravene: FCAS policy standards."

Crawford said, "Our task at the FCTCP should be to 'think out of the box'. The 'one university' concept doesn't necessarily mean, for example, that we need to use existing structures of review, no matter how well they have worked in the past for a single campus university. *If*, as Meszaros said, we take the Faculty Code as the standard, could there not be an annual review by FCAS and by the Faculty Senate of what we do at Bothell and Tacoma, that still leaves us our relative autonomy? We are not suggesting working outside the Faculty Code, but, from my perspective, neither do we want a senate committee approving our curriculum. Sending a representative to that committee would not change the matter."

Meszaros said, "I see a benefit in equal representation in SCAP. It would help us learn more about the three-campus University. There *are* differences between 'campus' and 'college', *but* this one-SCAP body would not change what *we do now* at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma."

Olswang said, "We do not take new BA programs to the Board of Regents unless they're unique. The board of Regents has delegated this process. We could create ultimate authority without going through the Faculty Senate, but the Regents would expect that *somebody* would have recognized a program as being a good University of Washington program."

Silberstein said, "Why can't all the lines [in the review process] go to FCAS? Why couldn't all the SCAP's lead to FCAS?" Holt said the role that new programs must play at the Faculty Senate level lies in the answer to the question: Do you meet minimum standards? This level asks: Are you impacting other programs? If so, what do you propose to do about it? Holt said there could be representatives from the UW Bothell and UW Tacoma Executive Committees on FCAS. "It would be good," he said.

Olswang asked Crawford, "Does creating a *centralized* body of program review create a loss of autonomy at the other campuses?" Crawford said, "Yes. As faculty members deeply involved in creating new campuses, we *need* our autonomy. The more that must be continuously sent to Seattle for 'approval,' the less we have a sense of ownership and identity in our own institutions. There must be a delicate balance between one university and three campuses, one senate and three faculty organizations. The 'one university' standard is only part of the story being written here. I recognize that a key issue is coordination. I agree with Meszaros that the FCTCP should be the key site for otherwise unresolvable coordination issues. Practically, the additional effort to represent our campus faculties centrally at SCAP and/or FCAS

in the program approval process would also lead to a loss of autonomy. The more effort expended centrally, the less time and energy for review of new programs and, more generally, for the exercise of faculty participation in shared governance on our campuses.”

Stein said, “What’s killing us is our having to work at all levels. If we’re to be an equal partner, we need *support*.” Kubota said, “There are three issues: 1) coordination; 2) review of programs; and 3) approval of programs. These are three different ways of looking at our program process: three different bodies. The one that *coordinates* seems the best one to me.”

Nelson said, “We *want* to have a University of Washington degree, and can’t imagine UW Bothell and UW Tacoma people looking at upwards of 50 different programs, and UW Seattle wouldn’t want that. What *kind* of degree do we want? We want the primary consideration to be at the campus level.”

Olswang said, “Is there an assumption that the Provost’s office doesn’t discuss all this *before* it goes down certain tracks? Because it definitely does so. The real issue lies in the question: Does the Faculty Senate play a role on behalf of the Board of Regents?”

Nelson said “since the Bothell and Tacoma faculty joined the Senate when they agreed to the Tri-Campus legislation, shouldn’t they just use current Senate structures?” Meszaros said, “When the tri-campus legislation passed, it wasn’t the case that we were *joining* the Faculty Senate. We were always in the Senate. The legislation gave us more voice in the code and provided this council through which we could decide about how to coordinate other things more effectively.” Crawford added: “We *knew* these issues would be there: the issues of the UW Tacoma *and* UW Bothell campuses.”

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, said, “We’re confusing positions and interests. We’re ‘resource poor’ at the University now. Thus we have a particular need to *coordinate*. Thinking in ‘strict disciplines’ won’t work in the future [with programs merging and coalescing]. We could do a lot more electronically than we’re allowing at present. It may be that you would need to get together only once a month or so.”

Stein said, “Anytime the three campuses are equally represented on a committee or council, it helps *us*! It helps in program approval and in other ways. I think it actually *strengthens* our autonomy.” Coney said, “I don’t think these ideas are at odds with one another.” Olswang said, “The principle is the same. So, you could have three separate bodies, or you could have one body with equal representation from the three campuses.”

Schaufelberger said, “The campus body would be linked to FCAS.” Stein said, “It’s the work load! If we have equal representation, we need *support* for the people who are doing this work.”

Meszaros said, “These are good ideas and concerns. We will work on them over the summer and will aim to have proposed legislation ready in the Fall.”

### **Legislative language defining a “campus”**

As for the legislative language defining a “campus”, on which the council has been working throughout the academic year, Olswang observed that, until the tri-campus curriculum approval process is resolved, reaching a definitive definition of “campus” will not be possible. The two issues are inextricably interwoven.

In Section 13-23A, #6 has been changed to read: “recommendations concerning campus and University budgets”.

Vaughn said, “I need to have a clear sentence about the Secretary of the Faculty’s role in this process.” After discussion the council decided to add the following sentence to Section 24-45D: “Such action will be filed with the Secretary of the Faculty or the Office of the Faculty Senate.”

In Section 23-23B, the bold sentence now reads: “The words ‘college’ and ‘school’ refer to those colleges and schools named in Section 23-11B.”

Olswang noted that Section 23-48 “affects grading policies.”

The council will work on finalizing the legislative language defining a “campus” in Autumn Quarter, when it also tries to resolve the process of tri-campus curricular review and approval.

**Next meeting**

This was the final FCTCP meeting of the 2001-02 academic year. The council’s next meeting will take place in October of Autumn Quarter 2002.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder