

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., May 24, 2012
26 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
 - 2) Approval of Minutes from the last meeting
 - 3) FCTCP Updates/Issues
 - 4) Student Conduct Code Revisions
 - 5) Cross-Campus Curricula Approval Process Discussion
 - 6) FCTCP 2012/13 – Next Steps
 - 7) Adjournment
-

1. Call to Order

Council Chair Bill Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes from the last meeting

Approval of minutes from the April 19th meeting would be deferred to a later time.

3. FCTCP Updates/Issues

Erdly expressed hopes to clarify Tri-Campus processes regarding curricula and programs. Bothell and Tacoma campuses are growing at a different rate than UW Seattle, expanding new programs and courses. Due to this quick growth, concern was expressed on the speed of approval for courses and programs and this discussion serves to discuss and clarify these processes.

4. Student Conduct Code Revisions

Julie Draper, Associate Director of Student Services at UW Tacoma, and Elizabeth Higgins, Director of Community Standards and Student Conduct, described the Student Conduct Code revision. Draper described the structure for composing the new code and parties involved in revising it, with the process initiating in November 2010. The revised Code is being finalized, with initial goals of ease of navigation for students and staff, in addition to updating rules for off-campus conduct.

The Student Conduct Code will represent a change in process processes, though not in values, and will address Washington State's plain language standards. The change came forth partially due to a Dear Colleague letter from the Department of Education in April 2011 which informed institutions how to interpret and be in compliance with Title IX, and was significantly different from the pre-existing Code.

Current significant changes were then described. The "Standards of Conduct" section informs of behavior that is not permitted. This has been expanded to address items which were absent in the old Code (trespassing, harassing or stalking) or were not sufficiently clarified. Discussion continued on "cyber-crime", and whether or not it would be better to have a broader "global" conversation rather than addressing this through the Student Conduct Code. The revision is considering peer institutions' policies to potentially use language in off-campus code to address this. Cyber-security development has

been coordinating with Chief Information Security officers. Addressing cases of stalking on Facebook, email or otherwise has been difficult with the current Code.

Faculty, students and staff from all three campuses have been involved in the revision of this document, and have provided feedback and questions on the drafting. Erdly requested a working draft of the Student Conduct Code for FCTCP to review. Higgins mentioned that during the upcoming fall quarter, a “cleaner” document will be provided to ASUW senates at each campus and GPSS for feedback.

5. Cross-Campus Curricula Approval Process Discussion

John Schaufelberger, Chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, and Virjean Edwards, University Registrar, would present on the curricula approval process across the three campuses. Interest was expressed in what actors are involved, how the program or curricula quality is assessed and how to resolve potential issues. Concern was voiced of the large role of the UW Curriculum Committee (UWCC), its representation and similarity to faculty oversight. Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien suggested discussing course or program approval separately, due to potential confusion between the roles within these processes, and later proceeding to discuss timeliness and scope.

Process for Approval of New Programs or Program Changes:

Total responsibility of curriculum, admissions and graduation standards is assigned to the Faculty by the *Faculty Code*. Roles have evolved, but the current process is as follows:

1. Faculty of school/college/campus complete curricular review for content & quality
2. Undergraduate program review by faculty for adherence to academic standards:
 - a. Undergraduate Programs reviewed at each campus (FCAS for UWS only; UWB & UWT review their own programs
 - b. FCTCP conducts tri-campus review process, as described in Executive Order IV.
 - c. Any issues arising from tri-campus review that cannot be resolved by the campuses involved are sent to the Provost for resolution.
3. Graduate program review by faculty for adherence to academic standards is conducted by the Graduate School Council.

Process for Approval of New Courses or Course Changes:

Course approval was then described as follows:

1. Faculty of school/college/campus complete review for content, quality, etc.
2. Dean or chancellor signs to indicate approval
3. Materials sent to UW Curriculum Committee for Registrar’s administrative review of materials to put into catalogue and database.

Curriculum Committee

Virjean Edwards began chairing the UWCC in fall 2011. She described the UWCC’s role as administrative, not reviewing course content, to ensure consistency across all campuses for the Registrar’s database which maintains student transcripts and records. It was unclear on both the charge and membership for the UWCC, whether faculty should serve on an administrative body.

Questions followed from UW Bothell and Tacoma on approval of courses and programs. A concern was expressed that UWCC’s capacity to alter course descriptions may fall beyond administrative editing. Discussion followed whether this was a substantive issue or editorial issue. In cases of conflict, questions

could be posed to the Registrar. Another question followed on changes to “equivalent” courses. With equivalent courses being changed, such courses would require review by the originating campus. Should the originating campus not approve the alteration of such a course, what can be done? One approach has been creation of different course numbers, though such courses could overlap, these could not have identical content. Further conversation followed the Tri-Campus Review. Concern was expressed on how to resolve cases of conflict between two campuses regarding proposed changes in a Tri-Campus review.

It was suggested that some of these issues are beyond the scope of FCTCP, but are important to resolve. Killien offered to summarize these issues in her next meeting with the Provost, and it was mentioned that Board of Deans would perhaps benefit by discussion on items. Issues were briefly recapped:

1. Should the UWCC have more (or fewer) faculty as members? Who should be the members?
2. When disagreements arise between the UWCC or curriculum coordinator requests and the faculty proposing a course, who resolves the issue (suggestion: the Registrar)
3. The name “curriculum committee” may be misleading in that this is not a faculty committee that reviews curriculum, but rather an administrative coordinating committee. (suggestion: change the name of UWCC)
4. When courses on two or more campuses have very similar content, who decides if they have the same course number? Are current “work-arounds” the desirable policy/practice?
5. Are any changes needed in the current information about UWCC found on the website above?

6. FCTCP 2012/13 – Next Steps

Erdly noted interest in investigating models of other universities with Multi-Campus systems, to develop a better system and resolve elements which are causing confusion or concern.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:47 a.m. by Chair Bill Erdly.

Minutes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. jayf@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Endicott Popovsky, Michael Kucher (representing Julie Nicoletta)
President’s Designee: Jeffords, Harrington
Ex-Officio Reps: Deardorff, Sugarman, Joseph
Guests: Julie Draper, John Schaufelberger, Virjean Edwards, Katie Baird, Gerry Baldasty, Elizabeth Higgins

Absent: **Faculty:** Collins, Roesch
President’s Designee: Wadden
Ex Officio Rep: Fridley, Leadley