

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY
Wednesday, May 23, 2007, 8:00-9:30 a.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Chair Marcia Killien called the meeting to order at 8:07 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of the minutes
 2. Update on status of Tri Campus legislation
 3. Update on cross-campus majors
 4. Evaluation of 3 campus review process
 5. Annual report
 6. Other business
-

1. Approval of minutes.

Council members approved with no comment the minutes for the May 4, 2007 meeting.

2. Update on status of Tri Campus legislation.

Chair Killien told the council that she had spoken with the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, Gerry Philipson, about the Tri Campus legislation. The faculty has until May 31st to register its votes, so there is no word yet on its status. It was noted that there has been no negative feedback heard about the legislation.

3. Update on cross-campus majors.

Council member Bellamy reported that he had heard from FCAS on the cross-campus majors proposal and that the council objected to it for the same reasons as did the Admissions and Graduation subcommittee. The problems were cited in a handout:

- It allows students from one campus to pursue a second major at another campus without being admitted there, which changes admissions policy.
- Students would be allowed to pursue the second major after having taken only 15 course credits at their home campus.
- It allows students to register for UWS courses through MYUW, without ever seeing an advisor here.

Bellamy explained that he felt that there was some misunderstanding and that the issues were different from what were listed in the objections. He said that he will be meeting this Friday with FCAS. The issue will be taken up again next year. Bellamy noted that he had spoken with Ed Taylor, the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs, and received general support. Killien suggested a possible joint meeting between councils.

4. Evaluation of 3 campus review process

Killien sought feedback on the draft survey she constructed on the 3-campus program review process. She introduced Matt Winslow as a guest from the Registrar's office who could answer questions about the review process and survey. Killien remarked that in creating the survey she was considering what information do we really need, and what is the best way to get it?

Council members discussed the questions within the survey and what kind of information was best for the purpose of the survey. It was noted that open-ended questions provide the best information. Council member Harrington said that the description of the process was important to the stakeholders filling out the survey. He suggested including an attachment or URL link to the Catalyst survey that provides a description of the review process that is relevant to them. Council member Cauce noted that most faculty members won't read the survey and suggested targeting a smaller sample of those members who participated in the process. Another suggestion was to target those who had commented through e-mail to the various proposals within the review process.

Council member Stein reiterated the need to avoid going back to the old ways. She noted that the review process opens up the relationship between the three campuses. Killien suggested that they could evaluate where the comments come from across the three campuses. This would involve analyzing the comments by first tallying where they originate, and then doing an internal analysis of their nature. Winslow commented that he saw the survey as either measuring how well people understand the review process or using it as a general forum for feedback on it.

Harrington suggested that they could use a targeted telephone survey to capture more open feedback

Council members discussed their confusion with the review process during various campus program proposal reviews. Confusion centered on knowing who to talk to and where the proposal goes next in the review process.

Bellamy offered questions to help clarify what to ask within the survey: is the process helpful in anyway? (identify curriculum issues); does the process provide enough information to respond to before it's adjudicated, does it provide a sense of fairness when adjudicated so that it's clear to whom issues get referred to?

Council members discussed when and if the library is involved in the review process. Council member Fugate noted that the issue is whether library resources are in place with program proposals, something that the Dean would know about. Killien commented that an ideal process would be one that, before it reaches FCTCP, would go through a program body and an administrative body that would check for resources. Fugate said that she thinks librarians do get the program review notices, and that she will look into it.

Stein voiced a concern that not having the process invites problems and that the focus should be on making it better and preserving the benefits. Council member Collins identified the benefits as adding predictability and pointing to an institutional process that

is fair. Cauce added that from an administrative view the process provides a chance to troubleshoot problems, point to a process and go forward. She noted that it was useful to the UW as a whole.

Harrington reiterated, for the record, the importance of the benefits of the review process:

- It clarifies the program-development relationship among the campuses
- It allows university-wide administration and faculty governance to point to a system in the adjudication of conflict over program development
- It has catalyzed the creation and standardization of program-development processes on the newer campuses

Killien recapped suggested changes to the survey which included adding something to question #2, removing the phrase “should be eliminated” from #3, and possibly combining questions #4 and #5 to address the benefits and limitations. Council member Corbett noted that this process won’t go away with the survey; rather it’s controlled by this council and the President.

Killien confirmed with the council that they wanted to proceed with the survey. She stated that she would send it out now to everyone for comments, and then again in the fall to fine tune it before it’s sent out. She offered to collect the other data. Harrington offered to make follow-up phone calls.

5. Annual Report

Council members discussed aspects of the draft copy of the annual report. Killien suggested that they attach to it what got voted on with a list of programs reviewed. Corbett and Winslow noted that there are several new programs under review that will be coming through FCTCP. Corbett offered to update the list and Winslow said he would get the details on the several forestry options under review. Harrington suggested that the report include a couple of sentences that state what passed and the purpose of it.

Council members suggested several future agenda items for next year’s FCTCP council. They include:

- FCTCP having a role in the Snohomish/Island/Skagit County UW campus issue
- Introducing the idea of having an urban studies major in a cross-campus collaboration
- Addressing accreditation issues
- Clarifying which faculty councils are functioning university-wide and which are functioning campus-only. This would bring governance in line with practice.
- Looking at a number of areas in the faculty handbook.
- Discussing Educational Outreach issues

It was also noted that there has been no GPSS representative on the council.

6. Other business:

Council members talked about scheduling meetings for next year. They addressed using technology to help facilitate involvement when members can't make it to UWS and having some meetings on other campuses.

Killien also asked council members for a small working group to serve over the summer and reply by e-mail. Council members Leppa, Neill, Killien, and Harrington agreed to participate.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m. *Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, mmkane@u.washington.edu, or 206.543.2884*

Present:

Regular: Collins, Harrington, Killien (Chair), Leppa, Neill, Stein

Ex-Officio: Nicoletta

President's Designees: Bellamy, Cauce

Members of Representative Groups: Corbett, Fugate

Absent:

Ex-Officio: Luchtel, Stiber, Lovell

President's Designees: Wood (excused)

Members of Representative Groups: Fleurdelys, Weitkamp