

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, **May 4, 2004**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Marcia Killien presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Killien (chair) and Primomo;
 Ex officio members Barsness (for D’Costa), James, Miller-Murray and Nelson;

ABSENT: *Professor* Behler, Leppa and Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, Campbell, D’Costa, Decker, Fugate, Heath, Stygall and Watts.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the April 6, 2004 meeting were approved as written.

Hispanic Studies Minor at UW, Tacoma

Killien said President Huntsman decided to implement the Executive Order by sending the proposal for a new minor in Hispanic Studies at UW, Tacoma out for tri-campus review. He sent the proposal to Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden, to Killien, and to the Chancellor’s Office at UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma. The FCAS Subcommittee on Admissions and Programs (SCAP) also received the proposal.

Killien stated she saw this as an opportunity to pilot the proposed Tri-campus Curriculum review procedures and asked that FCAS/SAP from UWS and the UW, Bothell curriculum committee review the proposal and send any comments to the FCTCP. Both groups agreed to do so and after their reviews, each responded to Killien that they had no objections to UWT’s proposal going forward. Killien then asked a subgroup of FCTCP (Plumb & Watts) to review a letter from FCTCP to the President that outlined the process and stated that the process had been followed. This letter was sent by email to Nancy Bradshaw (for the President) and copied to Senate Chair Wadden.

Several procedural problems were noted during this process. 1) Initially, it was hard for the curricular committees on each campus to obtain hard copies of the proposal from the Chancellor’s offices. Killien suggested that electronic copies [of such a proposal] would facilitate the review process, and preclude this kind of problem. 2) The UWS and UWB curriculum review bodies were not meeting in a timely fashion. That is a problem: What *is* a timely review? If the FCTCP recommendations are followed, there should be enough advanced notice for the proposal reviews and comments to occur in a reasonable time. 3) Killien’s email stating FCTCP’s position that the proposal should be approved has not yet reached the President because it is being held until Senate Chair Wadden gives his approval and he is awaiting a response from FCAS/SCAP (although their approval was already sent to FCTCP).

FCTCP members voiced frustration with the lengthy approval process for this UWT proposal. Nelson voiced his opinion that a tricampus review was inappropriate and did not have the support of faculty leaders on all campuses. Killien reiterated that the Executive Order mandated such a review and that the proposed process by FCTCP should lead to a more efficient implementation of this Order. Miller-Murray said, “There’s some urgency with this proposal so the minor will appear on graduate’s transcripts.” Killien stated she would contact Doug Wadden and urge moving the approval forward with speed.

Proposed Three Campus Curriculum Review

Comments from the three campuses on the draft proposal of 4/6/04 were discussed. The consensus was that the proposed process was too complex. It was recommended that the pre-proposal comment period be dropped and replaced with a statement that encourages communication across campuses about the proposal early in its development. It was also recommended that the distribution list for proposals be shortened and focus primarily on faculty groups, since this is a faculty matter. The scope of the review was debated.

Nelson said, “We don’t *need* this review for minors and certificates. We only need it for new degrees, or for changes in degree programs.” Killien responded: “That is something to be taken up with the president, because of the Executive Order.”

Killien said: “To summarize: Firstly, we would eliminate the pre-proposal review step, and make a statement of encouragement. Secondly, if we look at the review of formal proposals – Phase II – from the originating unit to their campus curriculum body, *we* had proposed a *comment* period (not *approval*) of new majors and minors. We had proposed that they go out *widely* for comment; that this would be an opportunity for faculty to comment. Those comments would then go to the originating campus’s curriculum body, and to the originating department. *They* would consider those comments. The comments would *not* be ‘We approve,’ or ‘We disapprove,’ but ‘How do you feel about our having a similar program?’, or comments of that nature. That curriculum body would then have those comments to help them in their assessment.

Killien said, “We *won’t* have a unanimous view. *If* we develop a recommendation, it will go to Doug Wadden and the president. It’s *not* legislation, so it won’t be going to the Faculty Senate. It’s up to Doug Wadden if he wants it to be formally acted on by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC).” Primomo said, “Whatever we say may change, with the new president. I want *something* in place. Let’s put *something* forward.” Killien said, “I think this is a lightning rod for everyone’s historical feelings. But FCTCP *must* have a recommendation. They can reject our recommendation, and that’s fine.” Primomo said, “The whole *point* of this has been *faculty review*.” Killien said, “All of this is contingent on what the new president decides.”

Primomo made the following MOTION: “I MOVE THAT THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY REVISE THE TRI-CAMPUS REVIEW PROCESS TO ELIMINATE PHASE I; TO CLARIFY THE ROLE OF THE COUNCIL IN THE REVIEW PROCESS; AND TO APPROVE THE POLICY WITH REVISIONS, AND GIVE THE REVISED PROCEDURES TO FACULTY SENATE CHAIR DOUG WADDEN AND TO THE PRESIDENT.”

THE COUNCIL APPROVED THE MOTION. Killien said she would send out the revised version of the Curriculum Review Procedures (as an attachment) with the minutes.

FCTCP Annual Report

Killien requested input from Council members about the content of the Annual report. The Council suggested that the issues to be addressed include: 1) the work the council did on the Executive Order Revising Section 13-23 C: Legislative Authority of the Faculty; 2) the council’s work on the implementation of the Executive Order; 3) the council’s *not* having a role in the Tri-Campus Presidential Task Force, though former FCTCP Chair Jacqueline Meszaros and current GFO Vice Chair at UW, Bothell, Linda Watts, are on the Task Force, 4) and the council’s work on the curriculum coordination process, and the revision of the Three-Campus Curriculum Review Procedures. When the Annual Report is completed; it will be shared with council members before submission to the Faculty Senate Office.

Next meeting

The final FCTCP meeting of the 2003-2004 academic year will take place on Tuesday, June 1, 2004, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall. Killien said that prominent agenda items for that meeting will be the Tri-Campus Presidential Task Force (where it stands at the time), and FCTCP membership for 2004-2005. At present Killien is the only regular faculty member from UW, Seattle. Faculty members from the other campuses are also needed. The goal is to have two regular voting faculty members from each of the three campuses on the council, along with the ex officio members.

Brian Taylor
Recorder