

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy  
April 24, 2014, 9:00 am – 10:30 am  
Gerberding 26

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Review of the Minutes from February 27, 2014
4. Vice Provost Search for UWEO
5. Report from the Tri-campus Review Subcommittee
6. FCTCP Planning Roundtable
7. Adjourn

---

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Erdly at 9:00 a.m.

**2. Introductions**

Members introduced themselves to the council.

**3. Review of the Minutes from February 27, 2014**

The minutes from February 27, 2014 were approved as amended.

**4. Vice Provost Search for UWEO**

Erdly reported on the recent Vice Provost Search for UW Educational Outreach (UWEO) and commented that this is an opportunity for councilmembers to provide insight and ideas to the search committee. A comment was raised to review the job description to ensure it is up to date with current issues surrounding tri-campus concerns. The job is engaged with complex financial issues due to the variety and complexity of arrangements as units move forward with different versions of educational outreach and degrees. Whoever takes over this position will need to the knowledge and history of all three UW campuses and understand the importance of having consistency in approaching the delivery of UWEO courses.

A comment was raised that a recently-passed bill now requires universities to create a committee composed of administrators and faculty to review the process of any state-supported degrees transferring to self-funded programs. Members discussed if this would be coordinated by the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) or a new committee.

Members discussed distance learning programs that are already being coordinated without UWEO, especially at the business schools. A comment was raised stressing the importance that the scope of the position also covers the concerns of the smaller campuses.

Members discussed the role of UWEO and how it impacts the delivery of programs across all campuses. At the minimum it would be beneficial to receive a report about what comes out of UWEO regarding the various forms of degrees that are being planned. In addition to reviewing the efficiency of delivering new programs UWEO can also play the role in coordinating with programs across campuses so they are not competing against each other. Members discussed the charge of the search committee and the characteristics/traits/experiences that the committee is looking for in a candidate. Members agreed to draft questions and ideas to assist the search committee. Erdly will distribute a draft of the questions/ideas following the meeting.

A comment was raised expressing concern about the lack of transparency related to UWEO's finances. Members discussed UWEO's flexible funding mechanism, the number of students taking courses through UWEO and compensation for lecturers.

## **5. Report from the Tri-campus Review Subcommittee**

Erdly provided a report on recent tri-campus subcommittee reviews and the types of comments/concerns that are being collected. Erdly reported that the subcommittee has reviewed 24 new proposals since January 1<sup>st</sup> and 50% of them are from UW Tacoma and Bothell. Comments typically cover issues related to the quality of distance learning, availability/distribution of elective courses satisfying program requirements, and similarity of degree names.

Erdly reported on an emerging trend in which comments are criticizing the depth and competencies of the new proposals which are similar to existing programs. Erdly explained that this addresses a much larger issue about the depth in similarity of degrees offered on different campuses. A question was raised asking for clarification of the underlying concern. Erdly explained that in many cases new programs are being developed that only cover portions of current, long-standing programs. Most of the comments that are made during the tri-campus review period are not focused on substantive problems, but related to the consistency in the production of UW degrees. Erdly clarified that each campus has the right to propose its own degrees and the quality should not be a concern because a review has already been conducted. However, there is still the outstanding problem of parallel degrees. Members discussed their experiences teaching similar programs in different colleges, campuses and institutions. A comment was raised that faculty in each program have their own specialties and focus which vary widely when identifying curriculum for certain programs. A comment was raised stressing the importance of addressing the unique audiences at each individual campus rather than worrying about teaching the same subject at three separate campuses. A comment was raised that this may be an issue common in liberal arts when covering issues with theoretical constructs, such as ethnicity, which creates a different way to learning and understanding the depth of a particular area.

A comment was raised that the tri-campus review itself creates ambiguity in whether the three campuses are supposed to teach universal programs or develop their own, separate programs at each campus. For example, by developing a separate program and asking other campuses to provide input makes it difficult to determine if UW wants consistency across the board, or allow each campus to work independently from each other. Discussion ensued. This brings up a much larger question for faculty leadership and administrators in determining the relationships amongst the three campuses. A comment was raised stressing the problems caused by transferring UW credits from campus to campus. While the program names might be similar to one another the transferability of the credits might not be compatible. Members discussed their personal experiences within their departments.

Members agreed that credit transferability is an important issue to focus on. A suggestion was made that new programs should require a statement of “credit transferability” to clarify this problem. This would be especially useful for distance learning courses that are offered by separate campuses since they all look the same when offered in an online environment. A comment was raised stressing the importance of having these discussions between campuses before the programs are officially proposed to allow time for more in depth discussions between campuses. Erdly explained this is the reason for the new Notification of Intent proposal as part of the tri-campus review process.

Members discussed the recent initiative to re-design the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) to address concerns about courses and programs offered by different departments. The UCC currently addresses technical issues about new course offerings, such as coding, but could expand to take on more complex issues that have been arising across the three campuses.

## **6. FCTCP Planning Roundtable**

Erdly provided list of items that FCTCP should continue to discuss over the next academic year:

- Pre-review process/legislation related to new degree programs
- Common Application
- Proposed policy on faculty salary/promotions
- Lecturers across the campuses
- Research across the campuses
- Tri-campus communications
- Transportation between campuses

Erdly explained that the NOI process will likely be the major issues for the council in the near future. A suggestion was made to recommend legislation for the Faculty Senate. Members agreed to start with a policy issue statement before drafting specific language for a new proposal. Members agreed that sending legislation to the Senate should wait until next year to provide time to develop a strong proposal with input from affected stakeholders. Mobus, Barnes, Crowder and Erdly volunteered develop a position paper outlining the problem which may lead to formal legislation. Erdly suggested presenting this proposal to the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, the Senate Executive Committee and other committees. A comment was raised that whatever is offered the council should sell the strengths of the proposal and explain the importance in having a pre-review process for new degree programs.

Members discussed the Common Application. Brown mentioned that many prospective students feel the Common Application is more convenient since they are applying other institutions using the same form. Brown reported the Michael Kutz (ASUW President) is reviewing this issue and will provide an update at the upcoming meeting. A question was raised if prospective students are quitting the application process when they are asked to fill out the criminal history questionnaire. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that prospective students also stop when asked their religious affiliation. A question was raised asking who decides the content that goes into the UW application or in choosing the Common Application. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that this should be within the purview of the faculty and may be a place to propose legislation with the consent of ASUW, the Rules Committee and the President’s Office. A comment was raised that UW-Tacoma would follow UW-Seattle if the Common Application is adopted in order to reach a wider group of prospective students. A

comment was raised while the admission processes are separate on each campus the admissions guidelines are still the same.

Members discussed recent developments of the new salary policy proposal. O’Neill reported that it will be presented to the Faculty Senate in the fall and code language almost complete. There has not been a large pushback from most departments except for the School of Business which has concerns regarding the market impacts on the new salary system. One outstanding issue that still needs to be addressed is the distribution of funds and how the system would ensure consistent reward for consistent performance over a faculty member’s career. A suggestion was made to invite Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) to an upcoming meeting to discuss the faculty salary proposal.

O’Neill provided an update on the tri-campus lecturer committee. The committee is on the verge of sending recommendations to the Provost regarding renewals and appointments of those currently holding non competitively-hired positions. Additionally, the committee is developing a set of principles and procedures for individual units to follow and clarify confusions about competitive searches. O’Neill explained that the lecturer issue is very complex because there are a lot of reasons for part-time appointments in each unit depending on their needs and demands. Resnick explained that a committee at UW-Bothell is reviewing recommendations from last year’s lecturer group to identify possible suggestions that could be implemented. Resnick clarified these recommendations are not associated with the hiring of lecturers.

Moy reported that Jerry Baldasty and members of the Graduate School are meeting to review consistency amongst different programs. Moy will bring up the issue of credit transferability at the upcoming meeting.

A comment was raised about an initiative to move towards awarding “badges” to students related to resume-building skills and connecting their majors to future career paths.

Members discussed the recent expansion of the Faculty Council on University Facilities and Services (FCUFS) and their agreement with the Office of Planning and Budgeting to provide greater faculty participation in capital planning projects.

Members discussed UW’s 30-year strategic plan and how it will incorporate tri-campus concerns, such as UW-Tacoma’s recent planning efforts. A comment was raised that FCTCP could have input in formalizing the process in how degrees are offered.

## **7. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Erdly at 10:35 a.m.

---

*Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst, gcourt@uw.edu*

Present: **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Crowder, Kucher, Mobus  
**President’s Designee:** Moy, Jeffords, Harrington, Jr.  
**Ex Officio:** O’Neill, Resnick, McKinley, Deardorff, Brown

Absent: **Faculty:** Dolsak, Endicott-Popvosky  
**Ex Officio:** Leadley, Fridley, Taricani