

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY

Members of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy and several guests from faculty groups and administration at all three University of Washington campuses met at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, **March 8, 2005**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. FCTCP Chair Marcia Killien presided.

PRESENT: Marcia Killien, Chair, Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy; Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, Office of University Committees, Faculty Senate; Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs, Office of Undergraduate Education, UW Seattle; Todd Mildon, University Registrar, Office of the Registrar; Kevin Laverty, Vice Chair, General Faculty Organization, UW Bothell; Robert Jackson, Chair, Faculty Assembly, UW Tacoma; Josh Tenenberg, Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly, UW Tacoma; Susan Jeffords, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Office of the Provost.

Killien asked everyone to introduce themselves, and to identify their position, campus, or administrative affiliation.

Killien said, "This meeting is an ad hoc working group convened to reach agreement on the fine points of implementing the three-campus curriculum review process. Hopefully, this process will be a model for future projects."

Killien said, "Last year, then-Interim President Lee Huntsman mandated a three-campus faculty review of all undergraduate programs. The President, when he received a new proposal from an originating campus curriculum committee that had been reviewed by the two other campuses, would send the proposal to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, who in turn would send the proposal to the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP). FCTCP's sole function would be to determine whether all three campuses were properly involved in the curriculum review process, i.e., that the three-campus undergraduate curriculum review process had been completely and properly adhered to ["Were the comments from the other campuses considered?" would be one of FCTCP's determinations]. If FCTCP determined that the process was indeed properly adhered to, it would communicate that determination to the Faculty Senate Chair, who would send the proposal back to the President and to the Chancellors of UW Tacoma and UW Bothell with that information. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

Killien said, "The spirit behind this is *awareness*. It is not supervisory or veto-based. It is making people *aware* of new proposals: that a program is being planned." She noted that "there could be cross-campus collaboration as a result of this awareness. It is *not* about road-blocks. From an administration point of view, it may be a way to collaborate on resource sharing. It may also prevent unnecessary duplication of programs. And it may allow the University to speak with one voice."

Killien noted that FCTCP tried to implement "Three Campus Undergraduate Curriculum Review Procedures" in June 2004, sending recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee. The "Exhibit D" brought to today's meeting is the most recent version of that implementation document. "The process has been endorsed by the Senate Executive Committee and by the Board of Deans," Killien said. "There are still some implementation details to work out."

Killien said the three-campus undergraduate curriculum review process "is a two-step process." The process begins when one of the three-campus curriculum bodies (FCAS at UW Seattle, General Faculty Organization at UW Bothell, or Faculty Assembly at UW Tacoma) receives a proposal from a unit for new or substantially revised degree program. If the curriculum committee on the originating campus determines that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit review, and that the proposed change of program, or proposed new program, is sufficiently substantive to warrant a tri-campus review, it will send the proposal to the Secretary of the Faculty. As Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn pointed out in her memo, materials to be forwarded to the Secretary include the applicable campus curriculum form and the rationale for the proposal. The Secretary will post the proposal for a 30-day "comment period"; it will be sent to the Deans,

Directors, and Chairs (DDC) list serve; to the Chair of each campus review committee; and to the entire voting faculty.

At the end of the 30-day comment period, the Secretary of the Faculty will compile all comments made on the proposal and forward them to the Chair of the curriculum committee at the originating campus. That committee can then consider the inter-campus comments as part of their deliberative process. Killien said the comments from the other campuses constitute “another voice” in these deliberations. The originating campus’s curriculum committee’s deliberations complete Stage I of the process.

After a proposal has been approved by the curriculum body on the originating campus, it will proceed through the approval processes already in place. When it reaches the Office of the President, Stage II will take effect, in accordance with the Executive Order. In Stage II, the President forwards the proposal to the Chair of the Faculty Senate who, in turn, forwards it to FCTCP.

FCTCP’s review of the process will be conducted by either the FCTCP as a whole or by a subcommittee of the Council consisting of the chair (or designee) and two council members (one representing the faculty of each of the other two campuses). FCTCP will review the process of three-campus review and issue a report to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, for forwarding to the President within 14 days of the receipt of the proposal. Their review will consider only the following issues: a) Was the final proposal made available for a 30-day comment period?; b) Were the comments received and responded to appropriately?; c) Did the campus curricular review body consider comments and responses in its review?

Killien said, “Today, we will look at the fine points of the review process. Vaughn said she pared down the “Summary of Proposed Tri-Campus Faculty Coordination and Review of Undergraduate Curricula” that she was sent to its essentials. (That process has already been described above.)

Killien noted that the proposal would go out to the other campuses for review when it is sufficiently developed, but still under review at the originating campus in its curriculum committee. If the originating campus’s curriculum body recommends changes based on its review and comments received, the revised proposal does not need additional three-campus review.” There will be a single comment period. Killien commented that this process is focused on faculty review of curricular proposals, not administrative review. Though Killien noted, once the posting has been made, an administrator – like anyone else to whom the posting is made available – may make a comment. The group also affirmed that the goal [in posting the proposal] is to get comments on the whole document, and not word-smithing.”

After an extensive discussion about the comparative advantages and disadvantages of e-post, web q, or peer review for posting the proposal, Vaughn decided that she would begin posting through Peer Review.

Killien said, “In Stage II, FCTCP will look at comments and see if they were considered. The home curriculum body will write a brief paragraph about any comments received and how they were considered. If FCTCP believed substantive comments were not addressed, they would forward the original campus’s rationale to the Provost, and note any comments. FCTCP is not a curriculum committee. Jackson said, “My concern would be that there are many movements in this process, allowing for the possibility of obstruction of the process. We need to see that programs don’t suffer from the process. There is justifiable anxiety among administrators.” Killien said the process should not be an obstruction, particularly with the 30-day limit on the comment period.

Relevant to Jackson’s concern, she turned attention to the “Three Campus Undergraduate Curriculum Review Checklist.” [Cf. Checklist.]

Vaughn noted that “most comments will come in the first week of posting.” The Stage II Checklist only comes forward with full documentation (with the proposal) and signature sheet. The originating campus curriculum review committee will fill out Phase I (or Stage I) of the Checklist, and the FCTCP Chair will fill out Phase II (or Stage II) of the Checklist.

Vaughn said she will keep the electronic Website in the Faculty Senate. Jackson also suggested that the Policy and other documents be kept on the Faculty Senate Web Page.

Next FCTCP meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Thursday, March 31, 2005, at 3:30 p.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder