

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, **March 1, 2004**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Marcia Killien presided.

PRESENT: **Professors** Killien (chair), Leppa and Primomo;
 Ex officio members Cameron, D’Costa, Decker, Heath, Nelson, Olswang and Watts;
 Guests Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, and Augustine McCaffery, Manager, Academic Programs, The Graduate School; Jacqueline Meszaros, Associate Professor, Business Program, UW Bothell, and former chair of FCTCP; and Carolyn Plumb, Chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.

ABSENT: **Professor** Behler and Stein;
 Ex officio members Campbell, Fugate, James, Miller-Murray and Stygall.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the February 2, 2004 meeting were approved as written.

Steven Olswang: Interim Chancellor, UW Tacoma

Effective April 16, 2004, longtime Vice Provost Steven Olswang will commence his new position as Interim Chancellor, UW, Tacoma. Olswang has served as an ex officio member on the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy since its inception in the 2001-2002 academic year. He addressed the council briefly.

“This council is very important; even more so now, in my perspective,” said Olswang. “And a significant part of the growth and future of the University of Washington lies in the Tacoma and Bothell campuses. We need to develop a solid relationship between the three campuses of the University. And we need smooth linkages. We need all of this chiefly for the students we serve, and the students we will be serving. I’ll miss this council the most, of the councils I have served on.” Olswang said that taking on his new responsibility at UW Tacoma “is thrilling,” and a challenge he looks forward to.

Olswang said the president has signed the Executive Order revising Section 13-23C of the Faculty Code in the University Handbook. He said that, at the last FCTCP meeting, some confusion occurred in the discussion because he had assumed that the council had received a copy of Faculty Senate Chair Doug Wadden’s letter to the president dated January 27, 2004, whereas in fact the council had not yet received the letter. In that letter, Wadden asked that the additional language be added to the Executive Order. Olswang noted that the president accepted the changes in language indicated in Wadden’s letter, in the final version of the Executive Order. “Those changes are now implemented,” he said.

Olswang informed the council that the Board of Regents approved “dean status” for the Milgard School of Business at UW, Tacoma. (This had been anticipated, and was discussed in an earlier council meeting.)

Olswang said, “This council has had a series of accomplishments. Service on FCTCP has been a privilege.” Killien thanked Olswang for “fixing up the holes” in the February 2nd FCTCP discussion of the Executive Order with the explanation of Doug Wadden’s letter to the president. She agreed that the council had not seen the letter and had not been informed of Wadden’s intent. She asked to receive a copy of the letter and also a copy of the letter from the President transmitting the Order back to the Senate. An electronic copy of the letter will be distributed to the council. Killien then welcomed Cheryl Cameron, Associate Vice Provost, and FCTCP ex officio member, to her new role as Steve’s successor in council meetings. Cameron has been very active in the past two years as a representative from the Provost’s Office, and will now assume the greater responsibility to the council that Olswang has so ably carried out.

Killien asked Olswang: “As the Milgard School of Business will now have a dean, what’s the possible snowball effect of that move?” Olswang said, “Executive Order #12 amends to drop the title of ‘dean’ so

that only the title of 'chancellor' remains at UW Tacoma and UW Bothell [to date, the same person has held both titles of 'chancellor' and 'dean']. Executive Order #14 describes the *order* of deans, and the definition of the Board of Deans. The dean of the Milgard School of Business will *not* be on the Board of Deans at UW Seattle. Meszaros asked: "What will it mean for P&T if the chancellor is no longer dean? Will the chancellor now be left out of the P&T chain above this dean?" Olswang said, "The Executive Order specifies that the chancellor will still be in the chain of review even though the dean title has been removed. The dean is now in the middle." He noted that there is only one unit with a dean at UW Bothell or UW Tacoma.

Killien said, "It's important to know [what the review processes and administrative structures are at the three campuses]. It's a work in progress. It will be important for the President's Tri-Campus Task Force to inform all of these processes. We're building pieces of the process, but we don't have the overall framework as yet."

Status of the Executive Order – Steven Olswang

Killien asked Steven Olswang to comment on the status of Executive Order 13-23C [revising Tri-Campus Policy on Legislative Authority of the Faculty]. Olswang said, "There are two issues I see in this process. One is the missing piece at the last FCTCP meeting. I did not know about Doug Wadden's letter to the president at that time. The content of the letter suggests that the council and the Senate chair have some differences in interpretation of the processes we wish to recommend. The Executive Order codified a specific process: how to keep information flowing in the review process." Killien mentioned that a concern of the council's is for flow of information *early* in the process. Olswang agreed that that is important. "I'd urge us to focus not solely on the Executive Order, but on how to clarify what it means, and what the process means. The Executive Order comments on that process."

Heath said, "If the earlier FCTCP ideas had been in place, there would have been less need for the Executive Order as is." Decker said, "I worry about the time factor. Certificates and minors, for example, usually happen fast, from conception to implementation. *This* [process created by the Executive Order] could take a year. When is the Curriculum Committee's review? *After* the 45 days?" Killien said, "There is a difference of assumptions. We don't have a body in place now for three-campus curriculum review by faculty. FCAS is not a three-campus review."

Curriculum Planning Task Force report – Janet Primomo

Primomo distributed a Revised Draft (March 1 2004) of the "FCTCP Three-campus curriculum review procedures." A Preamble has been added which reads as follows: "The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy has been working on a process to coordinate curriculum review among the campuses. This document is intended to clarify the process for coordinated review by all three campuses of new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs as required in the February 3, 2004 Executive Order, Section 13-23C. Legislative Authority of the Faculty."

Primomo pointed out that, on page three, in the lower right-hand box under the heading: "Undergraduate degrees, majors, options, concentrations, minors, certificates and changes," at "University level," the following has been added: "Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy: *Reviews for compliance with process (See diagram on Curriculum Coordination).*"

Primomo said, "The revised table, on page four, has been broken up into pre-proposal and final proposal categories. We have added a Preamble [cf. above]." She strongly emphasized e-mail notification to all three campuses early in the review process. The posting of comments would include University Week and possibly a link in the Faculty Senate Website to the Office of Undergraduate Education (which is under the Provost's Office). Notification would include campus faculty organizations, campus staff organizations, and all deans and chancellors.

The revised draft suggests: "At the time that a department/program sends a fully developed proposal forward for review by the College Curriculum Committee or Campus SCAP, and no less than 30 days

before that body holds its initial review of the proposal, OR at the time a proposal is forwarded to the Interinstitutional Committee on Academic Programs, it will be posted for comment to the entire University (i.e., three campus) Website. A link will be created from the Faculty Senate Website to the Office of Undergraduate Education Website.”

People will be asked to comment on: “concerns about duplication/ensuring distinctiveness”; “opportunities for coordination/synergy/efficiency”; “ideas for strengthening/improving”; and “lessons from other faculties’ experience.” [This applies both to the pre-proposal and the final proposal stages.]

Comments would be sent to proposing departments and units or to the relevant dean or chancellor if no program is indicated, in the pre-proposal state; and to the appropriate campus SCAP “for ensured response,” in the final proposal state. Comments will also be accepted by the department/program proposing the offering.

The revised draft states: “It is expected that most faculties/staffs will NOT comment on most proposals. Faculty/staff are to comment when they have important concerns or insights to offer.”

Killien said, “The draft emphasizes the importance of implementing discussions *early* in the process. This is based on communication at the campus level *prior* to the Executive Order stage.” Heath said, “I’d suggest the use of the word ‘consultation’ instead of the word ‘review’. This is advisory.” Killien said, “The *early* part, yes, *is* consultative.” Nelson asked: “Why, with the Executive Order now in place, do we need to *have* all this? This process has worked well for 14 years. And now we’ve had a program stalled for six months [a new minor in Hispanic Studies] that *needn’t* have been.” Meszaros said, “This process has not yet been adopted. I don’t understand how this process or this council can have held a minor up.” Heath said, “Perhaps someone was holding it while waiting for the Executive Order.” Nelson said, “That’s not the point. The coordination is not a good idea. You don’t need this process now that you have the Executive Order.” Killien noted: “We’re concerned about the *early* part of the process. Not everyone thinks the process *has* worked well.” Decker said, “It’s not clear that the Executive Order does not preclude a curriculum program being approved by everyone and then turned back.” Killien asked Nelson to provide his objections to her in writing.

Primomo said, “We need to clarify the process for review across the three campuses, so that it is clear to anyone looking at it. It must be absolutely clear what you have to do to have a new program. The chart on page three shows the course process on the left-hand side; then, on the right-hand side, the process for degrees, majors, options, concentrations, minors, certificates and changes. The Level of Review starts with the Sponsoring Unit (department or smaller unit); then goes to the appropriate college or school (Program at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma); then goes to the Campus level (there is no equivalent at UW Seattle for Campus review of courses); and, finally, on to the University level (where, as mentioned previously, FCTCP reviews degree programs, etc., for compliance with the process, *not* for content, and where courses from all campuses go to the University Curriculum Review Subcommittee: Tim Washburn, and administrative representation from UW Bothell, UW Seattle and UW Tacoma).

Killien said, “The real issue for post-presidential review is whether or not there has been an opportunity for full review. Have faculty been consulted? Have they had the opportunity for comments [on proposals]?” Plumb said, “This would require people keeping documentation along the way.” Killien said, “We have suggested that FCTCP serve as the body that implements the Executive Order for a review following submission of programs, etc. to the president because we *have* representatives from all three campuses. It would be a way to implement the Executive Order. We are suggesting that this review focuses not on the content of the proposal, but on whether the process of communication and consultation was followed. We could have an FCTCP subcommittee established for this purpose. There is a tension between the autonomy of each campus – their desire to have control over their curriculum – and the desire to enhance the overall vision of the University of Washington: honoring all autonomy and trying to contribute to the growth of the three-campus University.” She asked the council: “Should we move forward with this [revised draft]? Is this what we want to see?”

Decker asked about the volume of new degree programs that comes through SCAP and FCAS. Plumb said, "If we take out the changes [to existing degree program requirements], there is less than one new degree program a month that comes to SCAP. We've only had two new degree programs this academic year."

Nelson said, "I think this is a bad idea. The Executive Order should be all that is needed."

Killien said, "In principle, this seems to be heading in the right direction. Please send any comments you have to Brian Taylor at the Faculty Senate Office."

The Graduate School: How graduate programs are reviewed on the three campuses - Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, and Augustine McCaffery, Manager, Academic Programs

Killien explained why FCTCP invited Gail Dubrow, Associate Dean for Academic Programs, and Augustine McCaffery, Manager, Academic Programs, the Graduate School, to visit the council. "FCTCP has struggled with curriculum coordination across the three campuses of the University," said Killien. "In our case, we're concerned with undergraduate programs. We see the Graduate School as a model of what's going right in cross-campus coordination issues: especially, as regards curriculum coordination of new programs. We're very interested to hear how your process works."

McCaffery said, "We get notice that a particular campus is developing a new program. We work with the campus, and determine the program's arrival. We do not do full-blown reviews, as we formerly have. We have external reviews first. We then submit the proposal to the HEC Board. Finally, we submit the new program to the Board of Regents. Sometimes, a curriculum committee that includes faculty from UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma reviews the proposal before we send it to the HEC Board. Certificate programs are reviewed by the curriculum committee; we then send them to the Board of Regents."

Killien said, "Our interest lies in how you involve faculty in the review process." Dubrow said, "The principle body for that part of the process is the Graduate Council. Are there *other* communication loops? There *are* well-established loops statewide. We need these loops at the three-campus level." McCaffery said, "We ask that program proposals be seen by other campuses *early* in the process, so that there is early cross-campus consultation." Dubrow said, "As regards program reviews, the awareness of the three-campus view is *high* now in the Graduate School. We ask [those with new proposals]: Have you *thought* about your relationship to the other campuses?" Asked about the composition of the Graduate Council, Dubrow said, "It's composed of faculty members." Heath said, "This is an important body. It is the only elected and representative body of faculty that is *not* part of the Faculty Senate."

Dubrow said, "We have forms containing guidelines for program review and for self-study that you can use as models, if you like." Killien asked, "Is the consultative process across the three campuses more non-institutionalized now? Is it less formal?" Dubrow said, "A question we are now confronted with is: How do we institutionalize and formalize that [part of the process]? The representation is formalized. But it's not institutionalized." Decker said, "There's only *one* Graduate School for the whole University." Dubrow asked Decker, "Is that model working, in your view?" Decker replied: "Overall, 90% of the time, it's fabulous. But when UW, Tacoma had to respond *quickly*, it became a timing issue. People needed to move quickly, more quickly than was possible."

Nelson said, "We shouldn't move *away* from the one Graduate School." Dubrow said, "But there are *sub* processes." Decker said, "Yes. No one would *want* it to change. Overall, it's been very successful." Killien said, "Just to be sure of the process, what happens after the Graduate School has acted [on a new program proposal]?" McCaffery said, "After the Graduate School has acted, the proposal goes to the HEC Board. It's not always passed on to the Graduate Council. So, it often goes from external review directly to the HEC Board." Dubrow noted: "We *want* to formalize certain informal processes."

Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force – Jacqueline Meszaros

Jacqueline Meszaros, Associate Professor, Business Program, and a member of the Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force Steering Committee, said, "I've missed serving on FCTCP. This council – FCTCP – is where I could ground myself University-wide."

Meszaros said Doug Wadden and Ross Heath met with UW, Bothell faculty recently. "Our faculty are anxious that FCTCP be used in the Presidential Tri-Campus Task Force. Let me know what *you* think would be valuable to send to the Regents." She said, "There is a fear of creating a *tabula rasa* task force report. So we need to think of how things could evolve based on *who we are*."

Meszaros said the steering committee met on February 28th. The committee plans to report to the president and the Board of Regents on four areas. First, external conditions: changes in legislation, demographic forces and the national condition. Then internal conditions: e.g., how UW, Bothell and UW, Tacoma have their own identities, and what three-campus conditions currently look like. Section 3 will be a set of potential models, ranging perhaps from full integration to full autonomy. Section 4 will describe other systems."

Meszaros asked the council to "think about what *shouldn't be missed* in the work of the presidential task force. As to "models for three-campus relations," she asked how integrated and how autonomous they should be.

With respect to curriculum review, Meszaros said, "We should find a description of existing models, and reports on schools that have made the transition from being two-year to four-year schools. We're developing an understanding of what this will look like if it's to be of use to everyone. And we're trying to determine what the internal process will look like."

Heath said, "We're still arriving at a common vocabulary. We have to find a way to communicate the task force's ideas so that all will understand them. The educational aspect of this may be the most important thing. We need broad-based thinking to be of help in the future to the University as a whole."

Heath asked the council: "What do we need to say about the *status quo*? Let us know about that."

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Tuesday, April 6, 2004, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder