

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy  
February 28, 2013, 9:00-10:30 AM  
26 Gerberding Hall

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Welcome and Introductions
  2. Approval of January 24, 2013, Minutes
  3. FCTCP Review Process – Work Group Findings/Option Analysis/Discussion (Robert Corbett)
  4. Faculty Governance Tri-Campus Retreat and Planning
  5. Updates on salary adjustments/planning committee findings; distance learning planning/process
  6. Tri-Campus review subcommittee membership
  7. Agenda formation for next meeting
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Chair Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:06 and asked all those attending to introduce themselves.

**2. Approval of January 24, 2013, Minutes**

The January 24, 2013, minutes of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy were approved as written.

**3. FCTCP Review Process – Work Group Findings/Option Analysis/Discussion (Robert Corbett)**

Erdly reported that the working group formed to consider the possible revision of the Tri-Campus review process met and has come up with a couple of draft revisions to the current process for FCTCP's review. He began by reviewing the current process. The primary concern leading to a decision to consider revising the process was that issues and questions were often not taken into account in time to make a difference in the process.

Robert Corbett then described the options the working group came up with. The preferred option (Proposed Revision A) brings FCTCP into the process much earlier with the responsibility for notification of all proposed changes to all three campuses within 7 working days. The working group was also concerned that any revision of the process not add time to what it currently takes to run a proposal through this process. The current process allows 14 days for FCTCP's final process review before it goes to the President. The proposed new change would split FCTCP's 14 days into two 7-day tasks. The first is described above, and the second is a 7-day process review before the proposal goes to the President.

Discussion ensued about the importance of developing on-line systems to monitor and collate the input from the solicited feedback.

Lerum and Purdy both reported positive feedback from faculty at Bothell and Tacoma respectively, with some concern reported from Tacoma on how this would integrate with other procedures currently in place. Other concerns were allayed by hearing that FCTCP does have “teeth” in this process by virtue of its being in a position to refer a proposal to the Provost with its concerns and recommendations before moving it along to the President’s office for final approval.

Erdly added that he hopes to find a way to organize proposals in batches for the FCTCP review process in that the Council meets so infrequently.

Another idea that came up throughout the discussion is that it might be helpful to articulate what kind of comments the Council is looking for – asking for feedback that includes questions or concerns rather than critiques. Providing some kind of parameters for responders might avoid the edgier responses.

In response to the question of how this revised set of procedures (if approved) would be published, someone responded that an overall flow chart would be posted on the Registrar’s website in such a way that coordination among the three campuses is clear.

ASUW representative Sugarman suggested that it seemed strange that there is only one student on this committee having oversight on the process of changing programs so integrally related to ALL students on campus. The Council responded supportively and suggested there may be a parallel procedure to soliciting faculty input that would do the same for students – with opportunities for each to view the other’s sites. It may be especially important to have more student participation with distance learning degrees coming up in the future.

A question was raised about the possibility of increasing the number of student representatives on FCTCP to three – representing all three campuses.

ALUW Leadley added that the same parallel process could be set up for librarians across the three campuses.

Caution was encouraged against making the process more complex than it needs to be – and the importance of having as much of this as possible done on the web with the help of good software.

Finally, Erdly suggested that for next time, the same working group that drafted the first two options should reconvene to flesh out a more explicit Option A. The group might also address questions about format. In the meantime, proposals will go through the current FCTCP process. Once FCTCP is satisfied with the proposal to revise the process, it will ask the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to comment.

#### **4. Faculty Governance Tri-Campus Retreat and Planning**

Chair Erdly asked the Council if they had thought of any issues or agenda items for a Tri-Campus retreat. Lerum responded that the concept in general was a good idea and wanted to know when it might be scheduled. She is genuinely curious about what's happening at other campuses. Purdy added that although her campus faculty is focused just now on how to give budget advice, there is generally support for idea. It was suggested that a date in early spring quarter, before mid-terms, would work well. Early in the week of April 22 was proposed. Erdly would like to keep it a small group, perhaps with an invited guest presenter who could report on multi-campus governance structures. AAUP might have resources on the topic of multi-campus governance structures.

**5. Updates on salary adjustments/planning committee findings; distance learning planning/process**

No discussion due to lack of time.

**6. Tri-Campus review subcommittee membership**

No discussion due to lack of time.

**7. Agenda formation for next meeting**

Sugarman offered an update on the discussion of a common application. She has discovered that the delay in its consideration as a proposal is due to concerns about questions in the application related to criminal background and religion. Erdly suggested that copies of the proposal and student opinion on the criminal background questions be brought to next meeting.

**8. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:35.

---

*Minutes by Susan Folk, Faculty Council Support, [sfolk@u.washington.edu](mailto:sfolk@u.washington.edu)*

**Present:** **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Kucher, Crowder  
**President's Designee:** JW Harrington  
**Ex Officio:** Leadley, Sugerman, Deardorff, Lerum, Purdy  
**Guest:** Annette Anderson for Susan Jeffords

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Edicott-Popovsky, Reusch, Dolsak  
**President's Designee:** Doug Wadden, Susan Jeffords  
**Ex Officio:** Randall, Lee, Fridley