

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

WEDNESDAY, February 28, 2007

142 Gerberding Hall

Chair Marcia Killien called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Approval of minutes
  2. Cross-campus Enrollment discussion
  3. FCTCP review of proposed program in American Indian Studies
  4. Update on status of FCTCP proposed legislation
- 

**1. Approval of the minutes**

The first order was the approval, with no comment, of the January 5, 2007 council meeting minutes. A council member remarked that the December 8, 2006 meeting minutes had not yet been approved. Chair Killien inquired if there were any objections. With no objections the council approved the minutes.

**2. Discussion of Cross-campus Enrollment**

Council member Bellamy reviewed the two-part recommendations for cross-campus enrollment policy by UW Bothell. He noted that the proposed changes would streamline the ability of students to take individual courses across campuses, which the most recent policy changes made more difficult. The proposed changes would also allow all students to pursue a second major, without having to apply for a separate university admission. Possible protections to prevent an abuse of the policy included a limit on the number of credits that could be taken on the secondary campus to prevent students, for instance, from being admitted to UW Bothell and then taking all of their classes at UW Seattle.

Council members raised the following questions: How many students are we talking about? What is the difference in admissions standards between the three campuses? Council member Cauce cautioned that this proposal would seem to increase the number of students in two and three majors, and thus extend their time to degree. One council member responded that perhaps maintaining high academic standards would address that issue by limiting the number of students who opt for second majors. Other questions raised included does there need to be a dual review, and what majors are competitive? Council members discussed issues around majors that have no admission process, and overenrolled majors that are competitive. Comments were sought from UW Tacoma council members. They responded that they were not sure how many students would come up to the UW Seattle or Bothell campuses to pursue a double major, but that the policy change would seem to increase the choices for these students and their chances to go back and forth between campuses. Council member Wood cautioned that the Faculty Council on Academic Standard would find problems and that they need to be careful in telling students they can take what they want, since there is often limited room in the most attractive majors.

Chair Killien moved toward an endorsement of the proposal, and stated that the next step is a review by FCAS. Council member Wood noted that his office should review the document and comment on it before FCAS receives it. He asked what is the time frame on this? Members agreed that it would not be completed before the end of the academic year. A council member asked when it is sent to FCAS. The Chair then took a vote to endorse the

proposal in principal, which the council passed unanimously. It was agreed that the Chair would send a letter summarizing FCTCP's vote and discussion to FCAS.

### **3. FCTCP Review of the Proposed Program in American Indian Studies**

Chair Killien announced that for the second phase of the 3-campus procedure, it was the council's job to read through the comments and responses to the proposed program in American Indian Studies and determine whether or not they were appropriate.

Council members discussed comments about the use of the word "science" in the proposed curriculum. A member noted that it was not a natural, but a social science being offered. Council members concluded that the comments and responses were appropriate. Killien asked for a motion to forward the proposal to the Registrar with FCTCP's response. It was seconded, with no opposition.

### **4. Update on the Status of the Proposed FCTCP Legislation**

Chair Killien provided a review of the steps taken so far. Chair Killien noted that the proposal was reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, which presented a substitute document to SEC, where it was discussed and tabled. She noted that the President had approved the original document, but not the substitute draft. The substitute draft has been sent to the President, and a response is pending. Killien said a meeting with the FCTCP members Stein, Collins and Killien and the entire Advisory Committee is planned for early March. Shortly after they will report back on that to the full FCTCP council. Chair Killien raised several issues surrounding the change in proposal. The first issue concerns the time frame in which the proposal will next reach SEC, the Faculty Senate, and then the entire faculty for vote.

The second issue concerns the language to be used in the definition of campus. Council members discussed various alternatives. Council members advised to avoid use of the terms "campus" and "branch" because they are seen as the most offensive. Bellamy suggested the use of the terms "original and new campuses." Killien concluded that they had to work out the language of the proposal before sending it to the Faculty Senate and other faculties. Killien closed the meeting on the note that they wanted to move the issue forward, but not before there is widespread support for the language of the legislation.

**The meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.**

Minutes by Melissa Kane, Faculty Senate, [mmkane@u.washington.edu](mailto:mmkane@u.washington.edu), or 206.543-2884

#### **Present:**

Regular: Killien, Leppa, Neill  
Ex-officio: Nicoletta  
President's Designees: Bellamy, Cauce, Wood  
Ex Officio: Corbett, Fleurdelys, Fugate, Weitkamp

#### **Absent:**

Regular: Collins, Harrington, Stein  
Ex-officio: Lovell, Luchtel, Stiber