

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, **February 8, 2005**, in 36 Gerberding Hall. Chair Marcia Killien presided.

**PRESENT:**     *Professors* Killien (chair), Barsness, Behler and Stein;  
                  *Ex officio members* Chen, Jeffords, Laverty, Nelson and Tenenberg;  
                  *Guest* Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty.

**ABSENT:**     *Professor* Leppa and Schwartz;  
                  *Ex officio members* Bellamy, Emery, Fugate, James and Stygall.

**Synopsis**

1.        Approval of the minutes of January 11, 2005.
2.        Discussion of the implementation of the three-campus review policy (guest: Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty).

**Approval of minutes**

The minutes of the January 11, 2005 meeting were approved as written.

**Discussion of the implementation of the three-campus review policy – guest: Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty**

**THE FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRI-CAMPUS POLICY (FCTCP) VOTED UNANIMOUSLY TO APPROVE A “FRIENDLY AMENDMENT” TO THE “THREE CAMPUS UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM REVIEW PROCEDURES [06/02/04]” RECOMMENDED BY FCTCP TO THE FACULTY SENATE AT THE SEC MEETING ON JANUARY 10, 2005.** The “friendly amendment” occurs in “Phase I. Developed Proposal Comments”, under “Procedures: 1.”: The amended sentence would read: “At the time that a department/program sends a fully developed proposal forward for review by its Campus-level curricular review body, AND no less than 30 days before the Campus body approves the proposal, it will be posted for comment to the entire University (i.e., three campus) community through the Faculty Senate Website.”

On the “Three Campus Undergraduate Curriculum Review Procedures Checklist” that Killien distributed to the council, the following changes were decided on by the council:

Under “Phase I”, after “Review Completed by: (list name of curriculum review body) / Chaired by:” there are now these four wordings: 1) “Date proposal received by the originating campus’ curriculum body”; 2) “Date proposal sent to the Secretary of the Faculty”; 3) “Date proposal is posted [30 days between posting and approval by originating campus’ curriculum body”; 4) “Date of originating curriculum body approval.”

After these four wordings are the following two wordings: 1) “Number of comments received (please attach all comments)”; and 2) “Summary of comments and consideration thereof.”

Under “Phase II”, in the “YES NO” section, the fourth question now reads as follows: “Was response to comments appropriate? (explain, if necessary)”.

**REGARDING TODAY’S COUNCIL DISCUSSION (Guest: Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty)**

Killien informed the council: “We now have a go-ahead on implementation of the Three Campus Undergraduate Curriculum Review Procedures.” Faculty Senate Chair Ross Heath took the Procedures to the Board of Deans. The Procedures still have problems [to be worked out as the process is tested in actual practice], but it can now be implemented.”

Lea Vaughn, Secretary of the Faculty, emphasized that FCTCP cannot veto or approve any proposal, that its role is to see that the undergraduate curriculum review process has been properly adhered to. Vaughn suggested that it would help the review process if the DDC E-mail list (Deans, Directors and Chairs) were to be included when the Secretary of the Faculty receives the developed proposal from the originating campus curriculum review body and sends it to the other campus' curriculum review bodies, to University Week (a notice of posting), and to the Faculty Senate Website.

Killien noted that there are still old proposals coming to FCTCP. There are proposals that have already gone through the campus review process and arrived at the president's desk. An ad hoc coordinated review will need to be done on these proposals. An ad hoc E-mail subcommittee from the council – to be appointed by Killien – will review a French minor (emanating from UW Seattle) that must be processed by February 28<sup>th</sup>. Killien has contacted the heads of the faculty curriculum review bodies at the other campuses and asked them to respond to her by February 22<sup>nd</sup>. This will allow the council to communicate its response to the originating campus curriculum review body at UW Seattle before February 28<sup>th</sup>. Killien said she does not know how many other proposals are “out of sync with the new curriculum review process”. Killien said the two other campuses are being asked to handle their campus undergraduate curriculum reviews in whatever way they are used to handling them.

As for today, said Killien, she wanted to see if the council can agree on what exactly the “real [curriculum review] process” is. One issue to be mindful of, she noted, is whether one campus is approving something from another campus. “This is not an approval process; we're strictly advisory. The president approves [a proposal], or does not approve.” Another issue to pay close attention to is timeliness, Killien stressed. “We don't want delays [in the curriculum review process]. We don't want the process to take long and be problematic.” A third – and related – goal is to make the process easy to implement.

Killien said, “Let's start with a mock-up. Let's describe what we do in the case of an actual proposal. We have a faculty group who wants to propose a new degree program. The process starts when that developed proposal reaches the originating campus curriculum review body. Simultaneously, the developed proposal is sent to the Secretary of the Faculty. The Secretary of the Faculty will post the proposal on the Faculty Senate Website, will send a notice of the posting to University Week, will send the proposal to the heads of the other campus' curriculum review bodies, and will send the proposal to the DDC E-mail list (Deans, Directors, and Chairs) and ask for any responses and concerns they may have on the proposal.” The “Comment Period” will be [a minimum of] 30 days. The online 1503 new (or revised) program application form, it was suggested, could be used to expedite the review process.

As for the state of approval of proposals going out from the originating campus, Nelson said that no proposal will go out from UW Tacoma “until everyone has signed off on it [including himself and the chancellor]”. Killien asked Nelson how often a proposal at UW Tacoma would get curriculum approval where the discussion of the proposal would not include input from the administration. Nelson said it would be exceptionally rare. Killien asked if it was helpful to get other campus' input on the proposal. Nelson said, “It's not a problem. But we know what's going on at the other campuses.”

Killien said it must be kept in mind that “this is specifically a faculty curriculum review process, a process that is very important in [the University's overall] curricular soundness.” Tenenberg pointed out that “this is a new process for us”, and that it will take some time before the coordination of the process is as efficient as it can be. Barsness emphasized that, though the developed proposals will be sent to the other campuses for feedback and comment, the originating campus' curriculum review body will not be inundated by comments, because only those people who have a direct, or at least an indirect, connection to the proposal, will have comments they want to send on.

Secretary of the Faculty Vaughn said the newly developed proposals will be, on one level, a kind of environmental impact statement: Is the program being proposed already in existence at another campus? Has it been in existence before at any of the campuses? Also, the role of simultaneity in the review process [during the 30 day “Comment Period”] will be key, she noted. It will make the process much more efficient, and gainsay those who suggest the review process will take too long. Jeffords said, “Pull out the

funding issue from this process, where possible.” Killien concurred: “Yes, the funding issue is not part of this process (except indirectly).”

Killien said there may be situations involving more than usual to and fro between internal (originating campus) and external (the other campuses) curriculum review bodies. But even should this occur, the total amount of time should be able to be contained, or quite nearly contained, within the prescribed 30 day “Comment Period”. All comments would be sent to the chair of the originating campus’ curriculum review body in as timely a fashion as feasible. Killien said, “The only change in the current process is that curriculum bodies of the other two campuses would be making suggestions to the originating campus’ curriculum review body.” It was observed that there would be concern that faculty have proper opportunity for comment. “It’s important that the curriculum review bodies are the primary audience for the posting,” Killien noted. [By no means the only audience, but the primary audience.]

Barsness asked if, with respect to alerting people about proposals going through the review process, the DDC E-mail list (Deans, Directors, and Chairs) should indeed be included. Killien said, “Yes, it should be included.” Vaughn added that, ideally, the Deans, Directors, and Chairs should be notifying their faculty in turn, and asking them to respond if there is a concern with the proposal, and that this is the reason why the DDC E-mail list is part of the curriculum review process: not for further administrative response, but for further faculty response.

Stein stressed that “this is a simultaneous process, so no one will be asked about a done deal.” And she further clarified the important point that if a proposal goes to the other campus’ undergraduate curriculum review bodies, and feedback from those review bodies causes changes in the proposal, the proposal will not have to go out yet again.

Vaughn suggested that FCTCP write cover letters to the chairs of the three campus undergraduate curriculum review bodies. She, in her role, will receive the developed proposal from the originating campus undergraduate curriculum review body, then send it, as previously stated, to the other campus’ curriculum review bodies, to University Week (a notice of posting), and to the Faculty Senate Website.

It was pointed out that few of these proposals are developed in any one academic year: from eight (or fewer) to 20 (or fewer). Vaughn again said that FCTCP should let the three campus undergraduate curriculum review bodies (in a cover letter) know what they need to do, in their role in the process. Killien said those bodies need to know about the DDC E-mail list as well; FCTCP did not know about the list itself. “We would recommend wide distribution; our goal is communication,” she stressed. Vaughn said, of the three-campus undergraduate curriculum review process, “We’ll try it, and fix it, if need be.”

Asked when the president receives the proposal, and signs off on it [Phase II: Final Proposal], Killien said the president receives the proposal at the end of the process. He receives, via the Faculty Senate Chair, the “Report on adherence to process” sent by the chair of FCTCP to the Faculty Senate Chair, who sends it both to the president and to the two chancellors.

### **Next meeting**

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Tuesday, March 8, 2005, at 10:30 a.m., in 36 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor  
Recorder