

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
Tuesday, February 7, 2006
36 Gerberding Hall

In the absence of Chair Marcia Killien, Vice Chair Marcy Stein called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Synopsis:

1. Update of program review procedures, etc.
2. Impact of fee-based and other programs on UWB program offerings
3. Form 1503 comments
4. Tacoma and Bothell representation on faculty councils and committees; campus identities

1. Opening comments from the chair, introductions, agenda, minutes

Vice Chair Stein welcomed council members.

Approved minutes of the December 14, 2005, meeting are posted on the Website.

2. Update on program-review procedures

Stein distributed copies of "FCTCP Updates," provided by Marcia Killien for this council meeting.

Item 1. FCAS motion, unanimously passed on 12/16/05:

Continuing with recent practice, FCAS will delegate the faculty approval of new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and options to be offered at UWT or UWB, along with substantive changes for the same, to the Faculty Assembly at UWT and the General Faculty Organization at UWB, respectively. And further, that the chair of these respective faculty bodies at UWT and UWB, or their committee chairs as delegated are authorized to sign the proposals related to the above in lieu of the signature of the chair of FCAS.

A discussion of the FCAS motion ensued. Tom Bellamy pointed out that the underlying history to this motion extends back several years and relates to the relationship between the Seattle campus and Tacoma and Bothell. The group discussed Chair Killien's report about the Secretary's concerns about the FCAS motion being out of compliance with the code, and, as such, suggesting a significant change in the relationships.

It was agreed that a conversation among principals of the three campuses appears to be in order, but should wait until the two new campuses have permanent chancellors – although it was suggested that Steve Olswang should be involved because of his long involvement in the discussions. Leppa asked if there is some archival documentation of the conversations that have been conducted on this issue, as it has been extant for a decade. It would be helpful to have this documentation to avoid revisiting the issue whenever there are new personnel.

The vice chair will check with Killien about distributing the "THREE CAMPUS UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM REVIEW PROCEDURES" (approved 6/2/04). Note: these are attached at the end of the minutes. The revised (2/06) procedures are available on the Faculty Senate Website.

Item 2. The council approved a revision to the revised draft of review procedures, which incorporated comments from the December 2005 FCTCP meeting and is being sent forward to the Office of the Provost. The revision is "a procedure for individuals to request a 5-day extension of the 15-day comment period under special circumstances. . ."

3. Impact of fee-based and other programs on UWB program offerings

Tom Bellamy presented this issue in the form of “seeking advice and a preliminary conversation that relates mainly to Bothell, but may affect Tacoma as well.” Since a large proportion of UWB’s applicants are transfer applicants, Seattle’s drastic increase in the percentage of transfer applications it accepted for this year had a major impact on Bothell’s enrollment. The number of “transfer-intent” students in the region has recently been flat or declining, so the competition intensifies. In addition, UWEO is marketing Seattle’s evening degree-completion programs to the same pool of potential students that UWB has historically attracted.

Bellamy further mentioned the lack of an established venue for UWB to have program-related conversations with Seattle units. The boundaries between colleges are managed through the curriculum review process. Treating Bothell and Tacoma like colleges, however, becomes problematic when there is no formally established venue for the new campuses to discuss when outreach programs should be fee-based and managed through Seattle, or state-funded and managed by the new campuses. This becomes a critical issue when two campuses begin to serve the same area. It seems there’s a policy issue in which faculty should be involved. This is not to negate the importance and place of fee-based programs, but a mechanism needs to be available to have conversations about their development.

There was a clarification about the role of the HECB, that it is not involved in enrollment management, that it looks at programs individually and not at the impact of one program on another. And in Seattle, enrollment management addresses only Seattle and not the three campuses as a whole. It was suggested that UWEO is a “fourth site,” since it is cash-funded and self-managed, vs. the state-funded programs at UWT and UWB.

The council agreed that discussions are needed on how the approval process for self-funded programs is conducted for units in Seattle and the issue of coordination with the other two campuses. The question then becomes – what *is* the appropriate mechanism for having those discussions. And, who should be at the table? and where?

A two-step process was suggested: faculty from Seattle, Tacoma, and Bothell meet with UWEO, with Killien and Stein present to raise the questions; that would be followed by the development of a plan and involvement of the whole FCTCP membership.

5. Document: Form 1503 – “Creating & Changing Undergraduate Academic Programs”

(The latest version of this form had been sent to members earlier.) Robert Corbett went over the latest revisions made in response to feedback received in December. He received additional suggestions to improve clarity. There was a discussion of the limitations of the process – the circumstances that would fall outside the process. Corbett suggested the need for a more formal structure that would allow serious consideration of undergraduate programs at all three campuses, given the addition of the new undergraduate programs. (If an undergrad program is not part of a graduate program, the former does not get reviewed.)

FCAS will again review the document given the number of changes that were made at the meeting. Corbett said the form will become a PDF and data automatically submitted to the Office of the Registrar.

6. (Point of information) Tacoma and Bothell representation on faculty councils and committees; campus identities

Zoe Barsness asked if there is an inventory of all committees and officers, with some indication of representation by each of the three campuses. Carol Leppa explained that rather than have Tacoma and Bothell representation of all groups, which would be an impossible demand based on numbers, FCTCP was designated the central group, the body that would address only issues common to all three campuses.

The council reviewed historical events related to development of the two newer campuses, their status and identity. There is “confusion of identity” for new faculty: Tacoma and Bothell assert identification with the “University of Washington,” while promoting individual campus identities. The Faculty Code is also “murky”: it treats the newer campuses as colleges, but “colleges” are beginning to emerge on the campuses. This engenders issues of how to manage boundaries around budgets and enrollments.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m. Minutes taken by Laraine Hong, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW-Bothell. lhong@uwb.edu; 2-3276

Present: **Faculty:** Stein, Barsness, Leppa, Harrington
 President’s designee: Bellamy
 Members of representative groups: Chen, Corbett, Weitkamp
 Ex officio members: Collins

Absent: **Members of representative groups:** Fugate, Louie
 Faculty: Killien, Krishnamurthy
 Ex officio members: Stygall, Tenenberg
 Faculty Legislative representative: Lovell

THREE CAMPUS UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM REVIEW PROCEDURES

Recommended by
FACULTY COUNCIL ON TRICAMPUS POLICY
06/02/04

These procedures apply to new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors (and certificates) and substantive changes to same*

Background:

Executive Order, Section 13-23 C. Legislative Authority of the Faculty, (February 3, 2004) requires that undergraduate degrees, majors minors, and certificate programs, regardless of campus of origin, will be referred by the President to the Faculty Senate for coordinated review by all three campuses. This document outlines the processes for curricular coordination and review, recommended by the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy and supported by the Faculty Senate Council on Academic Standards, the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee of UWT, and the Executive Committee of the General Faculty Organization of UWB.

The purposes of these processes are to:

1. Enhance the quality of undergraduate curricula of the University through faculty peer review,
2. Promote communication about and coordination of curricular development among the campuses of the University,
3. Allow for faculty collaboration among campuses to promote quality and optimal use of resources.

The Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy believes that these purposes are best met by: facilitating widespread communication within and among University campuses in the early stages of curricular development; reviewing for consistent curricular elements on each campus; and monitoring the implementation of the recommended processes.

Early in the process of developing a new undergraduate degree, major, minor, or certificate, faculty of the sponsoring unit are encouraged to contact faculty of all campuses they believe may have experience, expertise, or interest in the proposal. The purpose of this informal communication is to notify faculty within and among campuses of curricular ideas in the early stages of development to promote collaboration that may enhance the quality of proposals.

Formal participation in curricular development by faculty of all campuses of the University is recommended at two phases of curricular development:

- I. Developed proposal comment
- II. Final proposal process review

Phase I. Developed Proposal Comments

The purpose of this stage of review is to help ensure that fully developed proposals meet the curricular standards of the University faculty and reflect consideration of comments by faculty across all campuses of the University. Such comments may enhance the quality of proposals, facilitate potential collaborations, and prevent unnecessary curricular duplication.

Procedures:

1. 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 holds its initial review of the proposal, it will be posted for comment to the entire University (i.e., three campus) community through the Faculty Senate website.

* These procedures apply to what is commonly known as “non-routine submissions”.

2. At the time of posting, an e-mail notification will be sent to a standard mailing list of Deans, Directors and Chairs (or their designees), campus curriculum and/or program approval committee, and advisors. Comments from all three campuses will be directed to the relevant Campus-level curriculum review body and the department/program proposing the offering.
3. The originating campus' curricular review body will review its own proposals, and should consider the following elements, using its own processes and criteria:

Fit with campus and university mission
Academic quality
Need
Effects on students
Effects on other programs
Feasibility/Operational viability
Adherence to University and Campus policies

Before recommending approval of a proposal, the Campus-level curriculum review body will also ensure that all comments received from the three campuses are considered.

Comments may include:

- concerns about duplication/ensuring distinctiveness;
- opportunities for coordination/synergy/efficiency;
- ideas for strengthening/improving;
- lessons from other faculties' experience.

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.

Phase II. Final Three Campus Proposal Process Review

The purpose of this review is to comply with the Executive Order and ensure that coordinated review by all University campuses has occurred.

Procedure:

1. When the President receives a final proposal for a new undergraduate degree, major, minor, certificate program or substantive change in these, the proposal will be sent to the Chair of the Faculty Senate who will forward it to the chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (representing the Faculty Senate), with copies for information to the Provost, Chancellors (or their designees) and designated faculty representatives at each campus.
2. A subcommittee of the Council consisting of the Council chair (or designee), and one Council member representing faculty of each of the other two campuses will convene and issue a report to the Chair of the Senate (for forwarding to the President and Chancellors) within 14 days of receipt of the proposal.
3. The Council subcommittee will review the documentation of the curricular review process submitted with the proposal for adherence to the process outlined in this document. The review will examine:
 - `Was the final proposal made available for a 30 day comment period?
 - `Were comments received and responded to appropriately?
 - `Did the campus curricular review body consider comments and responses in its review?
4. The Council chair will report on the review to the Chair of the Faculty Senate, who will forward the results to the President and Chancellors.. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

Appendix
Summary of Proposed Tricampus Faculty Coordination and Review of Undergraduate Curricula
 New undergraduate degrees, majors, minors (and certificates)
 and substantive changes to same

PHASE	COMMENTS INVITED VIA	RESPONSIBLE FOR POSTING OR NOTIFICATION	COMMENTS SENT TO	
Pre-proposal	Informal faculty discussion	Not posted	Sponsoring unit faculty	
I. Developed Proposal Sent to Campus Curricular Review Body	University Week Faculty Senate Website Email to: Campus level curriculum review bodies; all Chairs, Directors, Deans/Chancellors, advisors (or their designees)	Secretary of the Faculty	Campus level curriculum review body UWS: FCAS/SCAP UWT: Faculty Assembly Sub-committee on Academic Programs UWB: Executive Committee of GFO	
II. Final Proposal Received by President	Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (subcommittee)	President	Report on adherence to process sent by FCTCP Chair to Faculty Senate Chair for forwarding to President and Chancellors	

University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination

(02/06 version)

Introduction

Executive Order, Sec. I 3-23C: Legislative Authority of the Faculty (3 February 2004) requires the President to refer the following types of undergraduate program changes to the Faculty Senate for coordinated faculty review by all three campuses: undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, or substantive changes to the same of a non-routine nature, regardless of campus of origin. The purpose of this process is to enhance the quality of undergraduate course offerings through peer review, promote coordination and communication among the campuses, and to promote faculty collaboration that can lead to greater quality and optimal use of resources. This memo describes the process for carrying out the University Campuses Review Process. . Please note, however, that no campus has the power or authority to veto a program or program change proposed by another campus. Finally, this review is designed to generate feedback at a point in time where the proposals are developed but not approved so that the originating campus can make full use of any feedback that is provided.

Process

Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals

1. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. After a campus unit develops and approves a curricular offering, it should be forwarded to the appropriate academic program review committee for that campus.¹
2. The academic program review committee of each campus shall make an initial determination that the proposal is sufficiently developed to merit academic program review.² It shall also determine whether the proposed change meets the guidelines for tri-campus review.³ If a campus academic program review committee or the University Registrar has questions about the applicability of the Tri-campus review process, they should consult the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP).
 - a. If the proposal meets this threshold, it shall be forwarded immediately to the University Registrar, Curriculum Secretary. Materials to be forwarded to the University Registrar must include, in electronic form:
 - i. A completed university curriculum Form 1503
 - ii. The rationale for the proposal
 - b. If the proposal is not complete, it shall be returned by the University Registrar to the unit of origin for further development.
3. When the University Registrar receives the completed program proposal, it will be posted on the Web immediately for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days.⁴
4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Registrar shall send an e-mail to (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs (DDC) list serve, (3) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee, and (4) the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.
5. At the end of the comment period, the University Registrar shall compile all comments made on the proposal and forward the comments to the Chair of the academic program review committee at the originating campus. That committee shall then consider all comments as part of their academic program review process, and shall provide a summary of responses to the comments received from all campuses.

Stage II

1. The originating campus academic program review committee will obtain final campus approvals on the final proposal.
2. When final campus approval has been received the proposal will be forwarded by the appropriate campus official to the University Registrar.
3. The University Registrar shall forward to the Chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy with a copy to the Chair of the Faculty Senate the following materials: the program proposal, all comments, the campus academic program review committee's response to the comments, the University Campuses Undergraduate Program Review checklist.
4. The Council on Tri-campus Policy, or a delegated 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), will convene to determine if the review satisfied the following requirements
 - a. Was the final proposal made available for a 15 business -day comment period?
 - b. Did the campus academic program review committee consider comments and respond appropriately in its review? The Council will send, within 14 business days of receiving the proposal, a memo describing the results of their review to the University Registrar. In short, at this stage the task of the Council will be to ensure that the process described in Stage I and the intent of the Executive Order was followed.
5. The University Registrar will forward the final proposal and a copy of the Council's memo to the President for final action and transmittal to the appropriate dean/chancellor and Chair of the Faculty Senate. Matters of non-adherence to procedures or unresolved issues related to comments received will be the responsibility of the President.

¹ UW, Seattle: Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)
UW, Bothell: General Faculty Organization
UW, Tacoma: Faculty Assembly

² The originating campus' academic program review committee will review its own proposals, and should consider the following elements, using its own processes and criteria:

- Fit with campus and university mission
- Academic quality
- Need
- Effects on students
- Effects on other programs
- Feasibility/operational viability
- Adherence to University and Campus policies

³ As stated in the Executive Order, tri-campus review is required for new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, and certificate programs, or substantive changes to the same of a non-routine nature. This includes, but may not be limited to:

- a. Changes that would alter the degree information that appears on a student transcript, for example, new or changed degree titles, minors, or options, etc.
- b. Changes in pre-requisites that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students admitted to the major, minor, or option.
- c. Changes in graduation requirements that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students completing the major, minor, or option.
- d. Any change in a program on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses, for example changing the format of a program to distance learning or fee-based offering.

⁴ The Registrar may grant a 5-business day extension of this deadline to any individual who submits a written request to the Registrar prior to the end of the original comment period.