

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 10:30 a.m. on Monday, **January 13, 2003**, in 142 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

PRESENT: *Professors* Meszaros (Chair), Killien, Primomo, Schaufelberger and Stein;
 Ex officio members Cameron, D’Costa, Decker, Fugate, Sjavik and Wadden;
 Guest Carolyn Plumb, chair, Faculty Council on Academic Standards.
ABSENT: *Professor* Leppa
 Ex officio members Krishnamurthy, Nelson, Olswang and Whitney.

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the December 9, 2002 meeting were approved as amended.

Discussion of three-campus curriculum coordination

Meszaros said, “It seems there is clear agreement on some things, and not on others, regarding three-campus curriculum coordination.

By way of review, here is an excerpt from the last FCTCP meeting on December 9, 2002:

[“As for the draft of the coordination process, the “Curriculum Pre-proposal Coordination” process seemed fine as it is to the council. The process goes from Idea to Dean or Chancellor to the Provost’s Office; to the Inter-Institutional Committee on Academic Planning and Programs (referenced above) OR to the HEC Board List; and, simultaneously, from the Provost’s Office to the UW Community Posting in the University Week and the Posting Web site. At this point, preliminary comments will be welcomed. The replies will be made to the appropriate Dean’s or Chancellor’s office or campus SCAP.

“In the “Process for Faculty New Program Coordination,” the movement is from the Provost’s Office to the Dean or Chancellor; from the Dean or Chancellor to the Posting for formal comment (a period of 30 days), and, again, to University Week and the Posting Web site and to all SCAP’s and College Committees (a period of 30 days); then to departments for development; from the departments to Major Faculty Review (College Curriculum Committee if Seattle, the UW Bothell SCAP, if UW Bothell, and the UW Tacoma SCAP, if UW Tacoma, and the Tri-Campus SCAP if there are trans-campus objections, and UW Seattle SCAP if there are within-Seattle campus objections (all for a period of 30 days); and finally, to Final Faculty Review, and, specifically, review by UW Seattle SCAP, UW Bothell College Council, and UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly; or Tri-Campus SCAP when the proposal comes from UW Bothell or UW Tacoma (this also is part of the second 30-day review period).”]

To return to today’s meeting, Meszaros said, “It is agreed that if a proposal goes outside the HEC Board list, it should be posted for comments throughout the three-campus University.”

It is also agreed, she said, that the next stage is departmental development, and review by college curriculum committees. The SCAP committees at all three campuses would also review the proposal at this stage. (The review committees at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma would be called SCAP to be consistent with the SCAP subcommittee of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards [FCAS] at UW Seattle.)

Thus, Meszaros pointed out, the early phase of review, posting, and constructive comments is agreed upon.

What is not agreed upon is the formalized approval process.

Meszaros said, “The UW Bothell and UW Tacoma campuses are interested in enhancing the sharing of information. But we do not believe that the program approval process we have been using at the two

campuses for many years now has been in violation of the Faculty Code. Nothing in the Code suggests that we *have* been.”

Wadden said, “There’s still the Faculty Code, and there’s still one University Handbook; and that suggests that one appropriate committee or council – and FCAS has been that council – is responsible for approval of new or revised degree programs at the undergraduate level.”

Killien said, reiterating Meszaros’s point, “The current practice has been going on for some time. In this practice, individual campuses have their own mechanisms for going through the program approval process.” Meszaros said, “We’ve always been in communication with the Faculty Senate as we’ve gone through this process. But, again, nothing in the Code says there’s only one approval body. We see nothing against our practice in the Code.”

“We’ve reached an impasse,” said Meszaros. “I think we ought to move ahead with the changes to curriculum coordination that we all agree on, and I think we ought to write a statement as a council about what the impasse *is*.” This may be helpful to others as they work on these issues in future.” Meszaros said that, since both sides of the discussion need to be represented as fairly as possible, she and Wadden will draw up a draft and then show it to the council.

Plumb said, “It would be a good idea to define the two major points of view expressed during these last few months. It also would be good to include an evaluation of how the changes that have been agreed upon actually work over a period of time: if people are pleased with how that process has worked.”

Killien asked, “Would decisions be different if the practices were different? It’s clear there is disagreement about the Code – interpreting the Code – but would points of curriculum decision be different with a different process? Also, it must be kept in mind that individuals can interpret *any* document differently.”

Decker said, “We probably won’t undertake new degree programs in the next biennium, so keep that in mind. There won’t be many new degree programs going through the approval process in the foreseeable future.”

Wadden said, “There’s the reality of the financial situation and there’s the search for a new president. The new president could clarify the relationship of the campuses to one another. And the Rose Report, and possible restructuring of the councils, could clarify this relationship as well. As for RCEP’s, that is a University-wide process; it is not based on specific campuses.”

Plumb said, “Regarding changes we have considered: What about the implementation of these changes?”

The question was asked: Whose Web site *is* this? Meszaros said, “I would link it to the Curriculum office. If a department starts doing this [going through the posting and comment process], interested parties could send the comments to *their* curriculum committee.” Decker said, “But *ours* would go to the Executive Committee, which has staff support to process the comments.” Meszaros said, “Right. So in Seattle, it would be the College Curriculum Committee, and at Bothell and Tacoma the Executive Committees would likely be the central places for this process.” Wadden said, “With an FCAS-like structure, that group would be aware of what needs to be done next.” Meszaros said, “Right. So in Seattle, SCAP should also always be in the loop.”

Stein said, “Comments *could* be sent to more than one committee or body: to the accountability body and to other committees as well.” Killien asked, “How does the undergraduate program approval process work at UW Seattle?” Wadden said, “It comes to SCAP and FCAS once its been signed off by the department chair, the dean, and the College Committee. From FCAS it goes to Tim Washburn’s office and on to the president for his signature. If it’s an elimination of a program, it would go through the RCEP process. In that case, there’s a box you check off on the form that asks: Does this change affect any other department? Also, *this* would go through SCAP, as both new programs and revised or eliminated programs go through SCAP and FCAS.”

Killien asked, "So, where would information be posted so that we would have cross-campus knowledge of program proposals, and not just single-campus knowledge?" Wadden said, "There's an administrative factor here; institutional knowledge of process/programs (for checks and balances)."

Several council members asked who would oversee this process. Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs in the Office of the Provost, would certainly be involved. But this would be the work of many people. Wadden pointed out that "a cumulative tracking process would be daunting." Decker said, "Getting it on the Web page would be the key component." Wadden said, "If comments were localized in, say, Arts and Sciences, Engineering would never know about them. The comments must be made available beyond the college or school they originate in."

Schaufelberger said, "You could have two Web sites: one for new programs, coordinated through Robert Corbett's office; and one for program changes, coordinated through Tim Washburn's office. There would be communication with a coordinator in each department regarding notification of new programs or program changes." Decker said it would be a good idea to "split" the Web sites in this way.

Primomo said, "An E-mail list could be utilized on short order. The E-mail could say something like, 'If you want to comment on this proposal contact such and such.' You could also tell, thereby, how many people are taking that extra step to comment."

Meszaros said, "We'll write something up on this and take it to FCAS [of which George Bridges and Tim Washburn are ex officio members]." Decker said, "The relevant administrators and deans should know that these new programs are being considered, just for information purposes, *not* for decision-making purposes." Meszaros said, "I'll get a draft to [FCAS chair] Carolyn [Plumb] later this week. And a working group can discuss implementing the information sharing process. I want to see that the various sides of this discussion are fairly represented."

Plumb said, "It's important the way we frame this: the words we use. It would be good to suggest that it is a dynamic discussion; that a particular step is being taken but that there is not unanimous agreement on the entire process. We want to accent what is productive in the steps being taken rather than focusing on the part of the process on which we cannot reach agreement." The need to preserve the relevant documents electronically, and have a place where documents can be added, was also stressed.

Discussion of proposed legislation defining campus

Meszaros said UW Tacoma and UW Bothell are establishing forums with their faculty to determine what they think needs to be done regarding the effort to define campus. The point of departure is the proposed legislation, but the goal is to discuss the issue in general terms "so that our colleagues can best deal with this issue," and then to go back to the proposed legislative language.

Decker said the Executive Vice President, Weldon Ihrig, and the two chancellors are also looking at this issue. Wadden said, "The UW Seattle campus community does not know what the intent of this is about: the defining of 'campus'."

Meszaros said, "Many people at UW Seattle *seem* to think the campuses are like schools and colleges." Decker said, "In the late 1980's, the UW Seattle campus didn't even *want* the other campuses. The faculty who *chose* to go to the other campuses didn't *want* to be UW-identified." Killien said, "There is confusion even here at UW Seattle about the difference between college and school." Primomo said, "At UW Tacoma, and probably at UW Bothell, we need to articulate a vision for our campuses as they are now and as they will be in the future."

Meszaros said, "I've had inquiries about whether our group might look into an issue associated with academic integrity: whether the new campuses ought to have their own disciplinary committees. At present, disciplinary matters ultimately go before one of two committees at UW Seattle. It might make sense to do more of this work within each campus. We need to find out if this is a concern for all

campuses.” Cameron noted that there are important distinctions between different kinds of disciplinary issues, and that this must be kept in mind.

Schaufelberger asked, “Is this part of the Faculty Code or an issue for the Faculty Senate?” Cameron said, “This is delegated back to colleges and schools. Gus Kravas, Vice Provost/Special Assistant to the President for Student Relations, works with undergraduate issues of plagiarism and other disciplinary matters. Graduate disciplinary issues are dealt with elsewhere. The council may wish to speak with Gus Kravas.” Meszaros said, “I see. We’ll look into this outside of this council.”

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, February 10, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder