

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy**  
Wednesday, December 14, 2005  
36 Gerberding Hall

Chair Marcia Killien called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

**Synopsis:**

1. Discussion of procedure for approval of minutes
2. Confirm meeting times for winter and spring quarters 2006
3. Updates on three-campus review procedures
4. Topics for future discussion

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

Chair Marcia Killien welcomed council members and guests. Killien explained the new protocol for approving the minutes. Rather than waiting a month for the subsequent meeting, a draft of the minutes will be circulated via email by the Chair to all members for review and approval; following approval they will be posted on the Faculty Senate Website.

<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/councils/fctcp/fctcp-minutes/05-06/>

Approved minutes of the November 10, 2005, meeting are posted on the Website.

**2. Meeting times for winter and spring quarters 2006**

Following up on her email announcement, the chair confirmed the meeting dates for the remainder of the academic year: Jan. 10, Feb. 7, March 7, April 11, May 15, and June 13. All meetings will be held from 8:00-9:30 a.m. Killien noted that she selected dates that would allow representation from all three campuses. If members are unable to attend, substitutes may attend in their place but cannot vote. Killien will look into possibilities for video-conferencing but requested that members also submit other ideas.

**3. Update on three-campus review procedures – Review of documents**

Killien began by providing some background: (a) her experience participating in six to eight program reviews; and (b) an extended email discussion between her and the Provost's Office regarding the review process, including a Dec. 7 memo from the provost to Killien requesting FCTCP's assistance in helping to amend the procedures. The council then engaged in a review of documents:

**Document:** Tri-Campus Review Procedure: Proposed Revision

Summary of proposed changes from procedures adopted June 2005 (4 items)

- Item 1. Responsibility for implementation of procedures moved from Secretary of the Faculty to Office of the Registrar (including compiling all comments). The Office of the Registrar has offered to be involved, given its work with similar processes. It is the "official record keeper," and the student databases for all three campuses are housed in Seattle. The question remains as to how this office would coordinate with UWT and UWB campuses.

The council asked the chair to obtain clarification about whether the Office of the Registrar will assume 3-campus responsibility. In addition, although none of the functions proposed for the registrar are decision-making, this is not entirely clearly stated in the proposed procedure—especially, given provision 2.b. under "Stage I" in the draft of the "Tri-Campus Review Process," which does imply

some decision-making authority (Note: revisions to this text were suggested during the subsequent review of the draft).

- Item 2. Routing of Phase II. Current routing: originating campus-President-senate chair-FCTCP –senate chair-President. *Proposed routing:* originating campus-Office of Registrar-FCTCP (with cc to senate chair)-Office of Registrar-President. The proposed change reduces number of routing steps and keeps FCTCP “in the loop.” As a more substantial change, the Faculty Senate chair receives a copy and no longer delegates to the FCTCP (Killien has asked for a confirmation from the Faculty Senate Chair of approval for this change).
- Item 3. Add guidelines for what constitutes the need for tri-campus review. Currently the procedures are not uniform or predictable; they need to be institutionalized to establish consistency in the review. Additional continuing question of who should make the decision.
- Item 4. Make all documents electronic and consider a single form (1503) for all campuses.

Killien said other issues are included in this summary but unrelated to the draft of the document itself.

**Document:** Tri-Campus Curriculum Coordination (December 7, 2005 DRAFT)

As a preface to the council’s review of the draft of the document, Chair Killien reviewed the suggested criteria for which program changes require a tri-campus review:

- a. changes that create a change in a student’s transcript would be reviewed, e.g., new degrees, new minors. There was some question as to how large a change this would have to be.
- b. changes in prerequisites that would have an impact on the number of entering students;
- c. changes in graduation requirements that would have a substantial impact on the number of students completing a major or minor option. This leaves open the question of what constitutes a “substantial” impact. How many students more or less would be considered significant? Should that decision reside at the campus level? If so, it would minimize the number of issues going through the review.
- d. any change on one campus that could significantly alter program enrollments at one of the other two campuses. It was noted that the intent underlying this change is good but it leads to major judgment call on the part of the decision-maker. The council agreed on the need for some guidelines.

It was agreed that changes that do not require tri-campus review will be sent to the appropriate review committee at each campus: at UWB, the Executive Council of the General Faculty Council; at UWT, the Faculty Council on Academic Policy; at UWS, FCAS.

The council agreed that the four criteria should be added to the draft in footnote form.

The question remains – who decides what should and should not go through the review process if there is a question. Up to now, the decision has been made by the FCTCP chair. The council agreed this was appropriate, but it would not be appropriate for the registrar to make this decision, i.e., a staff member possibly overriding a faculty committee. Balance is required – if the procedures are “too loose,” a proposal could get to the President and be “kicked back.”

The council then engaged in a section-by-section review of the draft—including rationale, origin, implications, potential issues of each item. This included discussion of text that seemed unclear or might have unintended interpretations/results. The role of the registrar was again discussed; and the group requested that the chair make all necessary text changes to clarify this role. They agreed on other changes required for consistency, clarity, elimination of redundancies—while preserving flexibility within the document to meet future needs or circumstances.

The Chair will make all agreed-upon changes and send the revised draft back to the provost.

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

The council agreed, in principle, that this form is acceptable to the three campuses if appropriately revised to reflect new policy provisions, and as long as it is not an FCAS form.

#### 4. New Business

Motion from FCTCP to Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). Don Jansson, Chair of FCAS, suggested that FCTCP approve a motion (below), which he would present to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

FCTCP recommends that FCAS delegate the faculty approval of new undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, certificates and substantive changes to same to the Faculty Assembly (or APR) at UWT and the General Faculty Organization at UWB. (The council amended the statement by replacing “curriculum subcommittee” with appropriate names of respective campus committees.)

And further. . that the chair of these respective faculty bodies at UWT and UWB be authorized to sign the proposals related to the above in lieu of the signature of the chair of FCAS.

The rationale for this motion is to formally approve what has been actual practice although not stipulated in the Code. Following a discussion of potential benefits and drawbacks to this motion, the motion was made and unanimously approved to accept the two-part motion, as amended, while recognizing an eventual need to deal with the relevant Code provisions.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m. Minutes taken by Laraine Hong, Assistant to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, UW-Bothell. [lhong@uwb.edu](mailto:lhong@uwb.edu); 2-3276

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

**Absent:**        **Members of representative groups:** Fugate, Weitkamp  
                  **Faculty:** Harrington, Krishnamurthy, Leppa  
                  **Ex officio members:** Lovell, Stygall, Tenenberg

**Guests:**       Michelle Hall - PSO alternate  
                  Sharon Fought – UWT