

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

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy met at 9:00 a.m. on Monday, **December 9, 2002**, in 26 Gerberding Hall. Chair Jacqueline Meszaros presided.

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

Approval of minutes

The minutes of the November 4, 2002 meeting were approved as written.

Report on the progress on proposed legislation defining “campus” – Jack Meszaros

Meszaros said she attended three recent meetings related to the proposed legislation defining “campus”: one that included Faculty Senate vice chair Doug Wadden and former Faculty Senate chair Mary Coney, discussing general principles of curriculum coordination; another, with vice provost Steven Olswang and others discussing issues of ambiguity that remain unresolved; and a third meeting with the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, the so-called “Code Cops.”

Meszaros said, “The Code Cops worried that our language appears to sever the new campuses from the Faculty Senate. Since we had not intended this, we struggled to understand their concerns. During that meeting, Steve Olswang suggested that it might be helpful to at least have language in the legislation that makes the campuses equivalent to a school or a college. So we explored this with the Code Cops: what language would give campuses at least as much standing as schools and colleges.” Meszaros distributed a revision of this draft language, which was prepared by Olswang. UW Tacoma and UW Bothell are not comfortable with moving forward *only* as a school or a college, said Meszaros. “We’re working on that now, at both campuses.”

Report on the progress on curriculum coordination

Meszaros distributed a three-page draft of the curriculum coordination process based on work by the council’s curriculum workgroup. Page one shows the “Curriculum Pre-proposal Coordination.” Page two shows the “Process for Faculty New Program Coordination.” Page three shows the “Faculty Organization Chart for New Curriculum Coordination Procedures.”

Meszaros said, “We are trying to ensure early notification and comment. Marcia Killien and I met with Robert Corbett, Coordinator of New Programs in the Office of the Provost. Corbett said that, at the early stages of notification, an inter-institutional coordinating body, a subcommittee of the Statewide Council of Presidents (of public universities), is consulted. Corbett said posting proposed program information on a Web site should present no problems.”

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).

The Major Faculty Review is a review for: fit with mission, need/demand, effect on other programs, resource issues, proper process followed, and seeing that comments have been addressed. The Final Faculty Review is a review for: editorial clarity, operational viability, and policy compliance (admission, graduation, etc.).

In the “Faculty Organization Chart for New Curriculum Coordination Procedures,” the UW Bothell Executive Council and the UW Bothell SCAP will be complementary bodies; the UW Tacoma Executive Council and the UW Tacoma SCAP will be complementary bodies; and FCAS SCAP and UW Seattle SCAP will be complementary bodies: the Tri-Campus SCAP will be a joint venture of the UW Bothell, UW Seattle and UW Tacoma SCAP’s. This might be formally recognized as a subcommittee of FCAS.

Wadden noted that the Handbook “declares a 60-day period for the curriculum approval process. In Section 24-48 of the Handbook, under Procedures for School and Colleges, a 60-day period for approval is designated unless the president signs off earlier.” Meszaros said the draft can be adjusted to be in accordance with the Handbook.

Killien said, “Some objections might arise *after* the Idea phase, between the preliminary Idea stage and the formal Idea stage.” Meszaros said, “We will need to specify how much material goes out.” She stressed that “if a problem comes up early, the ‘Process for Faculty New Program Coordination’ [page two of the handout] looks all right. If the problem does not come up early, this part of the process may not be sufficient as it appears in the draft.”

Schafelberger said, “We need a SCAP voice for concerns later in the process.” Killien asked, “How does information get posted intra-campus wise? The appropriate posting across all campuses would be in the Major Faculty Review stage of the process [column B in the draft].” Cameron said, “This would mean three postings. Too many postings would be meaningless.”

Wadden said, “Forms can be constructed. If, for instance, there is a change since the previous reading, you could simply check a ‘change’ box. It’s changes to *existing* programs that are cumbersome, or that *can* be. If FCAS reorganizes something that’s an RCEP, they need to send the proposal back to the department.”

Killien asked, “What constitutes a ‘major change,’ etc?” Wadden said, “It’s a judgment call. It’s hard to tell what constitutes a significant change.” Killien asked, “Can an RCEP be requested?” Wadden said, “If it’s a minor change, and doesn’t trigger one of the cited criteria about degrees or employment, it’s called a ‘limited’ RCEP. A dean, ultimately, must decide about a proposal’s status, at the departmental level, and seek a review from the provost.”

Meszaros said, “There’s an opportunity in the original posting for people to say, ‘It’s non-routine.’” Schafelberger said, “If proper notification is posted, an individual faculty member could speak up.” Meszaros suggested that “routine” and “non-routine” are “ambiguous terms – we’ll need to offer more specific guidance on this.” Wadden noted that “it *does* take judgment; it’s hard to specify what is ‘substantive.’”

Plumb said, “Regarding the “Final Faculty Review” [or C] column, if the proposal is deemed ‘routine,’ how does that play out at UW Bothell?” Meszaros replied, “A tri-campus review is *not* triggered in that case; it is handled at UW Bothell.”

Plumb said, “Budget questions would come up earlier in the process. Curricular issues would come up later.” Wadden said, regarding budget issues, “FCAS never deals with budget issues. FCAS sends any such issue to the Provost’s Office.” Meszaros said, “But with the Tri-Campus SCAP, UW Bothell and UW Tacoma *will* be able to look at budget issues, because our faculty review people are *on* budget committees. Our Executive Councils are like UW Seattle’s Senate Executive Committee.”

Killien said, “Though SEC is still a faculty body. So: Is the Tri-Campus SCAP doing a resource review?” Meszaros said, “Resource issues would be dealt with in the first round of the process. But they would also be considered in the second round. We’re talking about faculty advice.” Schaufelberger said, “In column C [Final Faculty Review], the College Council is concerned with this, but FCAS, and SCAP, are *not* normally involved at this stage.”

Killien said, “Our curriculum committees are *not* concerned with resource issues. The College Council and the Dean *would* be concerned with resource issues.” Primomo said, “This discussion brings out the ways in which we are *not* like a UW Seattle college or school. I’m not supporting the Tri-Campus SCAP being part of FCAS. We’re struggling with this definition because we’re *different* from a college or a school.” Wadden said, “I still think if you separate out resources from curriculum issues, and think of a redefinition of FCAS, it might work better for you.”

Meszaros said, “If we just looked at the curricular soundness of proposals, this would solve many of our problems.” Wadden said, “Somewhat, yes.” Plumb said, “Regarding duplication, that seems like a curriculum issue, and should be part of this review process. There’s program demand, and accreditation issues are in part programmatic.”

Killien said, with respect to the third page [Faculty Organization Chart for New Curriculum Coordination Procedures], “Is the Executive Council a faculty body only?” Meszaros replied, “Yes; there’s a parallel committee that faculty sit on, too.”

Nelson said, “Why can’t each campus decide for itself what review bodies it has and uses?” Killien said, “This is a curriculum process, and if it’s in the purview of FCAS this process is *only* for curriculum review.” Schaufelberger said, “The vision is that there would be *a* body at Seattle, and *a* body at each campus, *each* called a SCAP.” Killien said, “The Executive Council is *not* the equivalent to UW Bothell’s SCAP.” Meszaros said, “That’s correct. They’re *not* equivalent.”

Stein said, “Column B [Major Faculty Review] is fine. The issue now is column C [Final Faculty Review]. When something’s not routine: how *that* issue gets resolved. Where does the tri-campus curriculum issue get resolved?” Schaufelberger said, “Once it gets past the Provost’s Office, you’re talking about the content of a program, not the process of approval.”

Nelson said, “The outcome of this – that we’re just like a school or a college – isn’t what we want.” Killien said, “I didn’t hear that. I heard that you should be *like* a school or a college in the rights *they* have in the curriculum process.” Stein said, “We’re *campuses* before we’re schools or colleges, in the sense of getting us in the Faculty Code. Our concern with the phased process is: Would we even get to phase B [Major Faculty Review]?”

Next meeting

The next FCTCP meeting is set for Monday, January 13, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in 142 Gerberding Hall.

Brian Taylor
Recorder