

UWT Academic Policy Council
Meeting Minutes
January 18, 2006

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rachel May at 10:30 a.m.

Members present: Rachel May, June Lowenberg, Kathy Beaudoin, Jerry Finn, Ed Hong, Janet Luft Mobus, Ex-officio: Bobbe Miller-Murray, Bob Jackson, and Alan Wood.

- I. The minutes of the December 15, 2005 meeting were approved and will be forwarded to UWT Faculty Assembly for posting on the Council's website.

- II. The Council discussed the three-campus undergraduate curriculum review procedures in order to familiarize ourselves with the process of program approval developed by the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy in June, 2004 (hereafter, the Policy). (copy attached) A briefing (hereafter, the Briefing) on this review process was prepared by Josh Tenenberg, Vice Chair of UWT Faculty Assembly, and also informed this discussion. (copy attached) The Council members proceeded with the discussion as an initial step in developing an articulated set of policies and procedures for its future operations.
 - a. A suggestion was made that consideration be given to a contingency not suggested in the Briefing outline. The pre-review procedure described in paragraph two of "When UWT is the originating campus" contemplates that the Council will forward program proposals to the 3 campus review stage after ensuring that documents have been correctly prepared. In some cases the Council may wish to correspond with the originating UWT program about substantive concerns within the proposal, and the current procedural steps don't anticipate this contingency. This suggests that there are two possible outcomes from the pre-review process: 1) the proposal is forwarded to the UW Registrar for the 3-campus open comment period; 2) the proposal is returned to the originating UWT program with comments and recommendations for further development from the Council. We will evaluate whether to develop our procedures to include the possibility of corresponding with the originating UWT program about substantive concerns on program proposals during the pre-review phase of program proposal reviews.
 - b. A suggestion was made that both the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the originating Program Director receive notification of the Council's pre-review decisions.
 - c. A suggestion was made to consider establishing timelines for receiving proposals. If a proposal is received for review during winter or spring quarters, it may not be possible to complete the approval process prior to fall admissions of students.
 - d. In response to suggested timeline considerations, a discussion ensued about differing conditions that might lead to flexibility with regard to established timelines. It was noted that UWT has often operated under decision deadline pressures that sometimes preclude a complete and thoughtful deliberative process,

and that a recent experience by the Council in a program proposal review offered just such an example. While recognizing the benefits of a 'non-emergency mode' operating climate, it is also true that sometimes windows of opportunity open that have externally imposed shortened timelines. In particular, legislative largesse is occasionally available under the condition that the institution responds in a very time-compressed frame - both the Institute of Technology and admitting freshman/junior cohorts are examples of this. While it is desirable to develop 'non-emergency mode' operating procedures as the general rule, we may also need an alternative approach for contingencies that we wish to take advantage of, even if that means short-cutting a fully deliberative process of development.

- e. It was suggested that when the Council makes its final recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, after the public comment period is complete and after due consideration is given to any comments received, that the Vice Chancellor notify the Council of the disposition of its recommendations regarding the proposed program.
- III. The Council discussed the proposed B.S. degree in Computer Engineering and Systems.
- a. A number of strengths of the degree proposal were noted.
 - i. Collaboration with UWS and community partners show support for the proposal from important constituents.
 - ii. Using the Institute's existing courses and resources shows a wise leveraging off of investments already made to expand into new opportunities.
 - iii. The course development process appears well underway with evidence of faculty support.
 - iv. The chart comparison among the Institute's existing and proposed Bachelor programs is very helpful.
 - v. The proposal is well written and developed.
 - b. Suggested improvements were also noted.
 - i. Grammatical and typographical errors will be communicated to the Director for correction in final documents.
 - ii. The foreign language requirement may be misspecified (this is the last Admission Requirement in the catalog description of the degree). If the requirement is for 10 university credits of a foreign language, the high school equivalent should be 2 years, not 1 year as currently specified.
 - c. The Council representative from the Institute answered Council members questions.
 - d. The Council will forward the proposal to the UW Registrar for the 3-campus open comment period.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned by the Chair at 11:45

Respectfully submitted:
Janet Luft Mobus

Approved by Academic Policy Council February 15, 2006

<http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/policies/tricampus/index.html>



[Search](#) | [Directories](#) | [Reference Tools](#)

[UW Home](#) > [UWIN](#) > [Faculty Senate](#)

Three Campus Undergraduate Curriculum Review Procedures

Recommended by Faculty Council on Tri-campus 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 whom 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.
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:
 - o Fit with campus and university mission
 - o Academic quality
 - o Need
 - o Effects on students
 - o Effects on other programs
 - o Feasibility/Operational viability
 - o 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 all 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 expected to comment only 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 two Council members (one representing the 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:
 - o Was the final proposal made available for a 30 day comment period?
 - o Were comments received and responded to appropriately?
 - o 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.

[Summary of Faculty Coordination and Review](#)



Faculty Senate

senate@u.washington.edu

Modified: June 29, 2005

Briefing on the Tri-campus review process for new programs

**Josh Tenenberg, Vice Chair of Faculty Assembly
15 February 2005. Revised 7 December, 2005.**

The Tri-campus review process for new programs has the following design goals:

Campus autonomy

Input from other campuses is consultative, and is not for approval. Originating campuses only have the obligation to collect and consider all comments.

Easy to understand and implement

Having a global understanding of the process is not without complexity. But each person taking a role in the process interacts with very few others and has clear responsibilities that are easy to carry out.

Timely

This is achieved through 3 campus review happening in parallel to the on-campus review process.

The process will be described from the point of view of the different faculty "roles" on campus.

The originating program

A program initiates the process by filling out a form 1503, and sends this electronically to the UWT new program review committee, along with any additional campus-specific information required by this committee.

After the committee has received comments, but not less than 30 days after receiving the 1503, the committee will either recommend approving the proposal as written, recommend rejecting the proposal, or will enter into a dialog with the originating department for changes to the proposal.

A faculty member not in an originating program

On receiving notification of a new program under review, the faculty member will direct comments to the new program review committee of the originating campus. The faculty member might also pass along notice of the new program to other faculty who might have an interest.

The new program review committee at UWT

When UWT is not the originating campus

The committee is responsible for determining the campus-specific procedure for the review of proposals originating outside UWT. It is assumed that the committee will read

the proposal and target notification of the new program to UWT faculty or programs that might have an interest, rather than broadcast notice of the new program to the entire UWT faculty. This committee should receive notification from the UW Registrar whenever there is a new program under review on any of the other campuses.

When UWT is the originating campus

This committee is responsible for determining the campus-specific procedure for the review of proposals originating from UWT, and for soliciting comment from interested parties throughout the campus.

This committee will receive documents for new program review from an existing school or program at UWT. On receipt, this committee will immediately do a "pre-review" to ensure that all documents have been prepared correctly and that the proposal is ready for 3 campus review. This committee will then forward electronically the 1503 form and a request to initiate a 3-campus review to the UW Registrar (currently Todd Mildon (tmildon@u.washington.edu)). In this message, the committee's email address and campus mailbox should be provided for the receipt of comments. (I recommend that this committee set up a special email address independent of any individual for this specific purpose.)

On receipt of the 1530, the Registrar will post the proposal and notify a pre-determined set of parties. Not less than 30 days after the proposal has been posted, the committee will meet to determine its recommendation. It is assumed that this committee will carry out its campus-specific procedure for new program review, which will be augmented by consideration of comments received from the other campuses. The committee is obligated only to give "consideration" to the comments received from other campuses. The committee will send its recommendation to the UWT Executive Committee.

If the proposal receives an affirmative recommendation that is eventually sent to the President, the committee will subsequently be contacted by the Tri-campus council. The Tri-campus council will be trying to ascertain if the Tri-campus review process has been carried out. To make this judgement, the Tri-campus council will ask the committee to send 1) important dates related to the proposal (when received, when sent to the Registrar, when posted, when the final review occurred), 2) the set of comments received from outside the originating campus during the 30-day comment period, and 3) a summary response indicating the committee's consideration of comments received from the other campuses.