Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from February 23rd, 2017
3. Update on revision to EO governing tri-campus review
4. Discussion of the work of the Tri-Campus Task Force – Zoe Barsness
5. Discussion of next year’s work
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1) Call to order

Stein called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from February 23rd, 2017

The minutes from February 23rd, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Update on revision to EO governing tri-campus review

Stein noted a small group made up of UW faculty and staff members (including the Registrar’s Office) have finished drafting revisions for Executive Order (EO) No. IV, in part to remove “Stage II” of the curriculum coordination process (Exhibit 1). The revisions significantly reduce involvement of the FCTCP in the curriculum coordination process as well as add a Notice of Proposal (NOP) provision within a newly-defined “Stage O,” requiring that an NOP be sent to the University Registrar/posted electronically for review for all substantive programmatic creations/changes (applicable to undergraduate degrees, majors, minors, options, or other transcriptable credentials). The changes are designed to improve upon the undergraduate curriculum coordination process by facilitating review by all campus stakeholders at a much earlier stage in program development.

There was some discussion of the revisions. A few members commented they were in favor of the changes, as it is logical that reservations/conflicts over new/altered programs be surfaced early in development of those changes rather than at a later stage.

It was noted the draft EO changes must be approved by the President in order to be codified. There was a recommendation that Guidelines for the development of NOPs also accompany the revisions, if approved.
Stein noted she would like a vote of the FCTCP to approve the language that has been forwarded as a revision to the Executive Order. A motion was made, and the revisions were approved as written.

4) Discussion of the work of the Tri-Campus Task Force – Zoe Barsness

Zoe Barsness (Chair, UW Faculty Senate) was present to brief the council on the work of the Tri-Campus Taskforce; she used a brief PowerPoint as part of her presentation (Exhibit 2). The Taskforce was broadly charged with assessing the current state of the landscape of the three campuses in order to leverage opportunities, work through challenges, and make short-term changes to facilitate stronger collaboration among UW’s campuses during 2016-2017. The group first identified shared core values for all three campuses, which included “Excellence, Diversity, Collaboration, Uniqueness, Transparency, and Communication.”

Barsness provided a brief overview of the recommendations the Taskforce has identified for both the short-term and long-term. These included:

- Implementing best tri-campuses initiative/program practices
- Adopting low cost technologies currently available to facilitate communication and coordination
- Considering additional infrastructure investments
- Developing metrics of success for a Connected U
- Clarifying and evolving the articulated governance relations
- Using the Co-Curricular Administrative Map to facilitate communication and coordination (Exhibit 2).

Barsness explained the Taskforce identified frustrations related to the proliferation of informal networks, connections, and knowledge-bases between campuses. Other multi-campus systems adopt a “shared-services” approach in relation to a number of essential university core services. The Taskforce felt the UW Center for Teaching and Learning was one suitable service that might be expanded to better serve all three campuses.

FCTCP

Barsness explained one question asked often in the Taskforce is how to tweak the existing university governance structures to improve coordination among campuses. The group honed in on the FCTCP as a center for change in this regard. Historically, FCTCP has been a policy-focused body, either neglecting or rarely addressing broader strategic implications for the entire institution. An idea surfaced in the Taskforce to alter the composition of the FCTCP to re-charge it as a joint Faculty Senate/Presidential advisory body. An alternative idea included a separate body be charged to serve as a decisive tri-campus entity, but one that is a “client” of the FCTCP – receiving strategic recommendations from the council.

There was some brief discussion of these ideas.

Members thanked Barsness for her report following the end of discussion.

5) Discussion of next year’s work

Being the final meeting of the academic year, Stein asked members to consider FCTCP’s long-term function and if the council should operate more broadly on an institutional level in the future. She
explained the council was formed and charged several decades in the past, and the timing is ideal to consider updating the council’s charge and function.

There was some discussion of elevating the FCTCP to a more strategically-focused level. A member commented that at the time FCTCP was first formed, the UW was very different and UW Bothell and Tacoma required much higher levels of support from the Seattle campus than they require now. Now, tri-campus relationships are more focused in communication and compliance than support. The member felt that moments when UW Bothell and Tacoma are directed to comply with a new policy are important opportunities for collaboration. She provided an example of a policy change within UW Continuum College that was not believed to have an effect at the other campuses, but consequently did. She asked how this information can become appropriately channeled in the future to avoid such consequences.

Another member felt that the FCTCP needed an “informant,” and that as a tri-campus university body, the council should be a repository of information. There was discussion of a tool that might be used to broadcast information about policy changes and the like across campuses. Members noted high-level decisions need to be regularly evaluated to determine if they have an impact at the other campuses.

A member commented if the FCTCP is to communicate more broadly, it needs a designated member of the administration to sit in with the council in order to improve communication and strategic involvement.

Montgomery recommended that terms for ex-officio members be longer than one year in order to maintain knowledge over an expanse of time.

A member noted there are meaningful differences depending on when FCTCP is asked to participate in various decisions. Timing can dictate if involvement is based in assessment and review, setting policy, or simply disseminating information and acting as a repository of information. Stein agreed this is very helpful in crafting what role the council desires to play.

Stein recommended the council work next year to define its participation in university governance, and work to enact those changes.

6) Good of the order

Montgomery explained the elected faculty leaders in UW Tacoma and UW Bothell have submitted a memo to the Provost requesting review of the reporting structure of the campus chancellors. She noted she or another representative would report on any resulting action in fall, 2017.

7) Adjourn

Stein adjourned the meeting at 10:15 a.m.
**President’s designees:** Susan Jeffords, Turan Kayaoglu  
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University Campuses Undergraduate Curriculum Coordination

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, or other transcriptable programs, or substantive changes to the same, 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 colleges, schools, and 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 0: Notice of Proposal

1. Each campus has the responsibility to develop its own curricular offerings. In order to facilitate coordination of substantive changes to their curriculum, a unit planning to offer a new undergraduate degree, major, minor, option, or other transcriptable credential or substantive change to any of these, should prepare a Notice of Proposal (NOP). If a unit is uncertain whether or not a change is substantive, they should contact the campus-specific curriculum review committee.

2. Once a unit has drafted an NOP, and had it approved by the appropriate administrators in its School or College, the document should be sent electronically to the University Registrar. Staff will conduct a preliminary review to assure that appropriate information and approvals have been included. Once that review has been completed, the Registrar will inform the appropriate campus academic program review committee that an NOP has been submitted.

3. The NOP will be posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days before it can be submitted to the campus-specific curriculum review process.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Registrar shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs, (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. If there are no significant comments to be resolved, or if they have been resolved, the unit may go forward with developing the proposal. A record of the NOP will be kept electronically that is password protected, including comments made during the early notice period.

6. Once a full proposal has been developed, the NOP will be included in the official university-wide full tricampus review.

Stage I: Review of Developed Proposals

1. Following the university-wide NOP review and after a campus unit develops and approves a curricular offering, it should be forwarded to the appropriate academic program review committee for that campus.

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.

3. When the University Registrar receives the completed program proposal, it will be immediately posted electronically for review. The proposal shall be available for review for 15 business days.

4. Simultaneously with the posting of the proposal, the University Registrar shall notify (1) the voting faculty of all UW campuses, (2) the Deans, Directors, and Chairs, and (3) the Chair of each campus academic program review committee, informing them of the opportunity to review the curriculum proposal.

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.
1. **Assessed current tri-campus landscape.** Emergent themes:
   - Balancing connectivity w/ local autonomy, identity
   - Assuring effective communication and collaboration
   - Becoming a truly “connected university”

2. **Articulated what we mean by “The Connected U”**
   - Distilled core tri-campus values: Excellence, Diversity, Collaboration, Uniqueness, Transparency, Communication
   - Assessed “stories” of exemplary tri-campus programs
   - Assessed four distinct tri-campus operating models: informal networks, formal and intentional efforts, shared services and decentralized complementarity

3. **Proposing near, long-term recommendations, such as:**
   - Implementing best tri-campus initiative/program practices
   - Adopting low cost technologies currently available to facilitate communication and coordination, and...
   - Considering additional infrastructure investments
   - Developing metrics of success for a Connected U
   - Clarifying and evolving the articulated governance relations
   - Using the Co-Curricular Administrative Map to facilitate communication and coordination

Q: How do we communicate and collaborate better, address outstanding issues and realize more fully the benefits of a “connected university”? 

Exhibit 2