

GFO Executive Council Annual Report 2009- 10

Executive Council Motions

October 9, 2009

EC motion

Nye made the following motion:

The Executive Council (EC) of the General Faculty Organization of University of Washington Bothell directs the Director of CUSP to move BCUSP 131 forward through the curriculum process for review by the CCASC.

The motion was seconded, discussion followed.

Discussion

- As an academic unit CUSP lacks sufficient faculty oversight of its curriculum;
- BCUSP 131 is currently offered as a special topics course, although the course description does not match the course being taught, this needs to be corrected;
- This course should not be presented as a remedial course.

Kochis called the question on the original motion, and hearing no objection, called for a vote. The motion carries to direct sending BCUSP 131 through the curriculum process for review by the CCASC(7-0)

EC motion

Jaffe made the following motion:

The EC recommends the EC Chair revise the EC CUSP Report Review Procedures and Timeline to be completed by the end of Winter Quarter 2010.

The motion was seconded, discussion followed.

Discussion

- Kochis will draft a new timeline for the EC approval.
- EC reps are encouraged to gather feedback from their programs.
- A shorter timeline will allow for implementation to move forward in a timely manner.

Kochis moved to amend the motion to state that the timeline be February 2010. Kochis called the question on the amended motion, and hearing no objection, called for a vote.. The motion carries to approve the EC CUSP Report Review Procedures and Timeline (7-0).

December 4, 2009

EC motion

Jackels moved to pass the motion:

The EC approves the proposal to renew the ATP program at a maximum enrollment of 25 students with a report to the EC spring quarter 2010 and a follow up report autumn quarter 2010 on the new ATP cohort. All curriculum that is a requirement for the program must be submitted to the GFO Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed, raising the following points:

- Pete Nye met with Andrea to discuss the ATP program, there was consensus that a maximum of 22 enrolled students would work best for the program with the current resources for student support.
- The UW transition student's writing course is limited to 20 students, ATP needs similar support for writing skills.
- A cohort of 22 students would be best, pedagogically.

The motion was called as amended:

The EC approves the proposal to renew the ATP program at a maximum enrollment of 22 students with a report to the EC spring quarter 2010 and a follow up report autumn quarter 2010 on the new ATP cohort. All curriculum that is a requirement for the program must be submitted to the GFO Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum.

The motion carried unanimously, 9 – 0.

January 19, 2010

EC motion

Jackels moved to pass the motion:

"The EC endorses forwarding the Tri-campus minor in Ecological Restoration proposal to the UW Registrar for Tri-campus review."

The motion was seconded.

Kochis called question on the original motion, hearing no objections, he called for a vote. By a show of hands, the EC vote was 5 yes, an electronic vote of the EC members not present at the June 11, 2010 meeting will be conducted.

February 2, 2010

EC motion

Jackels moved to pass the motion:

"The EC endorses bringing Gary Rhoades, AAUO General Secretary to UWB". The EC will not host the event.

The motion was seconded. By show of hands the motion passed unanimously.

Kochis informed the EC of a request from VCAA Jeffords for participation of the EC in the search for a Curriculum Director. This position will work with the programs and faculty in the development of curriculum and new major/minor/option proposals. Information will be distributed to the EC on the position.

EC motion

Servetnick moved to pass the motion:

"The EC endorses forwarding the option in Law, Economics and Public Policy proposal to the UW Registrar for Tri-campus review."

The motion was seconded, discussion followed.

EC discussion points

- Jacoby stressed that courses/requirements could be added as the option evolves and if this option become a major.
- Micro/macro economics will be taught in the lower division at UWB, more economics courses could be added over time.
- Rigorous offerings in economics are needed for public policy analysis and economics for a major.
- Once faculty are hired, development of the curriculum could become more specific, the direction of the degree could emphasize which courses to develop.
- If IAS develops majors broadly, how do we go back and develop; quantitative/scientific majors?
- Options to majors could evolve the degree in a more scientific direction.
- Students could get a BA in LEPP with only lower division courses in economics.

Kochis called question on the original motion, hearing no objections, he called for a vote. The motion carried with 8 yes votes and 1 oppose.

EC motion

Jaffe moved to pass the motion:

"The EC requests that the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs recommend a policy to the EC on how to distribute the faculty senate positions for UWB. The GFO will conduct the election.

The motion was seconded.

Kochis called the question, the motion carried unanimously.

April 7, 2010

EC motion

Kochis moved to pass the motion:

"The EC approves the procedure for electing UW Faculty Senators".

The motion was seconded, discussion followed.

EC discussion points

- How is balance achieved? What are the criteria for assuring that all programs are represented?
- Should we structure voting blocs? Not for this initial election.
- Jackels sent out a call for nominations to the full faculty, although the Faculty Handbook states that only voting faculty qualifies for election to the Senate.

Kochis called the question on the original motion, and hearing no objection, called for a vote. The proposal was adopted unanimously (8-0-0).

Jackels proposed the slate of nominees for the UW Senate: Arnie Berger, S&T; JoLynn Edwards, IAS; Kevin Lavery, Business and Linda Watts, IAS.

EC motion

Nye moved to pass the motion:
"The EC approves the slate of faculty as the nominating slate for the UW Senate election" (Attachment A).

The motion was seconded, no further discussion followed.

Kochis called the question on the original motion, hearing no objection, he called for a vote. The motion carried unanimously (8-0-0).

Attachment A

Proposal to carry out UW Senate elections at UWB in 2010. The CCPTFA has been consulted, and agrees to this proposal, at least on a temporary basis.

1. We have three senators to elect to two-year terms.
2. It is proposed that we elect the three senators "at large" with the entire UWB faculty voting for the three senators.
3. It is proposed that the GFO Chair and Vice Chair assemble a nomination slate of at least three candidates who have agreed to serve if elected. The Executive Council will review this slate for sufficient balance and distribution across campus and will approve it for the election process. (The requirement is that the candidates be "democratically elected with care that minority and small groups are assured a voice in university affairs.")
4. Either the Senate Office or the GFO Office will conduct this election for the approved slate plus a write-in opportunity. The top three vote getters will be the UWB senators.

EC motion

Jackels moved to pass the motion:
The EC gives final approval of the BS in Biology and approves the responses to the tri-campus review as sufficient.

The motion was seconded, no further discussion followed. The motion carried unanimously (8-0-0).

EC motion

Joseph moved to pass the motion:
The EC approves the CUSP recommendations as the Council's response to the CUSP review and endorses sending this recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (Attachment B).

The motion was seconded, discussion followed.

EC discussion

- One issue that was not addressed is the amount of part-time faculty in CUSP, these positions are not tenured, they can be eliminated.
- There should be a recommendation that lower division be staffed with full-time faculty.
- CUSP cannot hire faculty even for the courses that are owned by CUSP.
- We should ask for a stronger mandate to programs to staff CUSP with full-time faculty.
- Programs should be required to commit faculty to lower division.
- We could recommend that the VCAA tie new resources to participation in CUSP.
- The VCAA could allocate teaching lines to CUSP.
- The ability to coordinate courses across the programs for lower division needs to be stronger.
- Student advising is the key to these coordinating efforts.
- CUSP faculty do not have time for research, this could be problematic.
- It is difficult for CUSP to grow into a strong program if it is evaluated every few years and major changes are made. It is a transitional unit and cannot develop a strong support system.

Amendments to the CUSP recommendations:

Recommendation 4 - These incentives could include a plan for program participation in lower division as a requirement for approval of new faculty lines.

Recommendation 6 - Admission standards for pre-major students should continue to be the responsibility of the GFO Executive Council.

The motion was called as amended:

The EC approves the CUSP recommendations as the Council's response to the CUSP review and endorses sending this recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. The motion carried unanimously (8-0-0).

Attachment B

Dear Vice-Chancellor Jeffords:

As you know, in response to a third-year review of the Center for University Studies and Programs by a Task Force appointed by you and the Chair of the General Faculty Organization, the EC took up the review in fall of 2009 by having all programs read and discuss the review in their respective programs. The EC then began in Winter quarter 2010 its own discussions, including a General Faculty Organization meeting devoted exclusively to CUSP.

We want to formally thank the CUSP Review Task Force for its work, the programs for devoting time in meetings to discuss this issue, and to you and your office for patience and support as we work through one of the most important issues facing our institution.

We have formulated our response to the review in a series of recommendations to your office. These recommendations represent to the best of our ability a sense of the faculty as a whole. The

EC approves and recommends the continuation of a first-year program that is consistent with the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1

The EC recommends that there be a common first-year experience for all frosh admitted to UWB. This experience could utilize or combine several different forms: Discovery Core courses as now, first-year seminars, Focused Interest Groups (FIGS), or other common experiences supported by current pedagogical research. This first year experience should not exclude or conflict with other pathways to degrees. In particular, to facilitate majors that have highly structured lower division components, any required common experience courses should not generally exceed five credits during any term of the frosh year.

Recommendation 2

Lower division disciplinary courses should be the responsibility of programs that have faculty with expertise in that area. This does not preclude joint responsibility where expertise is shared over more than one program or where expertise does not currently exist on this campus.

Recommendation 3

The EC recommends that a unit like CUSP continue to exist to oversee and coordinate the particular needs and of first- and second-year students. The Administrative Unit should work closely and collaboratively with the Programs to maintain coherence for students through all four years of their UWB experience.

Recommendation 4

The CUSP Administrative unit, however, should not have independent faculty lines attached to it but continue to use existing faculty in the programs and pursue joint appointments with those programs, especially of full-time faculty. The VCAA should work with the academic program directors to identify incentives and resource models that assure enthusiastic participation of the academic programs in the lower division curriculum.

Recommendation 5

While no specific consensus over the exact structure of CUSP was reached, it was the general sense of the faculty that CUSP should be overseen by a faculty group composed of tenured and full-time faculty with broad knowledge of the campus and the variety of curricula offered at UWB. In particular, membership on the faculty governing group for CUSP, presently FOCUS, should draw on a wide range of program faculty and not be limited to faculty who have previously taught in CUSP.

The EC recommends that a task force be charged with overseeing the implementation of these recommendations, with charge to identify those changes that can take place immediately and those that will require the 2010-11 academic year to fully implement. This task force should include representation of the Executive Council of the GFO, the Academic Council, and the CUSP administration.

CUSP, as re-authorized consistent with these recommendations should be reviewed again in three years by the Executive Council of the GFO and the VCAA.

May 7, 2010

EC motion

Kochis moved to pass the motion:

"The EC approves the proposal to clarify the timeline for a review of CUSP in the EC recommendation to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs:

The motion was seconded, discussion followed:

EC discussion points

- Lower division needs to successfully support upper division, we cannot wait for three years to assess the program.
- Yearly status reports need to be submitted to the EC on the progress of CUSP.
- The EC should have clear goals that they would like to see in assessing CUSP.
- Issues that we need to assess:
 1. Integrity of the program.
 2. Process used to implement the program.
- Yearly interim reports should begin 2011, with a full review in 2014.
- CUSP should have a seat on EC, ex-officio, without vote.

The timeline for the implementation of the CUSP recommendation:

- 2009 – 2010 EC review
- 2010 – 2011 Implementation Task Force
- 2011 – 2012 New Lower Division – Year 1
- 2012 – 2013 New Lower Division – Year 2
- 2013 – 2014 New Lower Division – Year 3
- 2013 – 2014 EC review by the end of Winter 2014

The EC approves the proposal as amended:

Proposal with amendments.

Given that the "CUSP Implementation Task Force" will be using the 2010-11 academic year to lay the groundwork for significant changes in CUSP that will begin in fall of 2011, the EC understands that the three-year period to be reviewed will begin at that time (Fall 2011) and that the Review itself will be conducted in Winter quarter of 2014 with recommendations to the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs no later than the end of Winter quarter 2014.

Yearly interim reports on the recommendations of the EC and information to monitor the progress of the Implementation Task Force will begin Winter quarter 2012.

Kochis called the question on the proposal as amended. The motion was seconded, no further discussion. The proposal was approved unanimously (6-0).

EC motion

Sung moved to pass the motion:

"The EC approves the proposed amendment to the GFO Bylaws to include "electronic" voting in addition to mail voting for Bylaw amendments".

The motion was seconded.

Kochis called the question on the original motion. Hearing no objection, he called for a vote on it. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Revision to IRSC structure

Kochis will send the Bylaw revision to the IRSC structure via email for the EC to review, the revision is not finalized at this time.

EC motion

Kochis moved to pass the motion.

" The EC approves the new policy as proposed to change UWB's TOFEL and IBT scoring to align with UWS" (Attachment C).

The motion was seconded, no further discussion. Hearing no objections, Kochis called the question, the motion carried unanimously.

Attachment C

MEMORANDUM

TO: EC
FROM: Jill Orcutt
Director of Admissions
DATE: November 20, 2009
RE: TOEFL and IBT Score

The Office of Admissions at UW Bothell is recommending that UW Bothell align its TOEFL and IBT score policy for admission with UW Seattle. Please consider the following policy change.

UW Seattle has implemented the following new TOEFL score policy effective Fall 2010:

Minimum Requirement for Admission

Exam Title	Minimum Scores for Admissions Consideration
TOEFL: internet based	76
TOEFL: computer based	207
International English Language Testing System (IELTS)	6

**The institutional version of the MLT is no longer offered at the UW. Official MLT scores are still valid for two years and can be used for admission consideration.*

Note: New TOEFL score requirement for the internet-based TOEFL includes the speaking section. The UW will include the speaking section of the IBT in our minimum score requirement. The new score requirement on the IBT will be a combined total of 76 on all four sections. In the past, we have only considered the reading, writing, and listening sections of the IBT but for 2010 we will look at all four sections. The minimum score requirement is NOT an increase. Based on concordance tables, a 76 on the IBT is the same as a 540 on the paper-based TOEFL, a 207 on the computer-based TOEFL, and a 6 on the IELTS which are the previously established minimum requirements. The new higher score only incorporates the addition of the speaking section. We will now require a 76 out of 120 rather than a 57 out of 90.

UW Bothell’s current policy is as follows:

All international freshmen applicants must provide proof of English proficiency by providing scores that meet the University's minimum on one of the following exams:

Exam Title	Minimum Scores for Admissions Consideration
TOEFL: internet based	70*
TOEFL: computer based	237
International English Language Testing System (IELTS)	7

** For the internet-based TOEFL only, the minimum scores required are based on the combined total of the Reading, Listening, and Writing sections. The Speaking section of the test is not used in the admission review at this time.*

EC motion

Kochis moved to pass the motion.

“The EC approves the request to invite a 3rd cohort of 35 students into the ATP program”.

The motion was seconded, no further discussion. Kochis called the question, the motion passed, 6-yes, 1-oppose.

EC motion

Sung moved to pass the motion:

“The EC gives final approval of the Law, Economics and Public Policy Option”.

The motion was seconded, no further discussion followed. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

June 11, 2010

EC motion

Jackels moved to pass the motion:

“The EC, as presently constituted approves the procedure to allow endorsement of program responses to the tri-campus review and any other critical matters received over the Summer Quarter by a majority email vote of the EC. If no majority vote is received, EC review of the questions will be conducted Autumn Quarter.”

The motion was seconded.

Kochis called question on the original motion, hearing no objections, he called for a vote. By a show of hands, the EC vote was 5 yes, an electronic vote of the EC members not present at the June 11, 2010 meeting will be conducted.