

Minutes from the meetings of the Executive Council of the UWB GFO in 2017-18

2017 Autumn Quarter meetings:

October 10, 2018

October 24, 2018

November 7, 2018

November 21, 2018

December 5, 2018

2018 Winter Quarter meetings:

January 9, 2018

January 23, 2018

February 6, 2018

February 20, 2018

March 6, 2018

2018 Spring Quarter meetings:

April 3, 2018

April 17, 2018

May 1, 2018

May 15, 2018

May 29, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

October 10, 2017, 8:45 a.m., UW1 370

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair) Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, Jamie Shirley, David Stokes and Linda Watts

Absent: Jeff Jensen

Shankar welcomed the new and continuing EC representatives to a new academic year. Members provided short personal introductions.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes May 30, 2017 were approved

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Past Chair – Casey Mann

CCPB

The CCPB held its first meeting on October 4, Mann updated the Council on the UWB Faculty Salary Plan, a report was sent to the UW Provost last year on faculty salary planning at UW Bothell.

- The CCPB will work on recommendations from the Provost to identify peer institutions. The Council will also examine inversion and compression issues at this campus.
- There is compression at the full professor rank at UWB while assistant and associate professors are at or above their peers at UWS.
- There is a need to reexamine governance structure at the level of Schools. The question of School bylaws was raised and discussed with the Council. UWB Schools do not have bylaws presently, although Schools at UWT do. Should UWB consider School bylaws?
- The new RCM budget model will be implemented this academic year and faculty involvement in budgeting and decision-making are crucial, both at the School level and the campus level.
- Chancellor Yeigh met with the CCPB and updated the Council on tri-campus issues. The Chancellor spoke briefly about the UW Provost search currently underway and the importance of UWB's involvement in the search process. The Chancellor also spoke about shared governance and the role of the Provost as Chief Academic Officer of UW. In the governance structure of the UW, UWB and UWT are each treated as one collegiate unit; this designation needs to be revisited. We need to update the governance structure across the campuses.

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

UWB

Under the Faculty Code, it is the responsibility of budgetary leads, UWB Deans to communicate on budgetary matters with the faculty of their Schools. Watts update the EC on the UW Provost search. The Chancellors and faculty leadership from UWB and UWT have met with the candidates. Active participation from faculty, staff and students is strongly encouraged. The candidate's presentations are streamed and archived for access. Watts reminded the EC that Dean Elaine Scott is the UWB representative in the

search process and has been seeking input from the UWB faculty and staff. It is imperative that UWB faculty communicate with her on this important multi-campus appointment.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

EC

Shankar met with Thaisa Way, Faculty Senate Chair, George Sanderson, Faculty Senate Vice Chair, and Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, along with Lauren Montgomery, the Faculty Assembly Chair from UWT and Zoe Barsness, past Faculty Senate Chair. Discussion was held on the structure of shared governance across the campuses:

- UWT is structured in a “House” or proportional representation model, whereas UWB remains a “Senate” model, with equal representation from all Schools.
- Budgeting models:
 - UWB is in the early stages of adopting a RCM budget model
 - UWS has been using the ABB model for a few years.
- UWT has neither ABB or RCM at present; things may change soon. UWT has more faculty than UWB but with fewer students!
- Share governance and School Bylaws
 - UWT has School/Unit by-laws for all their Schools/academic units.
 - UWS has School level by-laws for their schools
 - UWB has campus level shared governance by-laws but no School level by-laws

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

The School of Business is launching a Supply Chain Management Option. A full industry launch will take place in January with student internship opportunities.

B. FYPP – Shayne

VCAA Jeffords announced at the UWB retreat that an Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education position will be opened. The AOC held discussions on the ATP access program and the future of the 10 credit team-taught Discovery Core I.

C. Educational Studies – Naranjo

The School of Educational Studies has undergone rapid growth in the last 3 years with undergraduate programs expanding. The Educational Studies degree path and Teacher Education has grown. Dual certification at the undergraduate and graduate levels, K-8 certifications and special education certification. Faculty research and teaching work in the community and community partnerships are a focus for the School, how to deliver Master’s programs in the most efficient way.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Stokes

The School of IAS will offer an Earth Systems Science degree, a joint major with the School of STEM. Dean Burgett is holding a faculty meeting to introduce the RCM budgeting concept to the faculty. The School Council will hold discussions on RCM, this Council advises the Dean on personnel and time sensitive matters, these matters then go to the School agenda.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Shirley

The School of Nursing and Health Studies has a new Dean. There has been faculty discussion on the RCM model and faculty to student ratio and tenured/full-time lecturer/part-time lecturer ratio within the School. The School has also discussed their commitment to not splitting the faculty between Nursing and Health Studies. The School has important partnerships with community colleges and community partnership programs. Other discussion items:

- Interdisciplinary work affected by:
 - Nursing Commission's involvement in programs
 - RCM budget model

F. STEM – Mann

The School of STEM retreat was held, discussions were held on difficulties involved in equitable ways to use peer facilitators and student graders. STEM has 4 divisions, Division Chairs have authority over budget and personnel decisions in an advisory capacity to the Dean. Are there currently a campus policy on TAs and grading support?

EC members stated that they were not aware of a campus policy, each School has decided on their policy in this matter.

New Business

A. Recommendations from Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs

Shankar opened discussion on recommendations for the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs. CCPTFA recommendations related to the structure of the CCPTFA, voting procedure, representation on the Council and the recusal process.

EC discussion points

Shift the faculty affairs responsibilities to EC and CCPB

- The workload of the Council is high and the responsibility of promotion and tenure case review is enough for the Council without the added responsibility of faculty affairs issues.
- Faculty affairs issues may not be addressed adequately by the end of each academic year once all cases have been reviewed and completed.
- Some faculty affairs matters may be policy matters and best reviewed by the EC (faculty salary policy).

Voting Procedure

- The GFO currently has a 2-step process for electing members of the CCPTFA. This process calls for an initial election to nominate candidates and a second election of willing candidates for a final nomination of representatives.
- The process is dependent on Academic HR identifying voting and tenured faculty and is time consuming.
- What does the Faculty Code state on this process?
- Some divisionalized UWB Schools have an extra step of review. Should we consider decentralizing the system and have Schools conduct P&T review? The campus level review has served to ensure consistency and equity across the Schools.

Address lack of representation by full professors and by lecturers

- Only faculty members that are senior in rank may vote on tenure and promotion cases as per Code.
- Should we have Senior Lecturers/Principal Lecturers to vote on promotions of the lecture track faculty? Are there enough Principal Lecturers on campus?
- Full professors are needed on this Council to review cases going from Associate to Full. At present, not all Schools have Full professors available to serve on this Council.
- In the past, when Bothell did not have many full professors, a "Committee of the Fulls" consisting of all full professors on campus was called on to advise on promotions from Associate to Full.

Be explicit in bylaws about who discusses cases

- The GFO bylaws state that members of the CCPTFA shall recuse themselves from promotion and tenure cases originating from within their own Schools. The CCPTFA manual states that recusal means "not participating in discussions of or voting on a case".
- In practice, have recused faculty discussed the case but only abstained from voting on the cases?
- Should recused faculty and faculty at the same rank or below as the candidate for promotion recuse themselves from *both* discussion and voting.
- Senior and Principal Lecturers cannot vote on tenure track faculty. Would they be recused from *discussions* on all tenure track faculty if they become members of the Council?
- It may be advantageous to have the faculty from the School or discipline be allowed to discuss cases and give input.
- Isn't allowing faculty (who are ineligible to vote) to provide input or participate in discussions a contradiction of the conflict of interest rationale behind the recusal policy? Don't the school Deans or designees provide the additional information and input that the CCPTFA may need?

B. Bylaws relating to GFO meetings

EC discussion points

Updating GFO Bylaws on GFO meetings, electronic voting

- The quorum required in the Bylaws for GFO meetings is outdated as currently GFO meetings are information meetings and forums for discussion where voting never occurs.
- We need to clear up language so that voting does not have to occur at GFO meetings.
- GFO bylaw amendments
 - Approved by the EC
 - Sent to the UW Code Cops for review
 - Ratified by voting faculty of the GFO

Bylaws relating to CCASC and 1503 program review process

Allow for Curricular review by CCASC, and Budget/Resource impact review by CCPB, before EC considers final approval. EC should provide guidelines for EC/CCPB/CCASC to help members focus their reviews appropriately to avoid duplicating efforts.

- The EC currently reviews 1503s for new programs; the CCASC reviews 1503s for program changes.
- The CCASC reviews courses but does not have context on these courses; it would be helpful for the CCASC to see the curricular relationships with courses and program development.

Update Bylaws on council memberships:

- CCASC/CCAL/CCPTFA councils: Consider 3-year terms
- CCASC/CCAL/CCPTFA: Require these councils to elect a chair-elect for the next academic year before the end of May, so that the chair-elect will be able to call meetings & organize for the following year.
- CCPB: Because of the RCM model, depending on what kind of feedback we get from the campus/deans/schools, we may need to change to membership of CCPB to include one rep from each School.

The specific language needed to update the GFO by-laws and to implement these changes would be discussed at future meetings.

C. Shared governance structure and elected councils at Schools

Shankar introduced the topic and stated that the UW Faculty Code allows the faculty of each School to create a set of School by-laws that help organize themselves in carrying out their academic and shared governance obligations under the Code. Most of the Schools at Seattle and Tacoma have School level by-laws. Should faculty at UWB Schools be allowed/encouraged to create a set of their own School by-laws covering matters such as faculty promotion and tenure, academic policies, priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets at the School level?

EC discussion points

- School bylaws would embody the Faculty Code at the unit level.
- Bylaws will operationalize the Faculty Code and caufify practices in Schools.
- Schools could have language on community based learning, diversity and other areas of faculty rights and responsibilities in their by-laws
- Bylaws would be helpful to new faculty and new Deans/administrators..
- Bylaws could also facilitate faculty involvement and decision making in the RCM budgeting process.
- UWS and UWT School bylaws can serve as a template to draft bylaws for this campus.
- Bylaws would also help new Deans with committee structure, etc. Bylaws would be useful at points of transition.
- There cannot be separate implementations of policy or procedures, bylaws would add consistency across the campus.
- What would be the process for drafting and approving School bylaws? Faculty at schools would have to take ownership of this process.
- School bylaws ratification process:
 - School ratification
 - UW Code Cops
 - EC review and approval

Consensus was reached that EC should consider encouraging Schools to have their own bylaws.

However, it would be good to have a discussion with the Council of Deans before any EC recommendation can go forward. The EC Chair will take this matter to the Council of Deans. The EC will develop a

rationale for the recommendation of UWB Schools to develop bylaws. Shankar will send a document describing the rationale to the EC representatives to discuss with the Deans of their Schools.

Good of the Order

Watts announced a GFO meeting on October 25, 2017, from 3:30 – 5:00 pm in UW1 361. This meeting will be an open listening session for faculty to discuss issues with the GFO leadership.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

The next meeting will October 24, 2017

Executive Council Meeting

October 24, 2017, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair) Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, Jamie Shirley, David Stokes and Linda Watts

Absent: Jeff Jensen

Guests: Annette Anderson, Dan Jaffe, Mark Kochanski, Eric Salathe and Rob Turner

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes October 10, 2017 were approved

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Past Chair – Casey Mann

CCPB

The UW Provost has allocated funding for UW Seattle campus compression and inversion issues, UWB will need to address funding issues for compression and inversion with local funds with Provost & SCPB approval. A CCPB subcommittee is working on measuring compression and inversion at UWB. It may be helpful to query Schools about compression across ranks and bring this information to the EC; this information may help prioritize resource allocation and unit adjustments. The CCPB is also gathering information and looking at criteria toward compiling a list of Peer Groups for Faculty Salary Equity Comparison using UWS as a benchmark. Some UWB Schools are looking at benchmarking issues within their units.

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

UWB

The GFO will hold their first meeting of this academic year tomorrow, October 24. This meeting will be a listening session, a two-way communication with the faculty and GFO leadership. UWB Senators and the EC have been invited. The meeting will be held from 3:30 – 5:00 pm in UW1 361.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

EC

Watts and Shankar met with VCAA Jeffords.

Discussion items:

- Potential School Bylaws
- CCPTFA membership
 - Full professors
 - Principal Lecturers
- Sabbaticals for lecturers

Shankar attended the Council of Academic Deans (CAD) meeting. The discussion on School bylaws showed support from all the Deans. One of the benefits of Schools developing bylaws will be the expansion of faculty consultation on budgetary matters and setting priorities for the Schools. The Faculty Code requires Deans to communicate with faculty on the budget. Bylaws will document this consultative

process. The discussion on peers for salary comparison purposes showed that some Deans use UWS as a benchmark, others use accrediting agency data as benchmarks and others use networks of comparative schools.

EC discussion points

- How much of an impact on faculty workload could the process involved in developing School bylaws entail? Some smaller Schools could be impacted in a large way.
- It was observed that Schools do not have to develop bylaws; it is the School faculty's discretion on how they will advise their Dean on School priorities and budgets, among other things.

Old Business

A. Shared Governance and School Bylaws/Updating GFO Bylaws

Some of the Schools have held discussions on School bylaws. There is support in Business and STEM at this time. EC representatives will continue to report on this matter.

EC motion:

Stokes moved to pass the motion:

"The Executive Council encourages faculty at UWB Schools and FYPP to formulate a set of their own by-laws that govern how their school faculty councils are organized and structured to carry out the various obligations described in the Code."

The motion was seconded, discussion followed.

EC discussion points

- Shankar and the EC reps will hold meetings with the Deans of the Schools and the interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Education to discuss establishing a common framework for School bylaws.
- What is the timeline for Schools to develop bylaws? Should this take priority? Work for the academic year has been set in the Schools.
- Adopting bylaws is at the discretion of the Schools, it is not mandated.
- If Schools want to adopt bylaws, it would be reasonable to set a timeline of the end of the calendar year to have preliminary components established and a list of items to address in the bylaws.
- EC reps and school faculty can begin the process of information gathering, council charges, documents outlining succession structure, process and policies.
- The EC will provide Schools with templates to help develop a common framework.
- It may be feasible to have School bylaws drafted by Spring Quarter or earlier.
- Once these bylaws are drafted and approved by the Schools, the EC and the Chancellor, the UW Code Cops will need to review.

There was no further discussion. Shankar, hearing no objection, called for a vote, the motion carried unanimously (8-0).

Shankar opened discussion on the GFO bylaws and proposed updates to those bylaws.

Bylaws relating to CCPTFA membership:

- Add 2 new lecture track members (Principal/Senior)
- At-large representatives will be full professors

EC discussion points

- How should we structure the ballots to ensure that the full professors elected are from different Schools?
- Should we consider a Committee of the Fulls to be called upon when needed? This would not entail a full year commitment of the faculty member. Members of the CCPTFA should be elected by the voting faculty. We need to follow our process in this matter.
- We must also ensure the any changes in the structure of the CCPTFA be done sufficiently in advance so that all candidates have an equitable review process and can be made aware of the constitution of the CCPTFA before they submit their dossiers.

An EC subcommittee to draft updates to the GFO bylaws will be formed. Shankar and Mann will work on this.

Other Bylaw updates:

- Change CCPB membership to a representative model, one representative from each school.
- Update language about voting at GFO meetings, these meetings are informational, voting is not required.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

The School of Business is working on updating their promotion and tenure document. UWB's community engagement plan is pursuing a Carnegie classification.

B. FYPP – Shayne

The Academic Transition Program review is underway. This program is an academic preparation program that runs concurrently with a student's first year of college.

C. Educational Studies – Naranjo – no report

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Stokes

IAS will begin searches for 2 positions in Natural Sciences.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Shirley – no report

F. STEM – Mann – no report

Discussion:

The EC will request more information on the Carnegie classification application process. What resources are needed to support this work and what are the payoffs for this campus?

New Business

A. Proposal for a new degree in Earth System Science

Professor Turner opened discussion on a proposal to establish an Earth Systems Science (ESS) degree program at UWB. This degree program is jointly administered by the School of IAS and the School of STEM. UWB would be the first institution of higher learning in Washington State to

offer this degree while highlighting our interdisciplinary approach to education. The program can be initiated by combining and revising curricula in the Environmental Science degree in IAS and the Climate Science and Policy degree in STEM into an Earth Systems Science pathway. Merging the two programs into a single ESS program will enable more efficient curriculum development, a stronger cohort of majors and an enhanced learning environment for students. The existing Earth Science degrees at UWB, IAS Earth Systems Science pathway in the IAS Environmental Science B.S. and the STEM Climate Science and Policy B.S. will be the starting point for the new degree with faculty expertise in these areas building the program. Kochanski spoke to the EC about a jointly administered degree program, academic oversight will be directed by a curricular academic workgroup (CAWG) at the division level. A Memorandum of Agreement will be drafted for EC review.

EC discussion points

- Is there a demand for this program? The program currently has 10-15 ESS majors, recruitment should bring the program to about 30 students.
- The focus on sustainability and environmental science gives students a wide range of job opportunities in a high demand field.
- This is a more interdisciplinary program and aligns with where both Schools are heading.
- Where will students go for advising? There will be designated advisors.
- Faculty coordinators will work on academic oversight and student issues.
- How much staffing is required to establish this degree? How much support/resources are needed? STEM has made a commitment to hiring for this degree. STEM is experiencing rapid growth. The School has students to support this degree.
- UWB is beginning to phase out part-time faculty, will this impact the program? The degree does not rely on part-time faculty.
- There are resources to begin the program. The program can be delivered with existing faculty and staff.
- Will the enrollment pause create issues for the program?
- UWB will begin to advertise internally for the program.
- Are there two sets of learning objectives? The capstones are comparable in IAS and STEM in Systems Thinking and Environmental Studies.

The EC will conduct another review of the proposal once the Council receives the MoA between the Schools and has more information on the resource requirements at different levels on anticipated enrollment.

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

The next meeting will November 7, 2017

Executive Council Meeting

November 7, 2017, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair) Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, Jamie Shirley, David Stokes and Linda Watts

Absent: Jeff Jensen

Guests: Cinnamon Hillyard and Sarah Ali

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes October 24, 2017 were approved

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

UWB

The GFO held their first meeting of this academic year on October 24. The meeting's purpose was to serve as a listening session, a two-way communication with the faculty and GFO leadership to establish a value of faculty governance and shared governance as a high priority on this campus. UWB Senators were invited to the meeting; they represent the UWB campus perspective on tri-campus legislation.

GFO discussion topics

- The 3-year roll out of the new RCM budget model
- Faculty ratios: 60:30:10, tenure, full-time faculty, part-time faculty
- Faculty to student ratio: 20:1
- Need for a faculty organization to address issues and meet challenges

EC discussion points

- What does each year put in place over the 3-year rollout? What are the assumptions around this RCM model?
- Impact of campus pause on enrollment, units need clarification on growth. What units can grow? How will these decisions be made?
- What are the campus values informing these decisions?
- How do we enforce principles, how do we operationalize a value system?
- A re-basing mechanism is part of the RCM model; we can make adjustments over time.
- What are the real consequences of the 20:1 model? Not all UWB Schools will have the same numbers, what are the offsets of this expectation, the implications?
- School size will affect faculty student ratios, smaller Schools will not be able to compile with this metric.
- We need a strategy for this campus; faculty must play a role in these conversations. The 20:1 ratio was created with input from UWB Deans; there was insufficient faculty input in the process.

- Some Schools have held discussions on the 60:30:10 faculty ratio and the 20:1 faculty/student ratio. These metrics impact class sizes and could influence faculty research output.
- What is the pedagogical basis for these metrics? Do we know how they were arrived at?
- The classroom utilization policy called for classroom capacity to match classroom size. Space utilization was found in reality to be a staff utilization, more students in the classroom increase faculty workload.
- These decisions became budgetary decisions, not pedagogy driven.
- Student experience and pedagogy should be the considerations for classroom capacity.
- Schools could conduct an inventory, what is the optimal pedagogical capacity for different courses?
- We need to set priorities, if we have small classrooms, what else must be adjusted?
- Faculty Councils in Schools can give feedback and input on how to meet expectations and what modalities may help meet these expectations:
 - Hybrid courses
 - Online courses
- What blend of instructional and non-instructional budget priorities are right for this campus?
- Are our stated needs for faculty, staff and students being met?

GFO Past Chair – Casey Mann

CCPB

VCPA Johnston and Steve Walline, from Institutional Planning and Budget met with the CCPB to discuss budgetary information on UWB administrative units. A UWB budget and expenditure by unit document detailed fixed costs for FY 2016 and FY 2017 for Schools and Administrative units. This document provided an institutional analysis for the CCPB. Additional information is needed to determine if UWB is in line with other institutions, better longitudinal data will help inform the CCPB and the GFO.

EC discussion points

- UWB has grown, have we realized economies of scale? What was the expenditure on UWB administrative units in 2012 as a % of total? What is it now?
- UW Seattle central still gets 10% of our funding; we have not realized savings in this area, although we now provide some services that were previously offered through UWS such as human resources at the campus level.
- Are some UWB Schools operating at a financial loss? Are other Schools subsidizing these programs? This deserves some scrutiny.
- We need to look at growth and determine what rational, operational efficiencies can be achieved at the campus level.

The CCPB assigned a working group with the task of developing a method for measuring existing compression and inversion in faculty salaries at UW Bothell. The CCPB reviewed the recommendations of the working group and voted to forward this recommendation to the Chancellor, along with a recommendation that the Chancellor direct the Deans of the Schools to make it a priority to use the recommended methods to study existing compression and inversion among their faculty.

EC discussion points

- SCPB reported there is compression at the full professor level, although not so much at the lower ranks. The situation at UWB may be different. There are also gaps at the lecturer level across programs.

- We need to determine internal and external comparisons for equity across ranks.
- What is the UWB narrative on equity across tenure-track and lecturer-track faculty? We assert that lecturers are valued faculty members; salary equity does not reflect that.
- We should look for external models on how equity is achieved across all ranks.

New Business

A. ATP and Discovery Core Task Force – Cinnamon Hillyard

Cinnamon Hillyard, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Learning updated the EC on the Academic Transition Program (ATP) at UWB. The Academic Transition Program (ATP) is a yearlong academic preparation program running concurrently with student's first year of college at the University of Washington, Bothell. The program provides support and mentorship to students that are not qualified for direct admission to UWB under the holistic review but show promise for academic success. The EC reviewed the report of the ATP Working Group, charged with the evaluation of the program and recommendations for the future of the program. ATP funding sources include financial aid and scholarships (Coca Cola Foundation) for students. The Diversity Center offers support to student and is creating a library for student materials.

The EC reviewed a report from the Discovery Core Working Group, charged by the FYPP Academic Oversight Committee to review UWB's three quarter Discovery Core series and make a recommendation regarding possible restructuring of the series with the goal of maintaining the high quality first year experience for as many students as possible. Hillyard updated the EC on the work of this group. The FYPP program has retained curricular responsibility for the Discovery Core, Composition, Introductory Mathematics and Language courses. Through the Mapping Project last year, FYPP identified several areas to work on to improve the experience of students through their UWB degree.

Hillyard asked the EC for input and feedback on the Discovery Core and the ATP program.

EC discussion points

- Do all students go through the Discovery Core? Yes, unless they have 45 credits, then they can opt out.
- This year 700 students took the Discovery Core. Students find it very valuable and have a high regard for the experience both with their student cohort and with the faculty interaction. Faculty express the same enthusiastic praise for the program.
- UWB's 3Cs, cross-disciplinary, connected learning and community engagement are integrated into the DC.
- Students gain valuable experience in working with faculty in undergraduate research and community based learning that carries throughout their academic career.
- Involvement of full time faculty in the DC would be extremely valuable for students and the faculty.

Hillyard invited the EC to speak to the faculty in their Schools and encourage full time faculty to consider teaching a DC class. Workshops and faculty support will be available for any faculty member wishing to develop a DC class.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

The School of Business approved 3 hires of assistant professors in Accounting, Management Information Systems and Organizational Behavior. The School is holding discussions on the ratio of part-time faculty and ways to reduce dependence on part-time faculty. The School is working on a new tenure criteria document. Deanna has sent a first draft of proposed School bylaws to the Dean and Associate Dean for review.

B. FYPP – Shayne

FYPP is working on a set of bylaws to go to the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Learning.

C. Educational Studies – Naranjo

ES is beginning faculty engagement in working toward School bylaws; a draft should be ready by the end of 2017. A search for faculty in Educational Leadership to replace Brad Portin will begin.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Stokes

A draft of School bylaws, modelled on the UW Evans School will go forward to the School Faculty Council and the Dean.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Shirley

NHS has searches for an assistant professor and lecturer in Nursing. The NHS faculty support the idea of School bylaws.

F. STEM – Mann

STEM engaged in discussions on class size, the faculty ratio by rank and the student to faculty ratio and the impact on teaching and research production.

Good of the Order

Shankar announced that George Sandison, Vice Chair of the UW Faculty Senate will meet with the EC to learn about UWB faculty governance and other issues that are on the minds of UWB faculty and to discuss recent UW Faculty Senate initiatives. On Dec 5th, VCAA Jeffords and Dean Burgett will meet with the EC to discuss the Carnegie designation for UWB.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

The next meeting will be on November 21, 2017.

Executive Council Meeting

November 21, 2017, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair) Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, Jamie Shirley, David Stokes and Linda Watts

Absent: Jeff Jensen

Guests: Professor George Sandison, UW Faculty Senate Vice-Chair, Eric Salathe, Dan Jaffe and Rob Turner

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes November 7, 2017 were approved

Shankar welcomed Prof. George Sandison, UW Faculty Senate Vice Chair and thanked him for meeting with the EC to discuss UW Senate initiatives.

UW Senate initiatives – Prof. George Sandison, UW Faculty Senate Vice-Chair

Professor George Sandison, UW Faculty Senate Vice Chair shared a brief introduction with the EC on his background. He is from Liverpool England and received both his undergraduate and graduate degrees in England, traveled to Canada and eventually to the United States and the UW. He is a professor in the UW School of Medicine in Medical Radiation Oncology and currently serving as Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate. Sandison outlined three initiatives the Senate is working on with the EC:

1. **UW Faculty Disciplinary Code.** A joint task force is in the process of reviewing the Faculty Code and a steering committee is examining the legal aspects of the Code. Some difficulties that the faculty have encountered involve interpretation of the Code from the UW Provost. The Faculty Code is the employment contract of the UW faculty; a clear and open process between the UW administration and the faculty that aligns with faculty values is critical.
2. **Open Access Policy.** This Class C legislation was initiated by the Faculty Council on Research and is an initial first step to bring the policy forward for faculty vote. The policy for an open access repository makes the results of UW research activity much more widely available than when those results were only available via journal subscriptions. Concerns were expressed regarding the policy's opt in default rather than offering a choice made by the author to submit their work to the repository. The UW sees this as an opportunity to share faculty research and efforts broadly. The Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Policy & Practice (ACIP3) will provide guidance to the President and Faculty Senate on pathways for implementing open access to UW faculty's scholarly works. Faculty can choose to opt out of this policy, although an author can publish a work without consulting with collaborators, so legal issues involving ownership rights. A leadership team will amend the Executive Order and bring Class B legislation to the Senate for a vote Autumn Quarter 2018.

3. UW Faculty 2050. A Senate committee will create a white paper to help identify and address what UW faculty will look like and what these faculty will need to be successful in the future. This important work will affirm the roles of the faculty in alignment with the values and vision of the institution. It will help inform a strategic plan based on shared governance in an inclusive tri-campus system.

Sandison discussed other governance issues with the EC. He stressed the importance of faculty engagement in fiscal matters of the university. UWS faculty councils are working toward greater involvement in budgetary understanding and decision making within their departments.

Lecturer Career Paths: The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs will address the need to strengthen and clarify career paths for lecturers, including consideration of criteria and processes for hiring and promotion and lecturer titles and responsibilities.

Shankar thanked Sandison for meeting with the EC and updating the Council on Faculty Senate initiatives and issues. Sandison also updated the EC on the UW Provost search. There are three finalist candidates; President Cauce may have a decision by Thanksgiving with completion of the process by the end of the calendar year.

Shankar spoke briefly about UWB faculty councils in the Schools and the GFO's Campus Council on Planning and Budget, which work to manage priorities in the budget at this campus.

New Business

- A. **Proposed Amendments to GFO by-laws; Gowri Shankar & Casey Mann**
Shankar reviewed the proposed amendments to the GFO bylaws with the EC.

Summary of Proposed Amendments to GFO by-laws:

1. Moving faculty affairs to EC charge.
2. Dropping Faculty Affairs from the CCPTFA charge; (ii) renaming council to CCPT (Article VI)

EC discussion points

- The dual reporting structure of the CCPTFA, advisory to the EC and the VCAA, can create timeline and workload difficulties for this Council. Promotion and tenure case review takes priority through autumn and winter quarters, which can leave any faculty affairs business to be addressed only spring quarter.
 - Moving Faculty Affairs to EC will help focus on faculty affairs through the year, especially in Fall and Winter quarters as campus plans and narratives are developed.
3. Requiring CCPT Chair election at beginning of Spring quarter (Article VI)
 4. Requiring Schools to conduct CCASC rep elections early in the Spring quarter. (ii) Requiring CCASC to elect a Chair for the following year early in the Spring quarter. (Article VII)

5. Changing CCPB membership to one from each of the five Schools instead of the current system of three faculty members elected at large. (ii) Dropping the one EC second year member requirement. (iii) Eliminating the section on CCPB election run by the GFO (Article VIII).
6. Streamlining CCAL membership & Chair election processes so that it is like the CCASC membership/election processes. (Article IX)
7. For quorum, (i) dropping the "all schools represented" clause and (ii) expanding definition to include all faculty councils. (Article XI)
8. Inserting definition of 'quorum majority' from the UW faculty code. (Article XII voting)
9. All GFO meetings to proceed for purposes of information sharing and informal discussions. (Article XIII)

EC recommendation: Proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws: Add a member from FYPP to the CCPB membership, elected from the Academic Oversight Committee in FYPP.

Old Business

A. New MOA ESS degree proposal – Eric Salathe

Professor Eric Salathe opened discussion on the ESS degree proposal; this degree is jointly administered by the School of IAS and the School of STEM. The MOA addresses resource requirements and the administrative management of the degree program. An ESS Academic Oversight Committee will coordinate the management of the program working with curricular area working groups. Deans of IAS and STEM support the new program. Instructional responsibility will be shared by IAS and STEM equally. A draft of an incremental budget for the program was reviewed by the EC. The budget framed the costs of the program in four stages:

1. Launch of the degree with current resources (10 -15 majors)
2. Basic program (25 majors)
3. Medium program (50 majors)
4. Large program (100 majors)

A 3rd year review will be conducted of the program; adjustments can be made at that time.

EC discussion points

- Is the funding and staffing cost reasonable for 100 majors?
- The budget proposal shows only the incremental costs; it does not show that the total additional costs would be over \$500,000 once the program reaches 100 majors.
- Optimal size for the program would be 50 majors, this would give national recognition.

EC motion:

Kennedy moved to pass the motion:

"The Executive Council approves the Earth Systems Science degree, contingent on the MOA being signed by the Deans of IAS and STEM and the proposal being shared with the entire faculty in both Schools."

The motion was seconded, there was no further discussion.

Shankar, hearing no objection, called for a vote, the motion carried unanimously (8-0).

Shankar thanked Professors Salathe, Jaffe and Turner for their contributions to the discussion of this proposal.

EC discussion points

- Should the EC create a best practices statement on jointly offered degree programs.
- Curricular review of these programs should involve the CCASC for campus level implications.
- A new issue, the RCM budget model may have implications also, Schools will be fiscally responsible, how will the revenue generated through FTE be handled in these programs?
- We need a long-term strategy for how Schools will incorporate a statement of needs.

An EC subcommittee was formed to create guidelines for the review process of new degrees and what is needed in the preparation of the review process for EC review. Watts and Kennedy agreed to serve on this subcommittee, with potential participation from other EC members.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy – no new report

B. FYPP – Shayne

FYPP is working on a set of bylaws to go to the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Learning. A working group is reviewing the Discovery Core series.

C. Educational Studies – Naranjo – no new report

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Stokes – no new report

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Shirley – no new report

F. STEM – Mann – no new report

Good of the Order

Shankar announced that VCAA Jeffords, Kara Adams and Dean Burgett will attend the December 5th EC meeting to talk about the resource requirements and the process for UWB's application for Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

The next meeting will be on December 5, 2017

Executive Council Meeting

December 5, 2017, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair) Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, Jamie Shirley, David Stokes and Linda Watts

Absent: Jeff Jensen

Guests: Joy Emory, Cinnamon Hillyard, VCAA Jeffords, Bruce Burgett and Kara Adams

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted as revised.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes November 21, 2017 were approved.

Shankar reviewed the agenda items with the EC:

- Joy Emory, Analyst for the UWB Office of Institutional Research is seeking feedback on the NSSE survey results.
- Carnegie community engagement designation: EC discussion on UWB's application for the Carnegie classification could address what benefit this designation will bring to the campus. What is the cost to faculty and staff time and resources with this designation?
- GFO bylaws: a draft of proposed amendments to the GFO bylaws will be presented Winter Quarter.
- School bylaws will be presented to the EC for review this academic year from most Schools. These bylaws will then move to the UW Code Cops for review.
- Update of the "Plan to Plan" report to the UW Provost, Watts will share with the EC.
- An EC sub-committee is working on guidelines for the 1503 review process.
- A salary plan policy on equity, compression and inversion will be reviewed by the EC.
- The IAS and STEM jointly offered ESS degree MOA was approved by the EC with the contingency that the faculty of both Schools have seen the MOA and a signed approval by the Deans is completed. Shankar will contact the originating faculty and confirm this action has been accomplished.

New Business

A. NSSE Survey Results, Dissemination and Action – Joy Emory

Joy Emory, Analyst for the UWB Office of Institutional Research presented the results of the National Survey on Student Engagement to the EC for discussion and feedback. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending their college or university. Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience that can be improved through changes in policy and practice. The survey will help to identify high impact practices. The EC reviewed some of the broad themes of engagement indicators.

EC discussion points

- Is the survey using psychometric properties to objectively measure skills and knowledge? Jason Naranjo will check out this out with NSSE.
- The measurement of student – faculty interaction for UWB was significantly lower than peer institutions. What might be indicated by this low score? Some peer institutions offer faculty career counselling for students; in comparison, we may show lower measures of faculty – student engagement.
- Measurements could also be reflective of student engagement with faculty outside the classroom.
- Some high impact practices include internships, clinicals and community engagement practices (the survey does not offer examples of these practices, so students may not respond in these areas of service learning).
- As a commuter campus, some student leave after classes, this may impact measurements of these practices.
- Longitudinal data will be coming in some of these areas in February; alumni surveys results will be available.
- If these values are important to students, we need to have a dialog on how to improve our scores.
- How are peers chosen? How do we benchmark geographically? Is UWT a peer institution?
- How does this data inform local practice and policy?
- We could run some focus groups based on the same constructs and run these over time to gather qualitative data.
- Focus groups could get the student voice and use that information to make informed policy decisions.
- How will the Diversity Center impact some of these areas? We need to look at sub populations also across campus.
- How does the nature of the survey reflect our practices?
- How do we make changes in the area of faculty – student interaction? How do we create opportunities without necessarily moving to a system of faculty advising?
- The CCAL could take up some of these questions and look at a broader plan for evaluation. This aligns with assessment.
- How do we preserve data, do we create a repository for campus access? Emory will send the EC a Sharepoint site.

Emory asked the EC for feedback on disseminating the data and next steps. The EC recommended that the data should be disseminated to faculty committees in Schools. The survey is useful for assessment of student learning, the CCAL could use the data to guide strategic planning. Past NSSE and alumni surveys could also assist in seeing across data sets. This data will be useful in informing practices and prioritizing planning efforts.

Shankar thanked Emory for her presentation.

UWB's Application for Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification – Kara Adams, Bruce Burgett and VCAA Jeffords

Kara Adams, UWB Director of Community Engagement opened discussion on the UWB's application for Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification. The Carnegie Foundation's Classification for Community Engagement is an elective classification, requiring evidence-based documentation of institutional practice for self-assessment and quality improvement in regards to community engagement.

UWB's mission statement and the 3Cs campus initiative supports a strong public service commitment to community engagement. Carnegie is involved in this work at a national level and classification will align with our institutional values and goals. Some benefits of the partnership for this campus include:

- Institutional self-assessment
- Public recognition
- Accountability (fulfilling the mission)
- Fostering institutional alignment with community-based teaching, learning and scholarship
- Institutional identity
- Faculty (promotion and tenure)
- Curricular integration
- Faculty rewards, including promotion and tenure

EC discussion points

- What is the resource commitment to the Carnegie classification? Has the faculty governance process been involved in this?
- UWB is currently involved in community engagement efforts, resources are already committed to these efforts.
- The Chancellor has charged the task force working on this classification to look at this as an institutional priority. Carnegie orients our community engagement efforts in a more strategic way.
- Carnegie focuses our resources in a formalized structure.
- Curricular indicators document community engagement practices.
- Focus groups are working on the impact to students, faculty and the community.

Burgett addressed the EC regarding the application process and asked that EC representatives to disseminate information on the Carnegie Community Engagement Classification with their Schools. The classification aligns with the mission and the direction of the campus, it will help us use resources more effectively and coordinate efforts that are currently underway. Carnegie will raise awareness of faculty work in community engagement and assist in the accreditation process.

Shankar thanked Adams, Burgett and the VCAA for meeting with the EC to discuss the Carnegie's Community Engagement Classification application process and the work of the task force.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has drafted bylaws, they will go to the full faculty for feedback with a vote to be conducted Winter Quarter 2018.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Shayne is working with another faculty member on a set of bylaws to go to the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Learning.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

ES has support for School bylaws, a discussion on bylaws will be on the January 2018 agenda.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

The IAS Faculty Council will discuss bylaws Winter Quarter 2018.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Jamie Shirley

NHS has support for School bylaws and will begin work on them. Shirley announced that Chris Wade will begin serving as EC representative next quarter. Shankar thanked Shirley for her service on EC.

F. STEM – Casey Mann

STEM has not held any faculty meetings on School bylaws yet. The School has applied for a grant aimed at increasing student participation in research and mathematics. The School is also working on refining merit criteria with a focus on lecturers.

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

This is the last meeting of Autumn Quarter 2017

Executive Council Meeting

January 9,, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair) Deanna Kennedy, Jeff Jenson, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, Chris Wade and Linda Watts

Guests: Jerelyn Resnick, Cinnamon Hillyard and Nora Kentworthy

Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes of December 5, 2107 were approved.

Jerelyn Resnick was ratified as continuing chair of CCAL

Officer Reports—

Casey: The faculty membership of CCPB met in December; Wolf, Casey, Ruth, and Linda met with the Provost to discuss the budget

Linda: The subcommittee (Deanna, Julie, and Linda) will meet soon.

Gowri: He met with CAD regarding school bylaws, and the deans are eager to support this effort. They also discussed compression/equity study of faculty salaries; Gowri and Linda met yesterday with Faculty Senate leaders. Topics discussed included sexual harassment training and the status of lecturers

Jerelyn: came to EC to seek advice about priorities for the CCAL; how can the council best serve the campus?

There are many possible points of focus for CCAL, such as the DC series, campus learning goals, NSSE results, the 3C's, and the Husky Experience. It would be helpful to have the council review the current GFO bylaws for any needed changes in council description/role, council composition, and election process.

Nora: came to present the Minor in Global Health; she began with informal regards regarding the motivation and vision for the proposed minor. There is significant student interest in health studies across campus. The minor provides a more scaffolded opportunity than would be possible simply by taking a series of individual health studies classes. Global health studies is a growing field, and Bothell is a specific growth area. Some Seattle students already come to UWB for their electives. The minor is consistent with campus interdisciplinarity, intellectual challenge, community engagement, and connected learning. The three core courses involve no prerequisites, and can be enrolled in any sequence. Nora will distribute Appendix A, which appeared to be missing from the document distributed in advance of the meeting. This document lists the elective courses, a roster that will be updated annually. EC members asked questions about the capacity of the minor, its sustainability, and potential community partners. The 1503 was approved.

Reports from School Representatives:

IAS—currently at interview stage of two faculty searches; working on School bylaws

NHS—lost 6 faculty, moving forward with two faculty searches (one tenure-track, the other lecturer track)

ES—currently conducting a tenure-track faculty search in Educational Leadership; faculty are favorably responsive to the school bylaws concept

BUS—three lines for assistant professors are being searched (all replacement positions); bylaws discussion pending

STEM—no report at present

FYPP—meeting Thursday to discuss bylaws

Minutes submitted by Linda Watts

Executive Council Meeting

January 23, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, Christopher Wade and Linda Watts

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes January 9, 2018 were approved.

Proposed changes to the GFO Bylaws

Shankar reviewed the GFO bylaws with the EC.

1/17/2018

Summary of Proposed Amendments to GFO by-laws:

1. Article V: GFO Executive Council (EC)

a. Page 4 (i) Moving faculty affairs to EC charge.

(ii) Adding "planning and budgeting" and "assessment and learning" to councils' charge.

EC discussion points

- Recommendation of the CCPTFA last year. The current Chair of the CCPTFA supports this proposed amendment.
- The CCPTFA has increased their workload in the last few years due to the increased number of faculty and cases coming to the Council for review. The increase leaves less time to devote to faculty affairs issues.
- Add Faculty Affairs charge as outlined in the bylaws to EC for clarity around the scope of EC responsibilities.
- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.

2. Article VI: Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure & Faculty Affairs

a. Page 5: (i) Dropping Faculty Affairs from the CCPTFA charge and renaming council to CCPT

b. Page 6: (i) Adding two members with instructional title of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer

(ii) Reserving two at-large positions for full Professors from different Schools

(iii) Requiring Chair election at beginning of Spring quarter

(iv) Specifying rank/title and School affiliation on CCPT ballot

EC discussion points

- Adding Senior or Principal Lecturers to the Council will give a broader advisory voice to the Council for non-tenure track cases.
- Will the CCPT lecturer members review all cases or only lecture-track cases?
- Per Faculty Code faculty cannot vote on promotion or tenure above their rank.
- How much participation on the CCPT will lecturers have? Can lecturers review all faculty cases, but only vote on lecture-track cases or would they be recused from the review of tenure-track faculty? Academic HR will need to be consulted regarding these issues.
- Will lecturers serving on CCPT be eligible for course releases?

- We should conserve resources, if members are recused or do not participate in discussions, a course release may not be necessary. It will depend upon the workload of the Council.
- Another issue is the necessity of ensuring that there is enough full professors on the Council to conduct a vote on faculty going from associate to full.
- We need to design membership for a functional council.
- Could we have alternate members who would be called upon to serve?
- All members of the CCPT must be elected by the voting faculty.
- Could we have a standing committee of the Fulls, the way we did it when the campus was smaller? A committee of full professors could be called into action when needed.
- Full professors may not be needed for all the cases and would not work unless needed. This would save resources.
- The VCAA meets with all members of the CCPT each year to advise before cases are reviewed. If a committee of Fulls is used this may need another meeting.
- We must also ensure that any changes in the structure of the CCPT be done sufficiently in advance so that all candidates have an equitable review process and can be made aware of the constitution of the CCPT before they submit their dossiers.
- Our Bylaws must align with the Faculty Code. The CCPT review looks at both the process and the merits of the case and makes recommendations. The letter from the Council addresses both.
- A 2-level review (School and campus level) protects candidates on this campus. A multi-tiered system addresses equity and fairness. The CCPT looks at consistency and fairness across Schools.
- This process can be subject to legal challenges, we must create a structure that is fair and equitable.
- The EC supports these proposed amendments to the membership of the CCPT.
- Add: to Section 2. Membership
"from within the membership" to the election of the chair of CCPT.

3. Article VII: Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum

- a. Page 8-9: (i) Requiring Schools to conduct CCASC rep elections early in the Spring quarter.
- (ii) Requiring CCASC to elect a Chair for the next year early in the Spring quarter.

EC discussion points

- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.

4. Article VIII: Campus Council on Planning and Budgeting

- a. Page 9-10: (i) Streamlining CCPB charge and eliminating redundancies
- (ii) Adding GFO Vice-Chair & dropping one EC second year member requirement.
- (iii) Changing CCPB membership to one from each of the five Schools and FYPP instead of the current system of three faculty members elected at large.
- (iv) Changing the order of ex-officio members
- (iv) Eliminating the section on CCPB election run by the GFO, since Schools & FYPP will elect members.

EC discussion points

- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.

5. Article IX: Campus Council on Assessment and Learning

- a. Page 12: Streamlining CCAL membership & Chair election processes so that it is similar to the membership/election processes of other campus councils.

EC discussion points

- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.
- Correction: change CCASC to CCAL in the text.

6. Article XI: Quorum

- a. Page 13: For quorum, (i) dropping the “all schools represented” clause and (ii) expanding definition to include all faculty councils.

EC discussion points

- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.

7. Article XII Voting

- a. Page 14: Inserting definition of ‘quorum majority’ from the UW faculty code.

EC discussion points

- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.

8. Article XIII: General Faculty Organization (GFO) Meeting

- a. Page 14: In absence of quorum, GFO meetings can proceed for purposes of information sharing and informal discussions.

EC discussion points

- The EC supports this proposed amendment to the GFO bylaws.

Shankar asked the EC for feedback on agenda items for future EC discussions. Watts spoke to the Council about the Faculty 2050 Initiative, a vision of the next generation of faculty and how the UW can support these faculty leaders. Some areas the initiative is working on:

- Core mission as faculty
- Persona
- Trends
- Uncertainties (funding models)

Mann identified some issues that the CCPB is working on:

- Salary equity
- Identifying peer institutions
- Budget data for non-School units
- Analyze how we spend money in alignment with our priorities

EC discussion points

- Equity issues among faculty are a concern.
- Part-time faculty need more professional development opportunities. Lack of mentoring and professional development opportunities can limit job progression for part-time faculty wanting to transition to full-time positions.
- Part-time faculty at UWB aren't competitive for full-time positions. What are the expectations for part-time faculty to transition to full-time?
- UWB could be a leader in promoting equity among faculty.

- We want to present a clear message to the new Provost about UWB's priorities in a tri-campus system.
- How will the new RCM budget model affect Schools understanding of setting priorities?
- There will be choices in the new budget environment, budget implications.
- With Russ Cannon leaving UWB, we should have a dialog on our data needs and how we can position ourselves in setting priorities.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has drafted bylaws, they will go to the full faculty for feedback with a vote to be conducted Winter Quarter 2018.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Shayne is working with Kris Kellejian on a set of bylaws for FYPP.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

ES has support for School bylaws, a discussion on bylaws will be on the January 2018 agenda.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

The IAS Faculty Council is reviewing School bylaws. Six faculty searches are underway.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Jamie Shirley

NHS has support for School bylaws and will begin work on them.

F. STEM – Jeff Jensen

The STEM Faculty Council is reviewing School bylaws. A 5-year review of the Dean is in process.

Good of the Order

Mann informed the EC that a survey will be coming out asking faculty for their employment history before coming to UWB. This survey ties into the faculty salary study and will help determine compression and inversion at UWB.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

The next EC meeting will be February 6, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

February 6, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, Cristopher Wade and Linda Watts

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted with the addition of an information item.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes January 23, 2018 were approved with revision.

Guidelines for EC review of curricular proposals

The EC reviewed the guidelines for reviewing new program and curriculum proposals. Watts, Kennedy and Shayne drafted a set of guide questions that the EC can consider in the review process of proposals and presented some issues that arose during the discussion of the guidelines. The enrollment pause that was instituted last year allowed the EC to think about the value added to their review of program proposals from UWB Schools. The guidelines were developed to use as an informal tool to help inform the Council's role in advising Schools and to express the faculty voice in these matters.

EC discussion points

- Some of the sidebar issues are not currently included in the review protocol.
- Is there coordination with UWS and UWT in the integration of programs? Are curricular equivalencies considered by UWB Schools?
- A current UW Executive Order mandates that Schools confer across the campuses regarding these types of issues.
- The EC helps facilitate these discussions on campus level implications and faculty governance issues.
- MOAs are useful and should be required; they provide clear and shared information from faculty in units. A MOA signed by the Dean stating that faculty in the unit have seen the proposal should be required.
- We can improve EC contribution by focusing on principle areas of EC emphasis:
 - Values, construct argument around values
 - Campus mission, how does this program support the mission of the campus and how is this demonstrated?
 - How do we prioritize the development of programs on this campus?
- EC review represents the faculty voice.
- We may encounter competing proposals, the faculty review is necessary.
- How does EC assess the proposals regarding costs, how is determination made in various areas:
 - Student learning
 - Library partnership
 - Support services
- The Academic Council reviews proposals, how can we engage in consultation to see if expectations are met? Can we establish a consultation model prior to review?
- In this resource environment, how do we ensure campus standards are upheld?
- Should we require 'two readings before approval' process?

- The EC should also set up a review process that allows meaningful discussion after the presenters conclude their presentation.

The EC will bring the guide questions to their School's faculty for feedback and input in the process. The first 3 questions could form a preamble in framing a working document outlining the responsibility of the EC in this review process.

Shankar thanked Watts, Kennedy and Shayne for a great first step in the process.

Proposed changes to the GFO Bylaws – 2nd reading

EC consensus on proposed amendments to the GFO bylaws:

Summary of Proposed Amendments to GFO by-laws:

1. Article V: GFO Executive Council (EC)
 - a. Page 4 (i) Moving faculty affairs to EC charge.
 - (ii) Adding “planning and budgeting” and “assessment and learning” to councils’ charge.
2. Article VI: Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure & Faculty Affairs
 - a. Page 5: (i) Dropping Faculty Affairs from the CCPTFA charge and renaming council to CCPT
 - b. Page 6: (i) Adding two members with instructional title of Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer
 - (ii) Reserving two at-large positions for full Professors from different Schools
 - (iii) Requiring Chair election at beginning of Spring quarter
 - (iv) Specifying rank/title and School affiliation on CCPT ballot
3. Article VII: Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum
 - a. Page 8-9: (i) Requiring Schools to conduct CCASC rep elections early in the Spring quarter.
 - (ii) Requiring CCASC to elect a Chair for the next year early in the Spring quarter.
4. Article VIII: Campus Council on Planning and Budgeting
 - a. Page 9-10: (i) Streamlining CCPB charge and eliminating redundancies
 - (ii) Adding GFO Vice-Chair & dropping one EC second year member requirement.
 - (iii) Changing CCPB membership to one from each of the five Schools and FYPP instead of the current system of three faculty members elected at large.
 - (iv) Changing the order of ex-officio members
 - (iv) Eliminating the section on CCPB election run by the GFO, since Schools & FYPP will elect members.
5. Article IX: Campus Council on Assessment and Learning
 - a. Page 12: Streamlining CCAL membership & Chair election processes so that it is similar to the membership/election processes of other campus councils.
6. Article XI: Quorum
 - a. Page 13: For quorum, (i) dropping the “all schools represented” clause and
 - (ii) expanding definition to include all faculty councils.
7. Article XII Voting
 - a. Page 14: Inserting definition of ‘quorum majority’ from the UW faculty code.

8. Article XIII: General Faculty Organization (GFO) Meeting

a. Page 14: In absence of quorum, GFO meetings can proceed for purposes of information sharing and informal discussions.

EC discussion points

- Amendment adding Senior or Principal Lecturer to CCPT to be considered after Academic HR is consulted regarding their role in deliberation of cases.

The amended bylaws, once approved by the EC will then be sent to the UW the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (Code Cops). After review and approval by the Code Cops the bylaws go to the GFO for review and finally to the voting faculty for ratification.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

Shankar announced that a Biology Minor proposal will be coming to the EC for review.

The VCAA is providing resources for part-time lecturers to prepare and apply for full-time positions. Information sessions will address competitive hiring considerations at UWB for lecturers, both full-time and part-time.

EC discussion points

- Transparency on the front end of hiring is necessary. Part-time teaching positions do not always provide a lead to full-time appointments despite years of teaching.
- Academic HR could hold coaching sessions for part-time faculty

GFO Chair Emeritus – Casey Mann

Mann introduced a proposal to the EC for new teaching time blocks. There were 2 options proposed:

1. Monday, Wednesday and Friday would offer shorter time blocks (1 hour 20 minutes blocks before noon, with one open block time (no scheduled classes))
2. A combination of short-time and regular-time blocks would be offered on MW and Friday, with one open block around lunch time

Mann offered some benefits of the open block/unscheduled mid-day block:

- Faculty development time where all faculty have a chance to participate
- Research presentation time and/or short unit meetings
- Student activities/functions
- Developing a culture of engagement with students and faculty on the campus (pizza lunches, speakers)

EC discussion points

- The curriculum is designed to be delivered in 2 hour time blocks.
- Pedagogically much of the curriculum is structured on longer class blocks.
- Lecturers with 3-day teaching schedules could not adjust classes to 2-day schedules, especially 10 credit courses.
- We must also meet the needs of students; many of our students are commuters with work and family obligations. This schedule would prolong their day.

- We should also look at how this schedule will align with bus schedules.
- What are we solving for? Do we want to free up time and space?
- Hybrid classes may free up space on the campus.
- We need to collect information from Student Life of some of these issues.
- How will this impact faculty and staff:
 - Scheduling final exams
 - Teaching schedules
 - Workload
 - Parity issue (lecturer workload)
 - Off set time slots
- We can consult with the Registrar and administration, request data on existing need (classroom space, etc).
- Standardized time blocks are easier than ad hoc arrangements.
- This could be done incrementally, as units/schools want, once feedback from schedulers, administration, faculty and student input is received.

Mann is co-Chairing the search for the Chief Information Office, he asked the EC for input on this position and candidate qualifications. EC input:

- Select a diverse pool of applicants.
- Support tech and classroom space accessibility
- Student learning needs

Reports from Program Representatives

- A. Business – Deanna Kennedy
- B. FYPP – Julie Shayne
Bylaws for FYPP to be presented to the AOC.
- C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo
- D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes
- E. Nursing and Health Studies – Jamie Shirley
- F. STEM – Jeff Jensen
STEM ratified merit review criteria.

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am
Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant
The next EC meeting will be February 20, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

February 20, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 370

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Linda Watts, Casey Mann, Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, and Cristopher Wade.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from February 6, 2018 were approved.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

The Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy is opening their meeting on February 22 to faculty for a discussion on the implementation of faculty governance. The Council is seeking input from faculty on issues of shared governance and elected faculty councils in Schools across campuses. Faculty can participate remotely, phone-in information will be provided.

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

VCAP Johnston is coordinating a financial forum with UW Seattle faculty and administrators to discuss their experience with Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) and how it might inform our transition to Modified Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM). Watts stated that this will be a public event and if EC members have any suggestions for panelists for this forum, please contact her.

New Business

A. Report from the Chancellor's Diversity Council on religious accommodations

Shayne spoke to the Council regarding troubling incidents that have occurred in the area of the Reflection Room on campus. A flyer on Gender, Women's and Sexuality Studies was defaced, a Muslim woman's image was cut out of the poster and some of the flyers were removed. This follows another incident that occurred in a washroom near the Reflection Room, in which a bag of excrement was found in the washroom. These incidents have left some students feeling violated. Posters announcing a lecture by Noah Purcell, Solicitor General of Washington State were also removed. This lecture was sponsored by the American Muslim Research Institute (AMRI) and the Office of the UW Bothell Chancellor; anyone witnessing any defacing or removal of these posters should contact the Chancellor's Office.

Professor Wayne Au, Chair of the UWB Diversity Council spoke to the EC about a request from students to consider accommodations for the religious observance of Ramadan. Students have requested alternate exam times in the evening.

Au shared some recommendations from the Diversity Council relating to this request that may impact faculty.

1. Adding explicit language to syllabi explaining accommodations and discussing in class.
2. Providing proctored exam spaces in the morning and late evening hours so that faculty can offer alternate exam times.

In addition, the DC recommends that faculty be provided guidelines on how to allow for religious accommodation in classrooms. Au would like to gather faculty input on these recommendations.

EC discussion points

- Alternate exams must be opened to all students, for parity of access.
- Any increase in faculty workload should be minimized to the extent possible.
- The UWB DRS testing office is currently over extended and underfunded; this testing accommodation should not be subsumed by that office.
- What space would be available for this testing on campus?
- If testing would begin after 10 pm, how will faculty arrange scheduling?
- Alternate testing hours may only be needed for classes/exams starting after mid-day, since students would have had a meal early in the morning and may not need alternate testing till later in the day..
- The VCAA should commit resources to fund the proctoring and faculty staffing for this testing. These resources should be over and above DRS testing resources which itself needs to be fully funded.
- Campus Safety will also need to be notified if exams are held outside open building hours.
- Alternate testing may require a large scale coordination of special accommodations; how do we coordinate these efforts?
- Pre-registration should be required for this alternate testing, to allow for adequate prep.

Professor Cinnamon Hillyard and Wayne Au summarized the EC areas of concern:

- Resource, funding commitment
- Staffing/proctors
- Faculty workload
- Open the testing to all students (parity access)
- Time sensitive, are morning classes affected?
- Syllabus language

Au thanked the EC for their views and agreed that he would take these back to the DC and VCAA.

B. Proposal for a new Biology Minor program from School of STEM

Professor Marc Servetnick presented a proposal for a minor in Biology. The minor will allow students majoring in disciplines across the campus to understand connections in the natural world and prepare them for employment opportunities in research, teaching, health care, medicine, allied health fields, environmental science, biotechnology and many other fields. This minor will intersect and align with degree programs in STEM, IAS, Nursing and Health Studies, Educational Studies and Business and help promote scientific literacy.

EC discussion points

- What is the current capacity of the Biology program to offer minors, in addition to the majors?
- How many minors can the School support with current resources?
- How much capacity/room is available in the introductory biology series courses to accommodate minors? 20 new minors, 30 new minors? At what new enrollment level will additional sections of Intro need to be offered?
- Are Bio courses taught in IAS included in the list of electives?
- If additional courses need to be offered, what is the budget impact? New part-time/full-time faculty?
- There are currently 250 students in the Biology major; is there admission capacity in Biology?
- Lab sessions may need to be added.
- This minor will support the teacher education pathway; the teacher education requirements will benefit from this minor.
- This minor will be open to all students and support many majors across this campus.
- Will there be a cap on minors? How many minors can Biology support, given the current resources?
- The EC would like to see the list of electives attached to the proposal.

Further discussion of this minor will be held once the School submits the full proposal with the requested information.

Guidelines for EC Review of Curricular Proposals

Watts opened discussion on the EC/GFO Guidelines for reviewing Form 1503 and other curricular proposals. She incorporated the EC recommendations for the last meeting, the EC reviewed the new draft of the guidelines. This document is a tool for the Council to utilize to promote EC transparency in the process and share with Schools before the comment phase in EC deliberation. It will provide a clear indication on budgetary matters and help proposers understand potential implications.

EC discussion points

- Most proposals do not contain adequate information to address questions:
 - Capacity issues, what is the program capacity?
 - New sections (put in numbers)
 - Existing resources, are they adequate to support the program?
 - Growth and resource issues
- How does the EC inform Schools if resources don't seem adequate?
- Scaling programs or staging based on resources to carry out the mission and goals of the campus.
- A constructive view is needed, information that will demonstrate alignment with resources or capacity.
- EC collegial process and informed decision making is essential.

The guidelines will be shared with Annette Anderson, UWB Curriculum Development Director and implemented next quarter as a pilot.

Old Business

A. Update on GFO Bylaws change

Shankar consulted with Prof. Michael Townsend, Secretary of the UW Faculty seeking an interpretation on the participation and voting process to be followed in promotion deliberations at the campus level as per faculty code.

Professor Townsend's replied that he had discussed this question with Cheryl Cameron, Vice-Provost for Academic Personnel, and Rich Christie, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulation. Their view is that the Code rank-voting rules do not apply to deliberations of the **elected faculty councils**, (emphasis added) but that the unit can impose such rules in the by-laws.

Given the above, choices available to GFO vis-a-vis CCPT voting:

1. No rank-voting: All CCPT members can attend, participate and vote on **all** promotion & tenure cases.
2. Partial rank-voting: CCPT members may choose to attend and participate in all deliberations but **only** superior rank faculty **vote** on promotion & tenure.
3. Full rank-voting: **Only** superior rank faculty can attend, participate and vote on promotion and tenure.

EC discussion points

- It may not be easy to defend these variations in court.
- We need to codify a voting process in the CCPTFA to maintain uniformity across years.
- One element of the rationale for full rank-voting is experience. Senior faculty have been through the promotion process.
- We need to ask what would be defensible in court according to the Faculty Code.
- If there is a move to change from the existing rank-voting process, we should consult with the UW Attorney General's Office in this matter.
- Full rank-voting would be a continuation of the process at the School level.
- Do we want the campus level process to be different from the School level process

Full rank-voting received strong support, though there is a diversity of opinion within EC. EC reps will seek input from their School faculty.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has 3 faculty searches underway in Management Information Systems, Accounting and Strategy. The School will continue discussion of School by-laws.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Bylaws for FYPP has been presented to the AOC for feedback.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

A faculty search for a position in Leadership Development and a staff search for an Associate Director of Student Services is underway.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

IAS discussions on School bylaws are ongoing. The School has hired 2 Biologists.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade

NHS has 2 faculty searches underway.

F. STEM – Jeff Jensen

Professor Emeritus Warren Buck was honored as a “History Maker” through the African American Oral History Collection.

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

The next EC meeting will be March 6, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

March 6, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Linda Watts, Casey Mann, Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, and Cristopher Wade.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from February 20, 2018 were approved.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Vice Chair Emeritus – Casey Mann

FY 18 budget data update and longitudinal data from previous years has been provided to the CCPB for review:

- FY18 budgets for each of the schools and administrative units.
- Budgets/expenditures for FY 2008 (ten years ago) and FY 2013 (five years ago).
- Narrative regarding shifts in spending priorities in the past as well as a narrative on emerging challenges.

Christian Adams with UWB Institutional Planning and Budgets is building a database on Tableau; he will make the data accessible to the EC for review. Another database, CUPA HR invoice on faculty salaries has been provided for limited CCPB use. This data will help us to identify spending patterns and determine if these patterns align with campus priorities.

EC discussion points

- There is a proliferation of administrative positions; can faculty fill these positions rather than hiring more administrative hires?
- Strategic spending in alignment with the academic mission:
 - Research spending
 - New programs
- Central spending:
 - Carry over funds
 - 70% - School, 30% - Institution, how is this distribution arrived at?

The new budgeting model could also present challenges for Schools.

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

A financial forum with UW Seattle faculty and administrators is scheduled for April 10 to discuss their experience with Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) and how it might inform our transition to Modified Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM). The forum is jointly offered by the GFO and the Chancellor, Watts informed the EC that faculty can submit questions for the panelists prior to the event.

EC discussion points

- Some Schools are feeling the impact of RCM budgeting already, classes have been changed and courses cut for part-time faculty.
- Introduction to writing courses have expanded from 20 to 50 students in a class.
- The enrollment pause will have an impact on class size and other issues.
- What is the role of faculty governance regarding these issues; it is time for a dialog to address these issues.
- New majors, growth over time, these are major budgetary decisions.
- What is the growth projection in terms of resources?
- RCM may impact the 20:1 student ratio.
- RCM may impact the 60:30:10 faculty ratio.
- How do we maintain the existing cost structure?
- We need budget data to see spending at the School level.
- There is no common structure for faculty to be in the decision process, to advise Deans.
- Faculty need to have a voice regarding instruction and budget.
- Elected faculty councils within the Schools are a good starting point.
- Most UWB School councils are still convened by Deans; IAS has a faculty chair convening the faculty council.
- Faculty elected chairs support governance at the School level.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

Shankar updated the EC on a communication from the Campus Council on Assessment and Learning (CCAL); the Council had planned to propose some amendments to the GFO bylaws regarding the charge of the CCAL, narrowing down and defining the scope of activity of the Council. Shankar suggested that the Council focus on specific projects or activities from the broad range afforded by their charge in the GFO by-laws.

The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) is holding discussions on the status of UWB and UWT Schools in the Faculty Code. Our Schools are not being given equal standing with UWS Schools in the system, although this was the intent of the Board of Regents. Our Deans do not serve on the Board of Deans, UWB and UWT Chancellors serve on this board. UWS Deans have more direct access to the Provost; UWB Deans need to contact the Chancellor or VCAA. UWB Faculty Senate representation may also change at the campus level, proportional representation may be recommended. These issues will likely be taken up for action in the coming year(s).

Old Business

A. GFO Bylaw's changes

Shankar reviewed the EC discussion on bylaw changes to Article VI, Section 3, regarding recusal and voting on the Campus Council on Promotion and Tenure. Three options were discussed by the EC:

1. No rank-voting: All CCPT members can attend, participate and vote on **all** promotion & tenure cases.
2. Partial rank-voting: CCPT members may choose to attend and participate in all deliberations but **only** superior rank faculty **vote** on promotion & tenure.

3. Full rank-voting: *Only* superior rank faculty can attend, participate and vote on promotion and tenure.

Shankar asked the EC representatives to provide feedback from their Schools on this matter.

B. Proposal for a new Biology Minor program from School of STEM

The Biology Minor proposal was reviewed by the EC at the last meeting. The School has addressed the issues that the EC recommended and added electives to the proposal.

EC discussion points

- Is there support from the School if labs are added? Is there space for labs?
- With the enrollment pause, how will growth in one area impact other areas? Will there be containment in another area?
- The EC will need to begin to more closely scrutinize programs from the campus level and from a faculty development point of view.
- An increase in upper division courses may need more tenured faculty, are there resources to support this?
- How will we fund the 60:30:10 faculty ratio and the 20:1 student/faculty ratio?
- What is the enrollment and staffing plan for this minor? Does this minor stay within the campus footprint?
- How will the Schools cap enrollment, competitive admission or other?

EC motion

Stokes moved to pass the motion:

“The EC approves the School of STEM's proposal for a Minor in Biology.

Shankar called the question on the original motion, there was no further discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

Shankar expressed thanks to Marc Servetnick and Jeff Jensen.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has hired faculty for Strategy and 2 searches are underway in Accounting. The School is scheduled to discuss School by-laws.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Bylaws for FYPP has been presented to the AOC for feedback.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

The School has an ongoing faculty search for an assistant professor in Leadership Development and a staff search for an Associate Director of Student Services is underway. The School is experiencing challenges in getting a diverse pool of candidates. The School has 2 full professors retiring this year. The School is working on bylaws.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

The School has hired 2 faculty in Earth System Science and a third position in Biologic Science, Conservation/Restoration. The School is also discussing by-laws.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade

NHS has 2 faculty searches underway.

F. STEM – Jeff Jensen

Professor Emeritus Warren Buck was honored as a “History Maker” through the African American Oral History Collection.

The EC held a brief discussion on voting within the Schools. Some vote at the faculty council meeting, some allow Catalyst votes and absentee voting, others have paper ballots.

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 am

The next EC meeting will be April 3, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

April 3, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Linda Watts, Casey Mann, Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes and Cristopher Wade.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from March 6, 2018 were approved.

Shankar opened the meeting and shared information on future agenda items, program proposals for Ocean Engineering (2nd reading) and Actuarial Science (1st reading) will be coming to EC for review.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

A financial forum with UW Seattle faculty and administrators is scheduled for April 10 to discuss their experience with Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) and how it might inform our transition to Modified Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM). The forum is jointly offered by the GFO and the Chancellor. Watts asked the EC to encourage faculty in their Schools to attend all or part of the forum if possible, a strong faculty voice in the budgeting process is critical. A Strategic Planning Steering Committee is being formed; this year has been designated as a “Plan to Plan” period for setting campus priorities.

Watts was invited by Kelli Trosvig, interim CIO for UWB Planning and Administration, to serve on the Technology Advisory Committee. This committee will provide advice and guidance on technology policies, strategies, directions, and priorities.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

GFO elections will be conducted Spring Quarter for the GFO Vice Chair and representatives for the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs and the Campus Council on Planning and Budget. Schools and FYPP AOC will be requested to elect their nominees for positions on the EC, the CCASC and the CCAL.

GFO Chair Emeritus – Casey Mann

Mann met with Pam Lundquist, UWB Registrar and the Time Schedulers Group to discuss the option of new teaching time blocks at UWB that would allow for a free time block around lunch time and also shorter 1hr 20mts classes on a MWF schedule. Some issues discussed:

- Other offices on campus could be affected.
- Faculty working hours.
- Food service during the free block.
- Transportation/parking issues.
- Classroom capacity.

UW Tacoma will be adopting some elements of this time block scheduling, although they are not as space constrained as this campus. Lundquist will check on implementation on the UWT campus and also look at room capacities here. Enrollment Management has been working on room capacity issues; there are safety considerations that are the chief concern for the utilization of classroom space. Online and hybrid curricular options would allow us to leverage space and underutilized time blocks. Campus online course development is one high quality alternative, which needs to be explored.

Mann updated the EC on CCPB activities. Christian Adams at IPB has compiled a Tableau database in response to a GFO budget data request. This data will help identify spending patterns and determine if these patterns align with campus priorities. The Council will need to decide how to use the data to direct strategic planning efforts. We need to align our focus with strategic planning.

EC discussion points

- How do we actualize priorities in a demonstrable way without the budget to support these priorities?
- Some areas that would require support (for campus priorities):
 - E-learning, individual faculty development/online program development
 - Disability Resources for Students (DRS)
 - Diversity
 - Faculty development
 - Student services
 - Sustainability
- Although the campus is ADA compliant, there are still areas on campus that are not accessible.
- We need to move disability to a diversity dialog.
- How is funding for community engagement spent? Where are resources going?
- The UW has made a commitment to sustainability. Is UWB doing anything meaningful to support that commitment?

The campus is also in the process of determining peer institutions; the CCPB has worked with IPB to assess information on comparison groups through the CUPA-HR database. The CCPB is using this tool to identify goals at this institution and begin a campus-wide conversation on peer institutions. Some statistical data for identifying peer institutions has been provided to the CCPB.

These comparisons assist us in looking at different areas:

- Strategic Planning
- Budget alignment
- Accreditation
- Faculty compensation

EC discussion points

- There are different things to look at with comparison groups, some considerations:
 - Growth rate
 - Aspirational peer groups
 - Public institution
 - Faculty size

- Faculty/student ratio
- Student population
- We can be more analytical in our strategic planning by examining these comparisons groups.
- We can also look at trend data, what areas are growing, what areas are shrinking?
- We must also be careful not to shop peers issue by issue.
- UWB is part of a multi-campus system, what are our benchmarks?
- How will RCM complicate campus level strategic planning efforts?
- We need to stay accountable to the principles we have worked to establish.
- The EC role will grow under this budget model to ensure shared governance remains strong.
- School bylaws will hopefully help strengthen shared governance.

Old Business

A. GFO Bylaw's changes

Shankar reviewed the EC discussion on bylaw changes, input from Schools is needed for the next steps in finalizing the bylaws. EC representatives will seek feedback from their faculty on bylaw changes regarding recusal and voting on the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs and report back to the Council.

Three options discussed by the EC:

1. No rank-voting: All CCPT members can attend, participate and vote on **all** promotion & tenure cases.
2. Partial rank-voting: CCPT members may choose to attend and participate in all deliberations but **only** superior rank faculty **vote** on promotion & tenure.
3. Full rank-voting: **Only** superior rank faculty can attend, participate and vote on promotion and tenure.

Shankar asked the Council if this amendment should be a separate ballot item.

EC consensus: The bylaw amendments to Article VI, Section 3, regarding recusal and voting on the Campus Council on Promotion and Tenure should be a separate ballot item.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has announced tenure awarded to Camelia Bejan and Sophie Leroy. There were 2 searches underway, one in MIS and one in Accounting, the search for an Accounting professor is on hold. The School is scheduled to discuss School by-laws and the CCPTFA amendments.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Bylaws for FYPP has been presented to the AOC for feedback. The goal is to have bylaws drafted by the end of Spring Quarter.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

The School has not been successful in the faculty search for an assistant professor in Leadership

Development. The School experienced economic challenges in hiring for this region. The cost of living and housing can be prohibitive for job candidates. Naranjo is working with a Carnegie designation team to gather project information across the campus.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

The School has hired 3 faculty. The School will be discussing the Carnegie initiative and promotion and tenure implications. UWB has made a commitment to community engagement and public scholarship and P&T criteria should recognize this tri-campus value.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade

The School has hired a full-time lecturer; a search for an assistant professor is on hold. The School is expanding programs to Providence; an offsite cohort at the Master's level will be forming. A hybrid cohort is forming for Summer Quarter.

F. STEM – Jeff Jensen

The School Faculty Council will discuss CCPTFA amendments, School bylaws and the Carnegie Initiative.

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am

The next EC meeting will be April 17, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

April 17, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Linda Watts, Casey Mann, Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes and Cristopher Wade.

Guests: Shima Abadi, Jennifer McCloud-Mann and Clark Musselman

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from April 3, 2018 were approved.

Shankar opened the meeting with a brief overview of the Financial Forum and thanked Linda Watts, GFO Chair and Ruth Johnston, VCAP for organizing the forum and Casey Mann for moderating the session. The discussion and insights of UWS faculty were helpful, VCAP Johnston will send out notes from the forum.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

A financial forum with UW Seattle faculty and administrators was held on April 10 to discuss their experience with Activity Based Budgeting (ABB) and how it might inform our transition to Modified Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM). Panelists stressed the importance of faculty involvement in strategy and decision-making. Strong faculty and shared governance at the institutional level and the unit level will be needed to develop an understanding of this financial system and the distribution of financial authority to unit Deans. Watts informed the EC that Provost Jerry Baldasty will come to UW Bothell for a budget talk in May. His experience on budget matters from a central perspective will help inform the discussion on strategic planning and aligning resources with priorities. Watts asked the EC for input on this discussion and encouraged the EC to send any questions to her that they would like to see addressed by the Provost.

EC discussion points

- Faculty need understanding and clarity in terms of GOF, FTE (student, faculty and staff) and resources for administrative units as well as instructional.
- In terms of revenue allocation, where are decisions made, what are the agreed upon parameters?
- Tuition generates resources, not all academic units will create the same amount of tuition monies. How will this be addressed?
- UWS supplements units, how are these decisions handled, number of majors served, total enrollments?
- This is a 3-year phase-in, we need to oversee at the outset areas of equity and resource allocation.
- How will School positioning impact institutional culture? Will Schools sustain their current state?
- How will shared revenue be allocated? (70% Schools; 30% central)?
- School bylaws will support the rights of Schools as participants of shared governance.
- Elected faculty councils will also support shared governance within the Schools. Faculty councils will be involved in budget discussions.

- Deans will have to consult with their Elected Faculty Council before advising the VCAA on budgetary issues, after the new School by-laws come into effect.
- The CCPB may have a representative from each School if GFO By-law changes are approved and can be another body for faculty engagement in the budget process and strategic planning.
- Where are the decision points on our campus? The PDP group, chaired by VCAP Johnston and the Chancellor's advisory group, CAD are both decision points on budgetary matters. Important shared governance groups for budgetary matters are the EC, the CCPB and faculty councils within the Schools. It will be imperative for faculty to be proactively involved at every level.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

Christian Adams, Director of IPB will make a presentation to the EC at the next meeting and will be available to answer RCM-related questions.

GFO Chair Emeritus – Casey Mann

Mann spoke to the EC about the Strategic Initiative process, the UWB priorities plan for planning and budget through 2020. The CCPB has been involved in this planning process and gathering data to help inform the Council's work. The Council is working on a process of determining peer institutions; these comparisons assist at looking at criteria and measuring success in many different areas. We can be more analytical in our strategic planning by examining these comparisons groups and frame the conversation to look at measureable outcomes.

EC discussion points

- Campus priorities could be accomplished incrementally, tied to observable outcomes.
- What are the parameters for peer institutions (size, location)?
- What are the reference points, benchmarks?
- We can develop institutional standards.

Mann held meetings with the Time Schedule group to discuss the option of new teaching time blocks at UWB. Shankar presented on this issue to the Academic Council and asked for feedback on the matter. More discussion is needed with constituents across the campus, faculty, staff, security and transportation groups, among others. This is also a School-level conversation. The UW Tacoma campus has adopted some elements of this time block scheduling. Space issues remain a concern at UW Bothell. It would be good to have a campus working committee with representation across all interested groups that can come up with workable alternatives.

New Business

A. Ocean Engineering Option within the Existing Major in Mechanical Engineering

Professor Jennifer McCould-Mann, Chair of the STEM Engineering and Mathematics Division introduced Prof. Shima Abadi and opened discussion on the Ocean Engineering Option. Prof. Abadi presented the proposal to the EC and gave a brief overview of the program. The proposal recommends an option in Ocean Engineering (OE) within the Mechanical Engineering (ME) major and would contribute toward satisfying the need for graduates in the ocean technology field, a high demand job field in the Pacific Northwest. There is currently no degree program in Ocean Engineering in Washington or Oregon, so the option does not compete with UWS programs. The option will provide students with fundamental principles of ocean sciences and engineering course work and laboratory experience. ABET certified, the option requires a minimum of 47 credits of ME

courses and 16 credits of electives focused on OE. Capstone projects will be related to ocean engineering concepts.

EC discussion points

- Will this option require additional faculty? An adjunct may need to be hired.
- In small programs, staffing is a concern. What if the professor leaves for an extended time, who will teach the courses? ME faculty can teach core courses, also faculty from the Applied Physics Lab at UWS are interested in teaching some courses; there is a broad spectrum of other courses.
- What about lab space? Discovery 362 has been provided as lab space, STEM funded. Hydrophones and other equipment have also been purchased. Even APL asked to use this lab. Dean Scott supports the lab space and the program.
- The enrollment increases will need to be supported. OE students will be about 28% of the ME program when full enrollment is reached. The incremental growth can be supported.
- Will this program be sustainable for faculty administering it? We must be aware of equity issues with untenured faculty building programs.
- Elective requirements should be noted as minor requirements, they are all within OE.
- Adjuncts could come from industry, capstone projects would interface with industry.
- Diversity planning will follow the ME diversity plans.

Shankar thanked Professor Abadi and Professor McCloud-Mann for the presentation.

B. Actuarial Science Minor

Professor Clark Musselman presented the STEM Actuarial Science Minor to the EC and opened discussion on the proposal. Professor Camelia Bejan was present to support the proposal for the minor on behalf of the School of Business. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projected the job outlook for actuaries to be better than average over all industries, creating a high demand for jobs in this area. After completing the minor students will be prepared to take the first three actuarial exams, industry partners have revealed that passing one exam will open up internship opportunities for students. There are no actuarial programs at UWB, UWT or UWS at this time. Current Math and Business faculty can teach the courses in the minor. There may a need for two part-time faculty to teach math courses.

EC discussion points

- With the UW directive to reduce the number of part-time faculty, are new part-time faculty positions supported?
- If faculty are shifted to teach new courses, will they be able to integrate teaching with research?
- It may be helpful to have an introductory to the field course. An advising event does give an introduction to the field, but that could be a consideration.
- UWB will apply to the Society of Actuaries approved programs list; this will help UWB connect to the professional community.
- What is the budgetary impact of the program? Additional courses will be added to Math electives and a new Business School course created. The Deans have indicated support for the proposal and have signed a memorandum of understanding on the funding and administration of the program.

Shankar thanked Professor Musselman, Professor Bejan and Professor McCloud-Mann for the presentation. The EC will hold a vote on both the above proposals at a May meeting.

Old Business

A. GFO Bylaw Changes

Shankar reviewed the EC discussion on bylaw changes, input from Schools is needed for the next steps in finalizing the bylaws. EC representatives will seek feedback from their faculty on bylaw changes regarding recusal and voting on the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs and report back to the Council.

Three options discussed by the EC:

1. No rank-voting: All CCPT members can attend, participate and vote on **all** promotion & tenure cases.
2. Partial rank-voting: CCPT members may choose to attend and participate in all deliberations but **only** superior rank faculty **vote** on promotion & tenure.
3. Full rank-voting: **Only** superior rank faculty can attend, participate and vote on promotion and tenure.

Shankar asked the Council for feedback from their Schools:

Business

- Current practice - only superior rank faculty can vote on promotion and tenure.
- Adding lecturers to the Council – approve

IAS

- No rank-voting: All CCPT members can attend, participate and vote on all promotion and tenure cases.

STEM

- Current practice - only superior rank faculty can vote on promotion and tenure.
- Consider the option to add lecturers

NHS

- Partial rank-voting: CCPT members may choose to attend and participate in all deliberations but **only** superior rank faculty **vote** on promotion & tenure.

ES

- Current practice - only superior rank faculty can vote on promotion and tenure.

Mann and Watts suggested that the EC obtain clarity on the legality of all these options within the Faculty Code. The Code Cops may be able to weigh in on this question. Shankar stated that we could leave the CCPTFA make-up as is for this year and study this issue more. More discussion will be held.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. **Business – Deanna Kennedy – no report**

B. **FYPP – Julie Shayne**

Bylaws for FYPP has been presented to the AOC for feedback.

C. **Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo – no report**

D. **Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes – no report**

E. **Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade**
A new Assistant Professor has been hired.

F. **STEM – Jeff Jensen – no report.**

Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 am

The next EC meeting will be May 1, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

May 1, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present from EC: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Casey Mann, Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, Cristopher Wade and Linda Watts

Present from CCPB: Chancellor Yeigh, VCAA Jeffords, Christian Adams, Dan Jacoby, Alka Kurian, Pierre Mourad and Adrian Sinkler

Shankar announced that this is a joint meeting with the Executive Council (EC) and the Campus Council on Planning and Budget (CCPB). The EC will finalize the review of the Actuarial Science Minor and the Ocean Engineering Option at the next EC meeting.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from April 17 2018 were approved.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

A joint UWB/UWS financial forum was held on April 10, this forum helped to set a strong base for the basic framework of strategic planning in relation to our mission and resource base.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

Shankar updated the EC on the progress of School bylaws, FYPP has finalized the draft of their bylaws with the approval of the AOC.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has one offer out for a faculty hire.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Bylaws for FYPP have been approved by the AOC. The Discovery Core Working Group presented their report on undergraduate learning regarding ways to improve the experience of students in this program.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

ES will hold discussions on the School bylaws, some of the proposed changes in the bylaws will change the governance structure of the School and this may delay approval.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

IAS will hold School bylaw discussions today. The School has lost four faculty members through competitive offers. There is growing concern among faculty that this may become more prevalent in the future. Cost of living in this area is an obstacle to hiring.

- E. **Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade**
NHS will hold School bylaw discussions today.

- F. **STEM – Jeff Jensen**
STEM will hold discussions on the School bylaws.

GFO Chair Emeritus – Casey Mann

This joint meeting of the EC and the CCPB will help inform strategic planning efforts. The CCPB, in consultation with campus leadership can and strengthen the role of shared governance in budget and planning on this campus. Over the last year, the CCPB has worked with Christian Adams, Director of Academic Budgets on a faculty compression/inversion analysis and a campus operating budget development process. Data that the Council requested gave an overview of institutional needs, resource constraints and priorities. The Council reviewed budgets for schools and administrative units and got a clearer idea of appropriations for each unit and how spending is tied to priorities.

New Business

A. UWB Budget presentation by Christian Adams, Director IPB

Christian Adams, Director of Academic Budgets, has created a database on Tableau. The database contains six years of GOF and DOF-funded budget expenditures; no fee-based programs are included. Some observations during the discussions

- Carry over funds. Historically, unused funds were returned to the division. From there, it is at the Vice Chancellor's discretion to re-allocate carryover funds.
- This year, a 20% biennium institutional carryover tax was instituted to add to the reserve fund for the campus.
- The reserve fund goal is to have a 10% reserve
- Unused DOF and GOF that is committed to faculty start-up packages are exempt from the carryover tax.
- RCM Budget model: New tuition funds are split between the schools and units..
70% - School, 30% - Institution.

EC discussion points

- What is the reserve fund used for and when can it be used? Chancellor Yeigh explained that the reserve fund could be used to address a financial shortfall or crisis; for e.g., if enrollment were to drop significantly, the reserve could help to fund expenses until enrollment increases. The Chancellor's Executive Team would make a decision on when to utilize reserve funding.
- We need to have directives in place to create an operating framework for the campus. The reserve fund helps buffer external forces and institutional emergencies.
- School budgets are not sufficient to create a reserve fund.
- A goal is a 5-6 year reserve of 10%
- FYPP is the least funded of the UWB units, once faculty lines moved to the Schools and FYPP is no longer an appointing body. The FYPP budget now funds the AVC, staff and part-time lecturer salaries.
- The operating budget: 30% non-salary, 70% salaries and benefits
- What are the priorities for UWB over the next 5-7 years?
 - Will units be fiscally strong to actualize priorities?

- How do we decide on what priorities to pursue?
- Priorities are not permanent and unless we replenish resources, priorities cannot be sustained.
- How are we growing resources with an enrollment cap?
- Philanthropic funds raised are not unrestricted; these are generally funds that are slated for scholarships and specific purposes.
- How do we determine which priorities are essential and which are aspirational?
- We should look to our mission and values for guidance on what our priorities should be.
- How do we benchmark our success?
- We also need a dose of realism in setting priorities; there are limited resources.
- The UW is at debt capacity, we cannot borrow money to build new buildings. UW4 is budgeted at \$75 million, with a \$3 million design budget. A 20% equity payment is required which UWB does not have at present; we will continue to pursue State funding, but the UW is moving this project to the next biennium and could move it out further.
- The budget is the key to implementing priorities.
- RCM will move School budgets and spending responsibility to the units.
- How do we find resources to address faculty salaries, merit, compression, and inversion issues?
- There are also hiring issues for recruiting and retaining (cost of living, etc.).
- We can plan strategically with a framework to guide us:
 - Principles (shouldn't fluctuate)
 - Priorities/goals (time specific)
 - Practices (most feasible)
 - Progress (measures, non-negotiable)
- One of the measures we can use is to assess how well staffed a priority is.
- Comparison against peers could be another measure
- There are different things to consider when setting up comparison groups:
 - Teaching, research and mission
 - Growth rate
 - Aspirational peer groups
 - Location
 - Public institution
- We also need to think about the purpose of the comparison groups
- We need to gather feedback from School Deans on how they select comparison groups for their school, if any.
- Constraints are important when considering peer groups, what you cannot change:
 - Mission
 - Financial base
 - Location
 - Surrounding area demographics
 - External funding
 - How Schools execute resources
 - Suburban environment
 - Cost of living
- Our proximity to UWS also is a factor.
- UWT could be a comparison group that we can get data on.

- We should consider establishing an Office of Assessment to look at a long-term view of what we want to track what goals we wish to achieve.
- There are short-term peer groups and aspirational peer groups. We can chart these from our strategic plan.
- Growth and funding will impact our strategic plan over time.

Shankar thanked the CCPB for the joint meeting and consultation.

Good of the Order

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 am

The next EC meeting will be May 15, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

May 15, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present from EC: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, Cristopher Wade and Linda Watts

Absent: Casey Mann

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from May 1, 2018 were approved.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

A draft of the UW Faculty 2050 was disseminated to faculty; this document will help inform a strategic plan based on shared governance in an inclusive tri-campus system. Watts encouraged EC representatives to provide feedback and input on the document; this planning document could have an impact on UWB and our input is critical for the new provost. EC comments can be sent directly to Watts. Provost Jerry Baldasty will hold an open discussion on our transition to the RCM budgeting model. He will be speaking to the UW Bothell campus community about his budget experience and process over the years, the discussion will be held on May 31 in Husky Hall.

The Senate Executive Committee held a discussion on admissions in different field areas at the UW. Differential criteria has been reviewed in relation to admissions, capacity, access to classes and under-utilized field areas have been looked at. These could be used as target areas for admission campaigns.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

The CCPB held discussions on e-Learning and capital planning at UWB. Models from other universities were presented on e-Learning and recommendations were made to the Council. Discussions with the School Deans will also be held, identifying high demand areas for online programs.

EC discussion points

- Naranjo spoke to the EC about Western Governor's University. This institution has a high success rate in enrollments offering online degrees; it is enrolling the highest number of students in Washington State. They offer programs in teacher education and STEM education and many other degrees.
- It may be time for UWB to consider more online courses.
- Southern New Hampshire University is another online institution offering much lower cost master's degrees to students.
- We are not competing strongly with these institutions.

- Online programs here are offered through UW Professional and Continuing Education (PCE), this arrangement has not always been successful for UWB. It is important for us to keep the integrity of our courses.
- The School of Nursing and Health Studies has successfully collaborated with area hospitals to offer degree opportunities as these branch sites.
- The School of Educational Studies also creates partnerships with area schools, our faculty go to these sites.

Shankar and Watts met with Chancellor Yeigh and VCAA Jeffords for discussions on faculty salary issues. Issues related to salary adjustments for addressing compression and inversion are being worked on with the Deans. These adjustments may need to be addressed over multi-year cycles. Competitive offers for our faculty are stressing the need for UWB to focus on this salary issue. A long-standing problem around faculty salaries is the disparity of compensation with years of service at the university. Faculty that have been here the longest and engaged fully in institution building can experience large disparities with faculty that are newly hired. Equity issues in this area have not been addressed. At the present time, the campus will follow CCPB guidelines and focus on measuring compression and inversion in salaries of tenured faculty and senior/principal lecturers.

Old Business

A. Proposed amendments to the GFO Bylaws

Shankar reviewed the proposed amendments to the GFO bylaws with the EC. The two major amendments being proposed involve (1) moving responsibility for Faculty Affairs to the EC (at the request of the CCPTFA) and (2) expanding membership of the CCPB to include all Schools and FYPP.

The discussion on the composition of CCPTFA and the extent of participation of faculty at lower ranks or title in promotion deliberations is ongoing. This issue will be revisited next year.

EC discussion points

- When will the take effect date of the amended bylaws be confirmed?
- We can have a take effect date and a take stock date.

EC motion

Watts moved to pass the motion:

"The EC approves the GFO bylaws as amended, upon ratification by the voting faculty, the effective date of the bylaws will be September 15, 2018."

The motion was seconded, further discussion followed.

EC discussion points

- A sunrise date must be explicit for promotion and tenure; we cannot change the review process or the composition of reviewers for faculty that have begun the promotion and tenure process.
- The bylaw amendments for the CCPTFA only change the responsibilities of the Council in areas of Faculty Affairs; no changes were made to the promotion and tenure process.

Hearing no further discussion, Shankar called for a vote, by show of hands, the motion carried unanimously.

B. Ocean Engineering Option within the Existing Major in Mechanical Engineering

Shankar opened discussion on the Ocean Engineering Option with the EC. Stated concerns about the program:

- Staffing concerns:
 - Junior faculty member taking on leadership role is commendable
 - Will the work be sufficiently resourced? How will the faculty value and count this kind of work? Will this faculty member be able to carry out a scholarly agenda in addition to building the program? Can a P&T case be based on program building?
 - Are there clear mutual expectations of the lead role between the faculty member and the division leadership?

EC motion

Naranjo moved to pass the motion:

“The EC approves the STEM proposal for an Ocean Engineering Option within the Existing Major in Mechanical Engineering”

The motion was seconded, no further discussion followed. Shankar called for a vote, by show of hands, the motion carried unanimously.

C. Actuarial Science Minor

Shankar opened discussion on the Actuarial Science Minor. Stated concern about the program:

- Sufficient enrollment

EC motion

Kennedy moved to pass the motion:

“The EC approves the STEM proposal for an Actuarial Science Minor”

The EC questioned why the minor is housed in STEM and not Business. This program is mostly aimed at Math majors wanting to minor in Actuarial Science, though all students will be welcome.

The motion was seconded, no further discussion followed. Shankar called for a vote, by show of hands, the motion carried unanimously.

New Business

A. School of IAS Bylaws

Shankar opened discussion on the IAS bylaws; he has sent a copy to the UW Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, (Code Cops) but has not heard back from them. They serve as an advisory body to faculty and will alert faculty if there are any violations of the Faculty Code in governance documents. After the Code Cops, the bylaws will go to the VCAA and the Chancellor for approval. The School of IAS bylaws outline the faculty governance structure of the School. The Faculty Council is the elected faculty body, which advises the Dean. The bylaws institute a formal set of rules for faculty authority within the School.

EC motion

Shayne moved to pass the motion:

"The EC recommends adoption of the School of IAS bylaws and forwarding them to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Chancellor."

The motion was seconded, no further discussion followed. Shankar called for a vote, by show of hands, the motion carried, 7-Yes and 1-no

B. FYPP Bylaws

Shankar opened discussion on the First Year and Pre-major Program bylaws. Shayne explained that the FYPP bylaws were based on the Global Honor's Program at UWT. The bylaws establish the governance structure of FYPP and focus on the Academic Oversight Council (AOC), the composition and representation of each UWB Schools on the Council. Broader support and representation on the AOC is important for the First Year and Pre-major Program.

EC motion

Naranjo moved to pass the motion:

"The EC recommends adoption of the First Year and Pre-major Program bylaws and forwarding them to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the Chancellor."

The motion was seconded, further discussion followed.

EC discussion points

- It is recommended that the AOC be constituted by current practice rather than proposed FYPP bylaws.
- The School and FYPP bylaws will need a take effect date.

EC recommendations:

- It is recommended that the AOC be constituted by current practice rather than proposed FYPP bylaws.
- It is recommended that the take effect date on approved bylaws be September 15, 2018.

Hearing no further discussion, Shankar called for a vote, by show of hands, the motion, with EC recommendations, carried unanimously.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has one offer out for a faculty hire. The School will review bylaws this week.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

Hiring for the Associate Vice Chancellor of Undergraduate Learning is underway. The Discovery Core Working Group presented their report on undergraduate learning regarding ways to improve the experience of students in this program. There is support for keeping the 10 credit Discovery Core (DC). DC II and DC III (portfolio) as unchanged. FYPP has higher retention the 1st and loses some students the 2nd year. Alice Peterson will be the FYPP representative for EC next year.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

The School celebrated faculty retirements. The School will review hiring practices; they have experienced one unsuccessful search. Discussions on the School bylaws will be held, the goal is to complete the bylaws by the end of the academic year. Placement rates for graduates are high, great news for SES.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

IAS has hired some job prospects, while two competitive offers have been made in joint STEM and IAS degree programs.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade

NHS underwent a site visit, the School passed, one area recommended to work on was a diversity strategic plan. One faculty member is retiring and another faculty member is leaving. Linda Bale, Advisor in NHS is retiring.

F. STEM – Jeff Jensen

Dean Elaine Scott has completed her 5-year review; she has been offered a re-appointment. The STEM bylaws are under review.

Good of the Order

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 am

The next EC meeting will be May 29, 2018

Executive Council Meeting

May 29, 2018, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present from EC: Gowri Shankar (Chair), Jeff Jensen, Deanna Kennedy, Casey Mann, Jason Naranjo, Julie Shayne, David Stokes, Christopher Wade and Linda Watts

Guest: David Socha

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC Minutes

The EC minutes from May 15, 2018 were approved.

Report of GFO Officers

GFO Chair – Linda Watts

The Senate Executive has received faculty feedback on the draft of the UW Faculty 2050, a shared governance planning document and on School bylaws.

GFO Vice Chair – Gowri Shankar

FCTCP update:

The Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (FCTCP) held a discussion on tri-campus issues and priorities for next year. One of the issues that came up involved the Board of Deans and Chancellors. Should there be a re-evaluation of the role of Board of Deans and Chancellors? Deans from UWB and UWT do not participate in that Provost-level meeting. Is it time for UWB and UWT to establish their own Board of Deans and Chancellors and invite the Provost to attend these meetings? Another area of inequity is budgetary authority. UWB and UWT Schools do not have the same independent budget authority as UWS; our budget is allocated at the campus level, not the School level. These are matters that UWB and UWT will need to communicate to the new Provost. Finally, the question of adequate representation from UWB and UWT on the UW Senate Councils and Committees was raised.

EC discussion points

- Is it necessary for UWB have representation on all UW Committees?
- Some Councils/Committees are UW-centric, UWB may not need to be seated at the UW Board of Deans and Chancellors, since there may not be significant campus level implications.
- The 2-way communication between the Provost and Deans is significant; communication flow is relevant. The presence of UWB leaders on this Board could keep their campuses better informed on tri-campus and shared governance issues.
- The Board of Deans and Chancellors was established by the UW President, membership can be decided by the President.
- The UWB School of Nursing and Health Studies is jointly accredited across all three campuses, so how does that affect things?

Unit adjustments update:

Discussions on faculty salary issues continue with the Chancellor and VCAA. Unit adjustments for addressing salary compression and inversion for long-serving faculty are being worked on with the Deans and the Chancellor has said he would like to address the compression/inversion issue soon. The issue of salary equity (a) between Lecturer track faculty and tenure- track faculty and (b) between faculty at different UWB Schools requires more study. We would also have to compare UWB salaries externally with (a) our peer and aspirant institutions and (b) with lecturer and tenure-track faculty at UWS and UWT.

EC discussion points

- The Provost must approve unit adjustments to address compression/inversion.
- UWB will need to find the resources to fund these unit adjustments. There are no central funds from Seattle.
- How can we prioritize the salary equity issue, across TT/LT faculty and across Schools?

Old Business

A. Pending 1503 proposal – Global Health

EC motion on Minor in Global Health

The Executive Council reviewed the responses from the tri-campus review of the proposal for a minor in Global Health.

Wade moved to pass the motion:

“The EC has determined that the proposing faculty in the School of Nursing and Health Studies have duly considered and responded to the comments posted by faculty from across the three campuses during the tri-campus review period.”

The motion was seconded, there was no further discussion. Shankar called for a vote, by show of hands, the motion carried unanimously.

New Business

A. Recommendations from EC/CCPB meeting

Mann presented a summary of recommendations from the joint EC and CCPB meeting and opened discussion on the proposed recommendations. A conceptual framework was recommended for goal setting, in alignment with the campus mission. We can plan strategically with a framework to guide us:

- Principles
- Priorities/goals
- Practices
- Progress

Strategic planning will continue in the Summer Quarter; data collecting from administrative units will move the next steps forward. Faculty will be involved in the consultation process to help align priorities with the organizational structure.

EC discussion points

- As we move toward a responsibility centered management (RCM) budget model, School goals should be identified and mapped onto a common set of campus goals.
- The CCPB has initiated work on determining a campus peer group in consultation with the EC. A working group can be created to look at the criteria for determining a peer group. The working group will need to identify measures and determine goals.
- We need to gather feedback from School Deans on how they select comparison groups for their school, if any. Is there overlap with the base level peer group? Faculty involvement in establishing a peer group and an aspirational peer group is essential. There is GFO representation on the Chancellor's Leadership Council; the EC can provide feedback to that Council through the GFO leaders
- The CCPB will also be involved in campus strategic planning efforts.
- UWT created a strategic plan last year, they have produced a good document, "Charting Our Course: UW Tacoma's Strategic Plan 2016-2021". The plan states the campus mission and goals, creates measures and accountability. We can reference this plan in our strategic planning process.

B. EC Priorities for Next Year

Shankar asked the EC representatives for priorities they would like the Council to work on next year. Suggested topics:

- Shared governance at Schools
 - Follow up with Schools and work to have by-laws in place by Fall 2018.
 - How should EC interact with Elected Faculty Councils in Schools (set in place by School bylaws)? What is the right structure for communication between Faculty Councils and EC?
 - Study the faculty advisory processes on budgets, planning and academic issues at UWB Schools, with a view to establishing best practices.
- Moving Faculty Affairs from the Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs to the EC. What are the faculty issues that EC should focus on?
 - School policies on release time; equity and consistency across campus is needed.
 - Faculty professional development and support. What are schools doing in these areas?
 - Ensuring faculty input in IT and software decisions. For e.g., Interfolio is not user-friendly or a good tool for building P&T portfolios; it was implemented without adequate faculty input or support.
 - Faculty retention initiatives across TT faculty and LT faculty.
 - Establishing CE research and teaching standards for Carnegie Classification; EC to work with Schools?
 - Continue studying the pedagogical impact of 20:1 student/faculty ratio implementation
 - Community building across faculty at different UWB schools should be stronger

- Review guidelines for evaluating Form1503 proposals from Schools; amend the pilot document as needed.

- Address Lecturer issues at UWB
 - Lecturer-track representation on the CCPTFA; Voting on promotion and tenure (ongoing discussion)
 - Salary equity across ranks within each School, and across UWB Schools.

- Classes Scheduling Improvements:
 - Can we schedule our classes to allow for a 'free' common time block to allow for community building and meeting activities?
 - Can we schedule our classes to allow for a mix of short (1 hr 20 mt) classes and long (2 hr) classes? Special scheduling needs of NHS should be met.
 - What coordination is needed to make an earlier start time work?
 - Library
 - Security
 - Students
 - The VCAA and the Chancellor could constitute a committee to study this issue.

- RCM budgeting and Resources:
 - GFO and CCPB should continue to take an active role in the RCM roll-out.
 - Where are the decision points in this process? Who makes these decisions and how? How can faculty provide input?
 - How does RCM work to establish campus standards?
 - How will RCM support the work of the smaller Schools on campus?

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Deanna Kennedy

Business has had two successful tenure cases and two three-year renewals for lecturers. Two of three searches have been successful, one in Management and the other in Information Systems. The School will vote on the bylaws Autumn Quarter.

B. FYPP – Julie Shayne

The new FYPP representative on EC is Alice Pederson.

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

ES faculty will vote for adoption of their bylaws. The School is developing a strategic plan as a School, the Leadership Council is considering a 3-5 year plan and a 5-7 year plan. The School is goal setting for full and part-time lecturers to work on issues.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – David Stokes

IAS has held discussions on personnel issues, salaries and retention offers. Equity issues for lecturers and tenured faculty have been discussed. IAS salaries are lower than other units, this is a serious equity issue across the campus.

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Chris Wade

F. STEM – Jeff Jensen

The STEM bylaws are under review, there will be a vote Autumn Quarter.

Shankar thanked Linda Watts, Chair of the GFO and Casey Mann, Chair of the CCPB for their service as Chair and Past Chair of the GFO and in many other roles. He thanked EC members Jeff Jensen, Julie Shayne and David Stokes for their two years of service as they rotate off the EC; he also thanked EC members Deanna Kennedy, Jason Naranjo and Chris Wade for their first year of service on the EC. Finally, he thanked Barb Van Sant, Program Coordinator for the EC for a superb job supporting the EC and all the other GFO Councils. The EC members thanked Shankar for his leadership this year.

Good of the Order

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 am

This is the last EC meeting of the academic year.