March 31, 2006, 2006, 10:00 am, UW2 327

**Present:** Steve Collins, Alan Leong, Carol Leppa, Kathleen Martin, Clark Olson and Bill Seaburg

**Absent:** Kevin Laverty

**Guest:** Tom Bellamy

**Approval of EC minutes of February 16, 2006 and March 9, 2006**

The EC minutes of February 16, 2006 and March 9, 2006 were unanimously approved.

**Status of lower division planning**

The Curriculum Committee has approved the first batch of courses and the course numbering system submitted to it by FOCUS. The UW Seattle Curriculum Committee is expected to conduct its review at its regular April meeting.

**Process for Worthington Academic Distinction Projects**

At issue: Funded projects could commit the campus to initiatives that in effect become our strategic plan. Given that strategic planning currently comes under the purview of the EC, how and to what extent should the EC be involved in the proposal evaluation process?

EC discussion raised questions regarding the current process for review of the Rose and Worthington awards and how it applies to the new Worthington Academic Distinction Projects. Since these are awards of substantial magnitude there is the potential of committing the campus to making strategic moves with long-term consequences. The possibility of *de-facto* strategic planning regarding these awards calls for careful scrutiny in deciding the set of considerations for large awards. Tom suggested 3 approaches to deciding this issue:

- Structure a selection committee of EC and AC members.
- Delay decision-making on the large awards for a month, until the new Chancellor is chosen.
- Continue the selection process as planned, with a single committee making recommendations on the all the awards.

One of the most important selection considerations for these awards is the sustainability of the award. Does the award support or add to the operational budget of any program? What is the future plan to fund the grant/award? Another important aspect of this issue is the prospect of awards being used to plan new degree programs. Should a grant fund a new degree program and more importantly, is this an appropriate way to launch new programs? Any new degree program needs to be vetted across the campus to determine if it is strategic to long-term campus growth.

At this point the EC favors continuation of the selection process as planned. At the end of the process, it will review the results for the potential strategic impact on the campus and communicate any concerns to the AC.
Executive Session

The EC weighed the merits of the chancellor candidates and formed its recommendation to the search committee. The EC chair communicated this opinion to the chair of the search committee by letter after the meeting.

Confirm date and agenda for GFO meeting in early May

Deferred to next EC meeting.

Feedback from EC to Special Committee on Council/Committee Restructure

At the request of the GFO chair, who serves on said committee, the EC discussed the merits of replacing Faculty Councils with a University Council system as a means of enhancing the faculty's role in shared governance. A university council would bring together representatives of the faculty and administration to do the work associated with that council. A shift to the UC model would be consistent with the recommendations of the "Rose Report" issued September 2002.

The EC had some questions about the structure of the relationship between UWB governance and the university councils, especially as it pertains to the UWB voice in decisions made by the councils that could have a significant impact on UWB. How would UWB be represented on UCs? If representation were equal to that of the other campuses (as it is currently on the tri-campus council), there would be no problem. On the other hand, if representation were in proportion to our size, as it is on the faculty senate, it may be difficult for UWB to project its interests and protect its autonomy. Would each campus have its own UC, or would UCs be centralized on the Seattle campus? It would be difficult for the EC to endorse a centralized model with all campuses proportionally represented. There was also concern about proliferation of councils. And even if UWB faculty amply represented, we would have to consider the impact on faculty workloads.

The bottom line for the EC is that decisions implemented here at UWB should be made here at UWB. Any proposed reorganization of councils would have to be consistent with this point to receive strong EC backing.