Sept. 27, 2005, 11:00 am., UW2 327

Present: Steve Collins, Kevin Laverty, Carol Leppa, Kathleen Martin, Clark Olson and Bill Seaburg

Discussion of EC priorities

Kevin initiated an EC discussion on 2 issues that are EC priorities for the coming year – the committee structure and role of the GFO and academic planning for UWB. He updated the EC on the shared governance structure of the UW and the strong support that the present administration is showing for faculty governance. The matter of involving faculty in a significant amount of work over the summer has become an issue for the EC to consider and how this may impact faculty research?

GFO Committee Structure

Kevin gave the EC an overview of the status of the GFO committees. The UWB Handbook outlines the committee charges and the committee’s role in shared governance and academic planning. The EC is responsible for the academic excellence of UWB; its role encompasses identifying academic priorities, resource and salary allocation and budgets. The EC is the decision-making body for the GFO. The EC also assumes responsibility for reviewing and advising on major-programmatic changes. GFO committees should assume a leadership role in all academic planning; the Curriculum Committee will be involved in the curricular development of lower division, as well as their on-going role in curriculum approvals. Academic Affairs will also play an important role in the lower division planning process. Faculty Affairs has been instrumental in bringing the issue of faculty salaries to the fore-front and will continue to be involved in faculty issues. Kevin sees the Instructional and Research Support Committee taking a role in the research support initiatives that have come out of the 5-for-5 work. The strong support of the UW administration, both at UWS and UWB of faculty governance is strengthening the role of the GFO at UWB. The GFO committees, rather than appointed task forces, by mandate of the UWB Handbook ensure a strong faculty voice in academic strategic planning.

Lower Division Planning

With Phase I of the timeline for decision-making on lower division planning due November 1, this critical process requires strong and decisive assessment and action on the part of the faculty. The faculty must weigh in on strategic decisions in a very short time-frame. EC discussion on lower division planning, comments and input from the Faculty Forum 2005 covered a wide range of issues:

- Support of a separate entity, a "Center" for lower division administration. An interim director for the Center needs to be chosen. Alan Wood is a good candidate.
- Cross programmatic emphasis is a true opportunity for UWB to be unique
- Transcripts should show the list of equivalent courses from a traditional university track to facilitate transfers
- Core courses - team-teaching/be innovative
- STRUCTURE - put twilight clause in structure/oversight committee
- Promote cross-program work
- Establish strong, transparent pre-requisites
• For programs such as nursing, make sure to use lower division as a building block for new programs or majors (e.g. health major) to encourage continued investment by that program in lower division
• Courses should be controlled by the administrative unit, with faculty who have an investment in the subject matter, once a course is required by more than one program, who will have the decision-making authority (e.g., Accounting – Business or IAS?)

• There is concern about the apparent lack of time and money - a budget is needed to move forward and make informed decisions on our planning parameters.
• The financial issue is critical in terms of sustainability.
• We want to be creative in naming and designing the courses, but we need to make the courses transferable. Make decisions on curriculum and decide what we will take off the table (i.e. Chemistry)
• What is the demand for higher education that we see in this community?
• Do we offer a small lower division program or are we on the track to becoming a 4-year institution - we need this knowledge to make decisions.
• The Legislature mandated UWB to become a 4-year institution.
• FTE barriers - the greatest number of UWB’s students are community college transfers, how will lower division affect this?
• Planning parameters - we must develop creative sources of funding to assure that we do not gut our upper division.
• Non-academic services - how will lower division be cheaper to run? If less money is funded for lower division, how will these services be provided?
• How can we deliver lower division courses that are true to our mission?
• We do not just want to become a "catch basin" for UWS, we want to forge our own unique identity.
• Develop a strong recruitment plan. - "Come for UW degree, stay for UWB education".
• What is our marketing plan - what will make UWB the institution of choice for students?
• Liberal arts model - fuse with skill based-professional programs - this could be the signature of campus.
• Recruit students, attract great faculty - what is our strategy?
• Make service-learning component part of the CUSP - chance to connect with the community.

The EC identified three major areas for decision-making:

1. Structure - a separate entity, a "Center" for lower division. A cross-programmatic effort is needed with every program committing faculty members to the Center.
2. Core Curriculum
3. Distribution requirements

A GFO vote will be needed on:

○ Charter
○ Discovery Core
○ Distribution requirements

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant