Executive Council Meeting

November 27, 2007, 3:30 pm, UW2 327

Present: Constantin Behler, Steve Collins, Bill Erdly, Dan Jaffe, Nancy Place, Gowri Shankar, Suzanne Sikma and Mike Stiber

Guest: Gray Kochhar-Lindgren and Carol Zander

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Approval of EC minutes of November 13, 2007

EC minutes of November 13, 2007 were approved as amended.

Reports of Officers

A. Chair - Mike Stiber

Mike met with Linda Bale, Chair of the UWB General Staff Organization (GSO). She will work with the EC to develop communication pathways to disseminate information from the GFO to UWB staff on pertinent policies and procedures. Other events that the GFO and the GSO coordinate in collaboration are UWB’s convocation and graduation events. The GFO will also contribute to and participate in co-sponsoring the annual UWB holiday party, scheduled for December 12.

Mike discussed the status of the policy on the committee of the Fulls at UWB. This committee is a program-level advisory group that advises program directors at UWB on promotion cases (from associate to full professor) in programs that do not have enough full professors to meet the Faculty Handbook requirements in Chapter 24, Section 24-54 mandating that the voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend the promotion. We have been operating under interim procedures; the Chancellor will produce a letter outlining an official policy on this matter to temporarily update the procedure. The Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs will work to draft a permanent policy on promotion and tenure review.

B. Vice-Chair - Dan Jaffe

Dan met with Jill Orcutt for a discussion on pre-admission issues which may come before the EC next quarter.

Reports of Committees

A. Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum
The CCASC is working to clarify criteria for evaluating curriculum and new degree proposals, including how curriculum and new degrees fit into UWB strategic planning. The UW Curriculum Coordinator, Jennifer Payne will meet with the CCASC and program advisors on December 3 to discuss curriculum review and the tri-campus review process for new undergraduate degrees.

B. Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure & Faculty Affairs

Constantin reported that the CCPTFA is meeting on November 28 to review 2 tenure cases.

C. Instructional and Research Support

Nancy reported that the IRSC met on November 19. The committee developed their charge and drafted priorities for implementation in 2007-08:

- December 12, 2007
  Grant review - Selina, Nives and Pete will work with Becky, Director TLC.

- January 2008
  Make visible UWB's intellectual capital.
  Partner with Elizabeth Fischtziur and Alex Webster.
  UWB website
  Partner with Jason Beard
  Undergraduate research symposium
  Partner with Elizabeth Fischtziur and Alex Webster.

- February 2008
  Research Issues
  Partner with Carolyn Brennen
  Integrated Collaborative grants
  Buy outs
  Worthington Awards, etc.

- March 2008
TLC - priorities and effectiveness

Tech decisions pathway/process

Tech Advisory Group - Munehiro will serve as IRSC liaison

  - April 2008

Blackboard/E Portfolio

  - May 2008

Measurement of teaching/research/service

Study/collect best/worst practices of other institutions

Old Business

A. Proposal on STEM--see attached revised resolution

Mike and Suzanne presented the revised EC Resolution on Appointment of a Joint Faculty/Administration Task Force on STEM degree implementation to the EC for consideration. Their revisions were intended to capture most of the suggestions made at the previous EC meeting.

EC discussion

Dan opened the floor for comments and discussion regarding the resolution.

EC program representative’s discussion

Nursing - Suzanne

  - Nursing is supportive of the intent of the resolution

Business - Gowri

  - Business supports the resolution

Education - Nancy

  - Education supports the resolution.

IAS - Constantin
- There are concerns in IAS relating to how the new academic unit will fit into the strategic planning on campus already underway in STEM. Another concern is the perception that this is moving toward traditional units and away from the interdisciplinary approach.

CSS - Bill

- CSS is supportive of the resolution as a whole but would like to see core concepts integrated in innovative, interdisciplinary ways into the curriculum.

EC discussion

- Enrollment issues are indicating that we need to begin to offer more traditional majors to bring in students.
- New majors - traditional vs. interdisciplinary is an issue that we need to think about now. We are at a critical point in the growth of this institution, we need both.
- In order to become a regionally important university, we must develop a much wider variety of majors that will appeal to a wider array of students.
- The list of majors listed in the resolution should be removed, leaving that decision to the task force (Steve).
- It is important to keep the list of potential majors in the resolution; this is part of our new strategy for growth.
- The task force will be composed of UWB faculty and external members. This task force will be aware of our interdisciplinary approach to teaching and also of the need to implement STEM at UWB.
- Programs at UWB carry out the interdisciplinarity focus of our mission in many ways.
- Science is not highlighted in any way at UWB, the lack of labs here is limiting research. Although there are resources to access lab space, there is no single point of contact to coordinate this effort.
- A series of faculty forums or charrettes would be useful to provide input to the task force.

Amendments to the resolution:

Steve submitted a number of changes to the resolution that incorporated feedback from IAS. These wording changes were discussed one-by-one. In each case, if there was unanimous consent, then the change was incorporated "without objection". If the specific change was not supported unanimously, then voting was conducted on wording changes. The final document reflects the results of those decisions.

Motion:

The question was called to vote on Appointment of a Joint Faculty/Administration Task Force on STEM degree implementation as amended. The vote was 7 in favor, 1 opposed.

B. Recommendations to Chancellor on Biotechnology and Biomedical Technology Institute (BBTI)

The EC reviewed a summary of campus responses received.
Dan opened discussion on the faculty comments on the Charter for the Biotechnology & Biomedical Technology Institute. The discussion took place in two phases, first with Mike and Steve present, then without their participation. Comments seemed to fall into two main categories, those addressing administrative issues and those addressing the institute directly. As the center is a fairly new concept at UWB, many of the administrative issues will need to be resolved as an on-going task.

**EC discussion**

- A clearer statement of goals and deliverables would be useful, concrete things that can be evaluated.
- A partnership with the new STEM entity is indicated.
- Differentiate the process of how start-up funds and new/resulting funds would be used.
- Differentiate the categories of expenses - internal, grant funds and external funds.
- How is a center/institute different from a faculty research group?
- A center has different roles and responsibilities.
- Community outreach and student internships will strengthen the footprint of UWB in the region.
- Identify the pipeline for student involvement in the institute.
- Build relationships with local businesses.
- STEM could add relevance to BBTI, add pathways for students.

**Summary of discussion:**

While the EC was generally supportive of the concept, we made no specific recommendation at this time. We would like to see a revised Charter that incorporates the following suggestions:

1. Outline a specific set of goals and deliverables.

2. Include a plan to develop a pipeline to bring students into the institute. Clarify the support role the institute will play to new academic units in developing curriculum.

3. Clearly differentiate how this is an institute or center rather than just a collaborative research effort.

4. Clarify the status as a center or institute. What is the difference and why is BBTI an institute not a center?

**C. Enrollment issues - Gray**

Gray thanked the EC for their collaboration with CUSP and FOCUS to review and decide on the guidelines for freshman admissions with the goal of allowing qualified applicants into UWB and maintaining the integrity of the Discovery Core (DC) sequence. Gray drafted a document that recommends the following:

1. All true freshmen will take the DC sequence.

2. Transfer freshmen (1-12 credits): DC I, II and III required

3. Transfer students (13-24 credits): DC II and III required
4. Transfer students (25-44 credits): DC III required

5. Once transfer students reach 45 credits, they will become sophomores and no longer have DC expectations.

FOCUS will develop a DC I for Winter 2009 (and following) and DC II for Spring to enable mid-year admits. The Discovery Core will be reviewed one year from Spring 2007.

**Motion:**

The EC moved to approve Gray's recommendations for freshman admissions. Mike called the motion, Constantin seconded, the motion was approved unanimously.

**New Business**

A. **Strategic planning for non-STEM areas**

This agenda item will be forwarded to the next EC meeting on December 10.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm

The next EC meeting will be on Monday, December 10, 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. The EC meeting on December 11 is cancelled.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant