Executive Council Meeting

October 7, 2008, 8:30 am, UW2 327

Present: Chuck Jackels, EC Chair, Dan Jaffe, Pam Joseph, Bruce Kochis, Pete Nye, Kelvin Sung

Phone: Suzanne Sikma

Guests: Hung Dang, Dan Jacoby, Gray Kochhar-Lindgren

Introduction of EC members and guests.

Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Reports of Officers

A. Chair - Dan Jaffe

Dan welcomed the new EC members and Chuck as the EC Chair. He opened the meeting with an overview of the role of the EC in the faculty governance of UWB. The EC has played a positive role in moving the campus forward working with the administration on strategic planning last year. As GFO Chair, Dan sees his role this year as more of an external role, working with the UW and the State Legislature. He serves on the UW Senate Executive Committee and the UW Planning and Budget Committee. Sitting on these committees he is able to represent UWB interests to the President and Provost and weigh in on issues at the highest level within the University system. He noted that UWB and UWT are getting the attention of UW faculty leadership, especially in enrollment discussions. The branch campuses can meet enrollment needs of the university, as currently most enrollment growth is happening at UWB and UWT. Dan would like to focus on external governance issues working with the Chancellor, the Provost, the President and the Legislature with Chuck working on internal governance at UWB. He updated the EC on long term planning initiatives at the campus level. The 10-year plan expands our enrollment to 6000 students and strategically develops new majors to meet the needs of that growth. A UW/State negotiated performance contract that mandates 8% annual growth for UWB and UWT aligns with planning that the Chancellor, the VCAA and the UW President have set for this campus. President Emmert told the Senate Executive Committee that UWS cannot accommodate even half of the applications received for admission to the university. UWB and UWT need to help meet this enrollment gap. The consistency of this message helps us build strong support in communicating what our current and future needs are. The State budget is not promising, with a 3 - 4 billion dollar deficit that will impact funding for education, we expect that there may be cuts in the state budget. Serious discussion involving the budget must wait though until after the elections. What we can continue to focus on is our commitment to develop the science and technology programs that we have begun. Dan and Chuck serve on the UWB Planning and Budget Committee; this allows the GFO leadership a place at the table where decisions on the budget get framed. Dan would like to integrate the faculty voice into these discussions and is encouraged to see a concerted effort to bring more transparency to the budgeting process. Space issues continue to be a problem at UWB, we are very close to capacity at this time, with projected growth, we will reach a critical stage very soon. Dan discussed
the need to try to lobby the Legislature to expedite the timeframe on the UW3 building. He would like to move it up by 2 years if at all possible. Toward that end, he would like to organize faculty, staff and students from UWB to go to Olympia and bring our message to the Legislature. He has also extended an invitation to President Emmert and Provost Wise to visit UWB to facilitate discussion on this and other issues facing this campus. The Provost has responded affirmatively on this and we will proceed with arrangements for one or more visits with the EC, the faculty and the campus. Dan feels that it would make an impact on the Legislature to hear from constituents at UWB directly and would like to get UWB students from Snohomish, Island and Skagit counties to deliver the message that we are serving these students and regions. He will work with the President and Provost to communicate to the Legislature that UWB is a vibrant, growing campus today, with funding needs at the present time. Dan will also work with Kelly Snyder, Director of Public Relations and Communications here and J.W. Harrington, the UW faculty representative to the Legislature to take our message to Olympia. One of our long standing challenges seems to be articulating our image to the public, parents and students. Our actions are not always consistent with our internal dialog, as we discuss our mixture of the liberal arts and sciences and professional programs. We need to have a recognizable identity, this is an important issue to resolve. Dan thought that it may be beneficial to schedule a meeting with Richard Penny, Vice Chancellor, Advancement and External Relations as a first step to consider what image we are marketing.

EC discussion

- Our identity is an important foundation on which to build our image and direct strategic planning.
- We cannot be all things to all people, we need to decide if we should be a comprehensive university.
- Is our growth plan consistent with our past identity?
- Our lower division was structured to fit students recruited for the program the first year, this model may not work for other incoming freshmen or transfers. The program cannot be designed to fit the needs of a specific target audience. The Discovery Core (i.e. 10 credit, 4 hour courses in DC I) may not be feasible for all students
- Innovative, interdisciplinary education has been our indentify, that should be our image.
- We need to bring our local legislators to campus to meet with the EC.
- We must continue to move forward and stress to the legislature that UWB is the answer to the needs of the region and we need the investment of facilities and funding now to meet those needs.
- Space issues are critical at this time, with the growth of new programs we need resources now.

Dan will make a recommendation to the Chancellor and VCAA to form a subcommittee to work on the UWB identity issue.

B. Vice-Chair - Chuck Jackels

Chuck addressed the role of the EC as faculty representatives of their programs. The EC represents the program faculty broadly. He would like to facilitate an active governance role of the EC to gather input and feedback of the faculty. He suggested using Catalyst as a survey tool to gather input from faculty across the programs.

Approval of EC minutes
Special Report

A. Enrollment Mgt Task Force (Hung Dang & Dan Jacoby)

Dan Jacoby opened the discussion of the Enrollment Management Task Force Report with a remark about the campus identity issues. He told the EC that the task force acknowledged the importance of determining an identity for marketing a strong sense of mission to the public. The task force went on to identify peer schools that we want to look like; these would provide a roadmap for growth and strategic planning. Hung Dang provided information on the findings of the task force with an overview of the eleven key barriers to enrollment growth at UWB that could be addressed in the next 1 - 5 years. The first ten barriers are prioritized, the eleventh barrier is the lack of a funding model and is placed last because the committee was not charged to develop a funding model but rather to identify the implications inherent in different funding approaches. In the past each program at UWB has had a funding formula. The task force recommends that a standing committee be appointed to implement the suggestions outlined in the report. The EC was asked to gather feedback, input or concerns from their program faculty and submit their recommendations to Ann Cox. The task force report will be finalized October 15, 2008 incorporating the feedback that has been received prior to that date. One of the most important factors in attracting students is the creation of new majors that appeal to broad student interest. We must keep our strategic plan in mind in funding new majors. Prioritization of resources stresses the need to fit new programs into the 21st Century Campus Initiative. The report outlines the following barriers to enrollment:

1. Limited majors reduce our appeal to prospective students and negatively impact retention.

2. Unfamiliar names of majors make student recruitment challenging.

3. Class scheduling and delivery format reduces student interest in enrollment.

4. Students may not enroll at UW Bothell due to a lack of defined pathways to degree programs.

5. The limited availability of student life opportunities impacts recruiting and retention.

6. There are insufficient efforts and resources to recruit and retain a diverse student population.

7. UW Bothell has limited appeal to out-of-state students.

8. International student recruitment is limited.

9. The UW Bothell transfer admission process is not consistent, responsive, or effective in a competitive admissions process.

10. UW Bothell is unable to match its competitors for the pool of most academically talented students.

11. Absence of a FTE funding model hinders planning and places quality of student experiences at risk.
EC discussion

- It is an important consideration that program proposals the EC review be in line with the 21st Century Campus Initiative.
- Projections for enrollment target 5000 - 6000 students, we are at capacity at 3000. UWB has outgrown its space now. It is a mistake to accommodate FTE on an ad hoc basis, we must have a strategic plan to accommodate FTE growth.
- Is there sufficient funding to support new majors? We must ensure each new program's success.
- The IAS program's options-to-majors proposal may not automatically and as a whole fit with the 21st Century Campus Initiative. Each proposal should be reviewed independently.
- Quality standards, sufficient funding and resources must be considered for all new program proposals; academic quality is the EC responsibility.
- Two new programs per biennium would be sustainable growth level.

Action item: Barb will send the Enrollment Management Task Force Report to the faculty. The EC will ask the faculty for input on this report.

Reports from programs

A. Business - Pete Nye

Pete updated the EC on the Business Program's Bellevue Initiative. This initiative is an effort by the program to offer an MBA cohort in a Bellevue location Autumn 2009. The Business Program currently has one cohort at UWB, this initiative would create a second cohort in Bellevue, with a distinct focus on leadership. The Bellevue Leadership MBA would have a broader appeal to a more diverse audience. Individualized student plans to develop organizational skills with an emphasis on leadership is the focus of this MBA, with students working with mentors in industry. The leadership MBA could encourage cross-programmatic enrollment and attract younger students. The Business Program may also consider an undergraduate program in Bellevue. Establishing a UWB presence in the Eastside promotes UWB in the region.

EC discussion

- The Masters of Nursing program is looking for electives in that area. The Bellevue MBA could provide Nursing students with courses in organizational theory.
- This program could open up opportunities on both campuses.
- The leadership MBA courses have strong appeal to graduate students in other programs (Nursing, MAPS, Healthcare Management)
- Is the program self sustaining? It is not. It is one program with two tracks.
- Was an Everett location considered? Not at this time.
- The demand for this program was expressed in the Bellevue/Redmond area from businesses there.

B. IAS - Bruce Kochis
Bruce updated the EC on new degree proposals coming from IAS in 2009. A BA in Interdisciplinary Arts is being developed. A BA in Media and Communication Studies will also be proposed. The options to majors proposal will be coming to the EC for review this year. Bruce asked the EC for clarification on the matter of faculty appointments. Does the EC advise the VCAA or the advisory committee on faculty appointments? Chuck answered that the EC does not advise on faculty appointments. Faculty appointment decisions are made by the recommending program.

C. Nursing, Education, and CSS- no reports

Reports of Committees

A. Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum - no report

B. Campus Council on Promotion, Tenure and Faculty Affairs - report received, with discussion postponed until meeting of 10/21.

C. Instructional and Research Support Committee - no report

Unfinished Business - none (first meeting of the year)

New Business

A. Identification of an EC member to serve as chair of IRSC required by GFO Bylaws.

Chuck will notify program directors that the EC has a deadline for naming program representatives to the IRSC committee. Action postponed until 10/21.

B. Proposed deadline for receiving new-degree proposals by the EC. Suggested Mar 1 to guarantee that it could be to VCAA by June.

Chuck introduced a proposal to meet deadline requirements for EC and tri-campus review of all new degree proposals. The deadlines proposed will ensure time for a full EC review and completion of the tri-campus review process by the close of the academic year. A December 1 deadline is proposed for review of proposals to reach tricampus review during Winter 09 and a March 1 deadline for tri-campus review before summer quarter. The EC will try to maintain a review process of two proposals a month, scheduling them into "slots" as they become available (one per meeting).

C. CUSP/FOCUS Review. Recommendation: initial discussion today, informing proposed actions at future meetings.

The original CUSP Charter, developed with the directive to bring freshmen to UWB called for a review in 3 years. A review by the VCAA and the GFO will begin this year. With the implementation of STEM at UWB, is CUSP as it is currently structured, the best organization for lower division? Another question that needs to be addressed is where does FOCUS fit into the organizational structure of the campus? The EC discussed creating a committee to guide the important process of the CUSP review. Some questions to identify for this process:
1. Do students like the Discovery Core?

2. Do students learn with this model? Measure student success.

3. Does the structure of CUSP feed into UWB majors, did we create a pipeline to our programs? Will CUSP continue to create pathways into the new planned majors in science and technology?

4. CUSP does not retain any faculty, should this change?

5. FOCUS does not fit into any organizational structure, should FOCUS be an EC council?

6. Should CUSP have a representative on the EC, a voting seat at the table?

7. How should the committee be structured, what is the timeline and charge for the committee?

The committee should be a jointly (EC/VCAA) appointed and charged committee to review CUSP and FOCUS. Gray asked for feedback/recommendations as soon as possible. He told the EC that he conducts surveys with students entering and leaving the program. Dan asked Gray to provide him with ideas on what assessment data he needs. It is still too new a program to measure student pathways to upper division or their preparedness.

**EC discussion**

- EC reps will get input from their programs, this could be incorporated into the charge letter.
- The Science and Technology Transition Committee could provide guidance on how CUSP can serve new programs in that area.
- How do CUSP students compare in preparedness for upper division courses with community college students?

**Action item:** Dan will create a set of possible questions to guide the CUSP review.

**D. Proposal to the IRSC regarding faculty seminar program.** Recommendation: commit to IRSC to develop proposal in conjunction with VCAA? - this agenda item is postponed.

The meeting adjourned at 10:30 am

The next meeting is Tuesday, October 21, 2008.

Meeting minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant.