

March 10, 2005, 3:00 pm., UW2 327

Present: Kevin Laverty, Jim Miller, Clark Olson, Bill Seaburg, Jane Van Galen and Linda Watts

Guests: JoLynn Edwards and Tom Bellamy

Discussion of proposed IAS Policy Studies minor

Kevin presented the IAS Policy Studies minor to EC for review, initiating the implementation of the new Tri-campus review of undergraduate curriculum proposals. The proposal was submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty on February 21, 2005 for a coordinated review by all three campuses. JoLynn provided information on the extensive review that IAS conducted to draft the final proposal and the approval of IAS Academic Affairs Committee and IAS faculty. After the 30-day tri-campus comment period, EC will consider the proposal for approval.

Report on Academic Affairs Retreat held 1/28/05 - Tom Bellamy

Tom briefed the EC on the Academic Affairs Retreat held in January. The Academic Council, with Kevin representing the GFO, launched a broad discussion on future academic strategy at UWB. Two group discussions resulted in outlining needs and goals that will focus attention on areas to create the academic infrastructure to move into the future. A scenario discussion looked at UWB five years out and laid out strategies for contingency planning. Another discussion summarized important opportunities to address, priority themes that emerged from that discussion were:

- Curriculum Planning - cross programmatic/grow on our strengths
- Communications and Branding - external public identity/UWB's educational value
- Institutional Studies - institutional research function/internal and external data dissemination
- Entrepreneurship that Supports Academic Work - establish framework that supports entrepreneurial effort/develop an approach that combines fee-based and FTE-based strategies for enrollment and budget management
- Community Partnerships - one of the 5-for-5 goals - outreach center
- Administrative/Policy Strategy - develop presence in Everett/academic infrastructure must be as efficient as possible

A joint Academic Council/EC retreat could strengthen shared governance and create a mechanism for the administration (externally focused) and the faculty (internally focused) to dialog on strategic planning. It was noted that any overlap of priorities with the 5-for-5 initiatives could minimize the attention given to the 5-for-5 priorities.

Discussion of proposed Office of Sponsored Research - Tom Bellamy

Tom opened discussion on the UWB Structures and Policies to Support Research and Sponsored Programs. He explained that the consultation process to draft this proposal was based on discussions with program directors and PIs and will be the first step in creating a support structure as recommended by the Academic Strategic Action Initiatives Committee to establish an Office of Sponsored Programs. The proposal puts forward two strategies to accomplish this goal:

1. Office of Sponsored Programs
2. Institute for Collaborative Research and Development

EC discussion points

- Transition issues - what is the next step in expanding grant processing from Finance & Administration to Academic Affairs?
- Program development - need support to identify sources of funding for grants.
- OSP seems to support the administrative support but not so much locating funding sources.
- What kind of faculty oversight is needed?
- How we structure faculty oversight is important - we do not want to create a tiered faculty structure of PIs, a cross section of stakeholders should be the goal.
- This program cannot become driven only by "research active" faculty and those that are experienced grant writers.
- Buyout issues - is this proposal the most effective way to spend our budget, would RAs or course releases work as well to support research?
- Will this program become self-sustaining - what are the implications of that?
- Preserving the mission of campus is vital, we are not a "research" institution in the same manner as UWS.
- The student/faculty relationship is paramount at UWB, we should make sure that our mission is not jeopardized in any way.
- How are indirect costs distributed?

Tom outlined the distribution of indirect costs:

- 20% - Principal Investigator (support professional development)
- 20% - Program support (supplement buyouts)
- 10% - Administrative support
- 25% - Research Investment Fund (managed by VCAA provides seed grants and other research investments that support research and sponsored programs)
- 25% - Research Expenditure Reserve Fund

Within the overall distribution of indirect costs:

- 30% - Research Infrastructure Support (may use up to 30% of the allocations to the Research Investment and Research Expenditure Reserve Funds to increase the capacity of the OSP)

Tom stressed that in order for the OSP to work it will need to provide enough support in the pre-award services to get faculty to use the program from the beginning, achieve balance across the campus with all programs, be scaled to succeed (support for increased workload) and provide strong support at the administrative level for PIs (budget, travel, supplies, etc).

Next EC meeting will be Spring Quarter, Monday, March 28, 2005.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant

