

**June 6, 2005, 11:30 am., UW2 327**

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

**Guests:** Tom Bellamy and Arnie Berger

The EC meeting began with, acknowledgment, recognition and thanks to Linda for her outstanding service, dedication and work over the last two years as Vice Chair and Chair of GFO.

### **Academic Planning – Lower Division**

Kevin initiated discussion of academic planning with a summation of where the EC stands at this point on lower division. Faculty voice has been heard through the open forum, Lower Division Task Force members and EC meetings. Because EC members will not meet this summer, it is critical that the EC provide guidance to groups that are working this summer. Points discussed included:

1. Lower division structure
  - EC affirmed its support for a separate structure (i.e. not within IAS)
  - A question for the Lower Division Task Force: Can we find out where this model has worked well and use this information?
2. Curriculum
  - EC members feel that the lower division “program” (not individual courses) will need to be reviewed through the Tri-Campus Curriculum process – currently we are not clear whether the HECB approval will be necessary.
3. Marketing
  - A timing challenge for this aspect is that this is the last faculty discussion prior to implementation (i.e. ads start in August 2005). Once we market a lower division program to high schools, parents and students, promises are implicit.
  - The EC endorses the marketing/recruitment message for lower division with 3 guiding concepts:
    3. Learning through relationships – learning communities
    4. Access to excellence – engage the passion of faculty and students
    5. Knowledge applied – students learn by participating
4. Financial implications
  - A question for the Lower Division Task Force - what are the financial implications of developing a separate “program” for lower division, versus other possible models?
5. Faculty workload
  - How will lower division impact faculty workload?
  - What will be the teaching requirements for faculty to teach lower division?
  - Will teaching lower division create inequities, real or perceived within the faculty and programs?
  - How will faculty be evaluated when building and serving lower division and at the same time being permanently appointed by another program?
6. Transfer options
  - Make sure that courses are not so specialized that students could not transfer easily.

7. Effect on IAS - How will buyouts for faculty affect IAS? Will there be sufficient IAS faculty remaining to attend to other IAS business?

Tom discussed 3 clusters of work projects that faculty will be involved with Summer Quarter:

1. 1.Design of central course sequence
2. 2.Broader curriculum questions – ongoing curriculum to meet requirements that feed into majors. Work with Cascadia Community College and UWS.
3. 3.Structure – charter/policy agreement

A planning coordinator will be assigned to oversee each group. In Autumn Quarter the GFO Curriculum Committee will be consulted and work on all curriculum planning and the EC will address the charter and policy agreements for faculty. Curriculum approval will go through the Tri-Campus Review Committee. It was noted that UWT has moved their phase in of lower division to 2007.

In summary, the EC would like the Lower Division Task Force to address 3 issues in the academic planning process:

1. 1.Gather data on what has worked at other institutions regarding separate lower division structure.
2. 2.Develop a clear plan for a faculty member's home department evaluating the work done by faculty for lower division – value must be placed on faculty teaching and doing institution building for lower division.
3. 3.Do a budget analysis on structure for lower division - whether in IAS or as a separate program or other options.

### **Academic Planning – Upper Division**

Tom presented a list of possible concentrations for Autumn 2006:

Middle school teaching endorsement  
Cross campus/cross programs  
Leadership  
Information/Communications  
Entrepreneurship  
Health related/Bioinformatics  
Health/Human Rights

The concentrations would involve all programs and may give CSS a way to prevent downsizing. Decisions will be made at the program level on how to stage the concentrations.

Tom also presented a list of large term possibilities for degrees that could be in IAS or be cross programmatic:

Sustainability/Science Studies  
Human and Organizational Development  
Integrated Science BA

Urban and regional studies  
Performing/Applied Arts

### **Strategic Planning – continuing pursuit of 5-for-5 goals**

Kevin asked whether the EC continues to support the implementation of the 5-for-5 initiatives. EC members affirmed this unanimously. EC is committed to connecting 5-for-5 to the budget.

The EC acknowledged the report submitted by the IRSC in June 2004 that addresses supporting faculty research. This will be an EC priority in Autumn 2005.

One of the goals of the EC for the 5-for-5 initiatives is to arrive at a set of deliverables with initiatives implemented and integrated into an overall strategic plan.

### **2005-2007 Budget – EC priorities**

The EC reviewed budget requests for the Office of Research Support, the Center for Civic Engagement and Undergraduate Research.

The EC did not reach a consensus on the ORS. If this is funded the EC will confer on modifications to shape this endeavor Autumn Quarter.

While the EC remains committed to the associated 5-for-5 goal, the Executive Council does not support funding the Center for Civil Engagement and Community Partnerships as proposed. Furthermore, the EC does not support a small amount of funding to keep the current initiative alive.

The two main issues discussed by the Executive Council in reaching this decision were:

- a. whether support for scholarship related to service learning/community partnerships/civic engagement is a necessary and inseparable part, and
- b. how widely would an anticipated Center serve the faculty. As our conversations went on through the year, the EC representatives from Nursing, Education and Business each said that they did not see the Center supporting their program's current or planned involvement in service learning and/or internships.

The EC supports Undergraduate Research and sees it as explicitly linked to the 5-for-5 initiatives.

The EC discussed how the budget process pits program needs against campus needs vying for the same dollars. EC members felt that faculty cannot assess the budget needs of other departments and programs and try to prioritize how they should spend their money.

In general, there is consensus in the EC to support research on campus.

The EC will make a recommendation for a budget increase in the percentage of total funding that goes to academic programs.

**Student Conduct Code/Assistant Attorney General review**

The EC unanimously approved the Student Conduct Code with the revision from the Assistant Attorney General's Office to align with the UW code.

**GFO positions for 2005-2006: officers, committee chairs, etc.**

There is no GFO Vice Chair candidate at this time and Kevin expressed an unwillingness to serve as GFO Chair without a Vice Chair. This opened discussion on the service conundrum at UWB and the lack of compensation for those doing faculty governance service on the GFO and its committees. Service and work loads are causing critical lack of faculty leaders.

This is the last EC meeting for the academic year. The next EC meeting will be in Autumn Quarter 2005.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant