

October 25, 2004, 4:00 pm., UW2 327

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

Guests: Tom Bellamy

Approval of EC minutes of October 4, 2004 and October 18, 2004

EC minutes of October 4, 2004 were unanimously approved.

EC minutes of October 18, 2004 were unanimously approved.

Lower division planning parameters and planning process for lower division at UWB.

Kevin began deliberation on lower division planning with the EC recommendation that the GFO Chair and Vice Chair charge an advising body to initiate the planning process. There will be a two-stage process for this planning effort.

1. The "EC Plus" advisory body (EC members and faculty to be determined) will define planning parameters for the lower division program. EC Plus will seek out and represent the views of the UWB faculty for this process. This advisory body will complete its work by November 30, 2004.
2. The Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs and the EC will appoint a joint task force to continue the planning process begun by the EC Plus advisory body and will take responsibility for more detailed planning efforts. This task force will begin collaboration with the EC Plus in November and continue the planning process through Spring 2005.

The "EC Plus" will conduct two listening sessions to gather faculty input, feedback and suggestions for developing a lower division program. Four questions will be addressed at the listening sessions:

1. Who will lower division serve? Who will it not serve?
2. What will be the basis elements of the program?
3. Will the lower division program be the "6th program" at UWB or will it be within an existing program?
4. How do we articulate the basic message: who we target, how to reach students, why will we serve them better than alternative choices and how this compliments 2+2.

EC discussion points:

- GFO bylaws state that the EC shall assume responsibility for recommendations for major programmatic changes and/or changes involving significant budget implications.
- What resources will be allocated to faculty for work on the task force?
- Stage 3 - implementation - curricular review, programmatic review, planning for 2005-2006, how will this work proceed?
- Freshman class - place-bound, honors, first generation college students, at-risk students - we must carefully articulate the descriptors of targeted students.

- Create message to focus on UWB being an alternative pathway to success.
- Articulate message that UWB will continue to provide the leading alternative to non-traditional students, those not best served by a conventional 4 year institution.
- Lower division can attract academically motivated students who are looking for an interdisciplinary program
- Market how we are successful at UWB - interdisciplinary studies, student/faculty relationships, our distinctive character
- Lower division program features:
 - (Relationship intensive
 - (Academically rigorous programs
 - (Leadership focus
 - (Interdisciplinary focus prepares students for graduate studies
 - (Accessible scheduling serves students that have families, jobs or other commitments.
- Market UWB distinction from community colleges and UWS
- Academically prepared students who were not admitted to UWS, how do we send the message that we are their best alternative or first choice?

The task force will produce recommendations for curriculum, program structure, funding, operations and academic and student services in support of the program.

Action item

Linda, Kevin and Tom will draft general statements of guidelines for the faculty sessions, incorporating EC recommendations to focus the questions.

Question 1 - articulate and qualify terms used to describe target

Question 2 - important issues - will prerequisites channel into all majors? Where will the prerequisites be met? We cannot meet all prerequisites, what are the parameters? Programs must be consulted. How does co-enrollment/co-admission impact the planning?

Question 3 - Advantages vs. Disadvantages of each model

Question 4 - Send a coherent message to Legislature and community, how we will serve students better than any alternative choice.

Tom briefed the EC on updates to the 2707 report recommended by the Board of Regents. Tom highlighted two important areas in which the wording of the UWB Report to Washington State Legislature for SHB 2707, dated October 17, 2004 differs from the September 30, 2004 draft report (the EC voted to approve the goals of the September 30 report):

1. Page 7, first paragraph - reference is made to potential transition to a four year program.

"While our plan envisions this lower-division program to remain small as a reflection of the Legislature's emphasis on collaboration with community colleges and co-location with Cascadia Community College, the plan is not intended to preclude eventual transition into a full four-year program that responds more directly to the region's needs for UW degrees."

2. Page 7, third paragraph - reference to research structures is made.

"While faculty responsibility for scholarship will continue, we plan for selected and limited development of research structures like those supported at UW Seattle."

The new report will be sent out to the faculty.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant