

November 15, 2004, 4:00 pm., UW2 327

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

Guests: Tom Bellamy, Arnie Berger, Cynthia Fugate, Cinnamon Hillyard, Steve Holland, Sarah Leadley and Carol Zander

Kevin summarized the EC's charge for defining planning parameters for the lower division program. A GFO listening session on November 8, 2004 gathered input, feedback and ideas from the faculty on lower division planning. Kevin outlined the principles, parameters and some of the structural issues involved in defining a lower division program.

### Principles

1. Big picture view see UWB as a whole build upon our strengths, reputation.
2. Design something that is "scalable" for the long and short-term.
3. There are two distinct roles for lower division blend in the middle to help 2+2 articulation and a small cohort. Planning should recognize this distinction.

### EC discussion on the principles of a lower division program

- A cohort needs cohesion and focus; will we have the courses necessary to create that?
- Establish "learning communities" for a coordinated educational experience.
- A great benefit of lower division is to generate a pool of students ready to do aggressive upper division work.
- The role of blending in the middle" must be clarified; we cannot offer all the prerequisites that are necessary for each program.
- Students will need some courses that we do not offer; a seamless articulation program with community colleges is needed.
- A small freshman cohort, with a larger sophomore group will meet transfer needs.
- Sophomores could conceivably bridge into their program of intent in the "learning communities" model.
- What will our core be how should we market to students?
- The target group will drive decisions traditional/non-traditional students, day/evening classes, distance learning.
- The faculty/student relationship must remain a priority, large classes may jeopardize this.
- We must be sure that we receive the funding to support the student services necessary.

### Parameters

1. Distinctiveness must be designed, infused, nurtured and heavily promoted.
2. Having students for 4 years leads to opportunities that you cannot achieve in 2 years.
3. This scale requires something close to a "core experience".

### EC discussion of the parameters of a lower division program

- Will a small cohort be attractive to high school students, will this model work to serve that need?
- Co-admission/co-enrollment could direct students who have a plan for one of our existing BA degrees.
- Admission criteria could allow students to go into their major in their second year.
- There may not be enough resources based on the proposed scale to offer the prerequisites for all the programs.
- The curriculum will dictate the program - who will be our core group of students.
- Can we serve both traditional and non-traditional students?
- There are students who live at home, no other 4-year program is available for them.
- Develop the "leadership" theme students will benefit find a label for that.
- Leadership is a product of interdisciplinarity, market the learning community.
- Will UWB attract enough of the academically focused students out of high school who want to be part of a program?
- Is there a mission-related dilemma can we serve both traditional and non-traditional students effectively? Can lower division offer day and evening courses or distance learning? Will aggressive growth result in large classes, how will that affect the faculty/student relationship? Many questions need to be addressed to make sure we do no harm.

#### Structural issues

- Decision: part of IAS or a separate program?
- Decision: do we draw upon existing faculty or hire new faculty?
- Decision: solid liberal arts education or all programs?
- Decision: will student's educational plans be restricted to continuing into UWB majors or going to UWS?

#### EC discussion on the structural issues of a lower division program

- How many courses can we offer?
- This program needs to be a good one, it will affect UWB as a whole.
- What is the funding metric day/evening classes, distance learning?
- The "learning communities" will require block scheduling, when do we begin planning?
- There are huge implications on faculty to consider across units, what happens at lower division affects upper division.
- If faculty will add teaching time for freshman and sophomores, will grad students have less access to the faculty?
- Retention piece relationships are formed with students, success will build upon those.
- Questions on how to administer the program:
- Integrate with IAS/in IAS bring in new faculty/in IAS utilize other program faculty?
- New program with new faculty/new program with current program faculty?
- Who will have curricular authority, hiring authority?
- A separate program drawing on faculty from all the programs would be best, support lower division and give ownership across the programs.
- Dedicated faculty could be brought into teach specialized courses.
- Faculty could rotate through the learning communities, establish relationships across programs with students.

Some issues that Tom addressed relating to long-term institutional strategy were keeping UWB intact as a Research 1 institution. We must be careful in configuring a 6th program for lower division, that could possibly have implications toward our research status. Faculty input on lower division could be used as a model for the assessment of student learning.

The next EC meeting is scheduled for November 29, 2004.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant