

Executive Council Meeting

Jun 1, 2020, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

Present: Jason Naranjo (chair), David Socha, Keith Nitta, Julie Shayne, Tyson Marsh, Nora Kenworthy, Shima Abadi, Surya Pathak, Santiago Lopez

Guests: Sharon Jones, Grace Lasker, Carrie Tzou, Paola Hidalgo Rodriguez, Deanna Kennedy, Natalia Dyba, Shauna Carlisle

2020/21 EC Membership

Jason Naranjo (Chair) – GFO VC
Keith Nitta – GFO Chair
David Socha – GFO Past Chair
Surya Pathak – Business rep
Tyson Marsh – Education rep
Julie Shayne – FYPP rep
Santiago Lopez – IAS rep
Nora Kenworthy – NHS rep
Shima Abadi – STEM rep

Approval of Minutes: Minutes approved

EC End of Year Council Report – Campus Council on Academic Standards & Curriculum (CCASC)

Dr. Grace Lasker, CCASC Chair

- Status of 2020/21 CCASC Charges
 - Completed all charges for 2020/21
 - Worked to transition to online programming for 1503s
 - Streamlined weekly proposal review process – created preliminary review spreadsheet
 - Integrated into CEL designation process and procedure
 - Engaged multiple conversations around Distance Learning but ran out of time for campus-wide discussion
 - CCASC will form committee in Fall to address transition back to campus and what that means for Distance Learning
 - Online proctoring issue resolved
- UW Bothell Curriculum Guide 2021/22
 - Engagement
 - Fall 2020, school curriculum coordinators and those who work with curriculum regularly, asked to provide feedback
 - Incorporated feedback, added details around new process of 1503s moving to Kualii, sent draft back to group for further feedback leading to more iterations
 - Solicited feedback from VCAA and Offices of Connected Learning, Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Library, Information Technology, DEI, and Planning and Admin before final draft was done
 - Major change; created process to include check-offs to ensure conversations happen across campus when thinking about new undergrad and grad majors and minors before EC review.
 - Question for EC; considering newly developed check list to ensure conversations happen across campus and considering more robust NOP process implemented at Tri-campus, is the Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) form still necessary? PNOI for GRADUATE programs is not a Bothell-only process so that PNOI will remain.

Questions/Feedback:

- What does CCASC recommend in regard to PNOI?
 - Recent tri-campus change means NOP must be done within 15 months, the PNOI hinders process. Doing away with it means EC won't come into process until the end
- Seattle only sees UWB PNOIs for graduate programs so nothing would be impacted there
- Suggest including a checklist indicating what EC wants to see
- Need to establish deadline for submitting proposals for GFO EC review

- Reasonable to do away with PNOI but have NOP go to EC in parallel as it is going through the process?
 - Could develop timeline for EC and remove PNOI from strict timeline but keep it in parallel process to assess its value
- Suggest including in checklist, a question asking if faculty will be pulled from existing majors to teach in new program. And staff impact.
- Suggest including the following in guide:
 - “As of” or “Last updated” date
 - List of approval processes it goes through
 - Brief list of revisions since last draft
 - Unique numbers for headers so readers can be guided to those sections easily.

**MOTION BY NITTA TO APPROVE CHANGES TO UWB CURRICULUM GUIDE
SECONDED BY SHAYNE
PASSED WITHOUT DISSENT**

EC End of Year Council Report – Campus Council on Promotion & Tenure (CCPT)

Dr. Carrie Tzou, CCPT Chair

- 15 total P&T cases in 2020/21, 8 mandatory and 7 non-mandatory. Next year’s anticipated caseload is 35-37, largest ever
- CCPT handbook updated to reflect new DEI language in faculty code. Need EC approval.
- 4 main areas of year-end reflection and discussion from CCPT:
 - External Reviewers
 - Several situations of borderline conflict of interest regarding externals reviewers
 - CCPT raised questions with Deans about who should be an external reviewer
 - CCPT has dual role of process check and evaluative check. Main goal is to address and document all possible concerns before forwarding on to VCAA
 - What are the appropriate ranks of external reviewers for teaching-track faculty?
 - Ex: when teaching track faculty external reviewers all full professors
 - Universities don’t all name or rank teaching track faculty in the same way, that makes it challenging to identify teaching track appropriate rank for appropriate promotion
 - CCPT presented recommendation to Deans that a chart of all external reviewers who submitted reviews be included in dossiers, indicating if reviewers are from candidate’s or committee’s list
 - OE/HR is creating a fillable template to include in Interfolio
 - Completing chart is optional so less likely to be completed, need to spread the word and encourage people to complete it
 - Interfolio as a Platform
 - Due to slow speed of Interfolio, OE/HR will download cases as .pdfs to google drive
 - Organization of files becomes very important since pdfs will be 100s of pages
 - Suggest including coversheet that marks beginning of each section and indicates what to expect (i.e. scholarship, teaching, service, etc.)
 - Portfolio structure and composition. CCPT suggestions to Deans:
 - Include template in dossiers that orients reviewers to materials they should expect as each school/unit may have different requirements

- Include record of all leaves taken with dates to cut down on CCPT having to investigate gaps. No details required, only dates.
- Include chart of teaching evaluations (not currently uniformly used but should be)
- Be explicit about trajectory in narrative in each relevant section

Questions/Feedback:

- Examples of suggested charts and cover sheets would be useful
 - Peer observation cover page and chart of teaching evaluations already exist as templates from OE/HR and are currently optional but not uniformly used
- Helpful to include brief explanations for each recommendation as to what questions these suggestions help to answer
- Is there a formal process to go through to decide what gets added to dossiers?
 - EC chair suggests (if EC votes to endorse suggestions) putting forth a recommendation to Chancellor and VC that encapsulates what CCPT has found and suggests for campus
 - What goes into dossiers is determined by schools (other than what provost requires), unsure if we can dictate what goes in across schools
 - There can be (and will be for next cycle) a VCAA-required section. May be able to include a shared set of expectations across schools there
- Ongoing CCPT Issues:
 - 4th year in a row that faculty voted in all female-identifying members to CCPT. This is a problematic pattern of who is doing the tremendous amount of work of CCPT.
 - Suggest including current make-up of councils when calling for nominees
 - Ongoing issue of CCPT members from smaller schools having higher workloads
 - To reduce workload CCPT chair recommends having a subset of 3 CCPT members read each case instead of all members reading all cases. After members recuse themselves from cases, chair would assign cases to reviewers.
 - Neither faculty code nor CCPT handbook goes into detail of process.
 - How does EC want to handle suggested change to process?

Questions/Feedback:

- At provost level, dossiers with few votes will get questioned. Having few votes minimizes the weight of those votes.
 - Could have “lead” reviewers do full review, present to committee, and committee looks at few key things, then it goes to full committee vote without everyone having to do exhaustive review
- If not specified in faculty code or CCPT handbook, it is practice that CCPT chair and committee can establish procedures. Good to brief EC prior to implementing though.
- Nitta suggests EC hold a consent vote for CCPT’s recommendations and then Nitta and Naranjo will formalize recommendations over summer and send on to administration.
 - EC needs to be careful to not reach too far into how CCPT runs processes
- Motion is to support the efforts of CCPT to work with campus to improve P&T process through the suggested (but not required) changes and call on admins and Deans to enact the recommendations in schools.
 - Tzou will gather recommendations, write an explanation for each to include how they will make the process more efficient. This will go to candidates as well.

**MOTION BY NITTA TO SUPPORT ADOPTION OF RECOMMENDATIONS PUT FORTH BY CCPT
SECONDED BY SHAYNE
PASSED WITHOUT DISSENT**

CEL Course Designation Conversation Revisited

Paola Rodriguez Hidalgo, Deanna Kennedy, Natalia Dyba

- Why a CEL course designation?
 - Student visibility
 - Supports assessment of community engaged learning and campus-wide learning goals
 - Enhances quality
 - Addresses Carnegie question: *“Does the institution have a definition, standard components, and a process for identifying community-engaged courses?”*
- Two processes currently happening at once:
 - Tri-campus UW wide CEL definition and registrar tagging
 - UWB internal process for designating CEL courses
- Creative and feedback loops:
 - Carnegie Curricular working group created initial draft course process in 2018
 - 2020-21 Community Engagement Council Curricular/Co-Curricular working group draft course designation process
 - GFO EC - tri campus CEL definition update
 - Consult with Grace, CCASC chair to make sure it aligns with curricular procedures
 - 1st draft form and rubric shared with full CE Council for feedback. CE Council faculty provided individual and collective feedback
 - 2nd draft shared with a couple faculty in each School outside of CE Council for feedback
 - 3rd drafts compiled
 - Review course designation process with CCASC for feedback
 - GFO EC – UWB CEL internal process, form, rubric update
 - Advisors Council, and Academic Directors of each School for feedback
 - Finalize process with CCASC
 - Review process, form and rubric with GFO EC
 - Pilot CEL course designation process in 2021-22, slow roll out with target number of courses approved. Start with ongoing CBLR courses
- Goals for today:
 - Respond to proposed CEL designation process
 - Talk about moving forward with piloting the process and assigning the CEL designation in Autumn quarter while continuing to collect feedback from faculty to refine the process
- Issues for GFO EC input re: proposed process:
 - CBLR Office as primary owner/ manager of the CEL designation process
 - Faculty voice in approving CEL forms
 - Grandfathering in existing, ongoing CBLR courses to have the CEL designation
- Feedback loops since May 2021 meeting:
 - Campus Council on Assessment of Learning (CCAL)
 - School Curriculum Committees
 - Received: Business, IAS, NHS
 - Pending: STEM, SES

- Community of Professional Advisors (CPA)
- Undergraduate Academic Advising Leadership Council (UAALC)
- Feedback received. Major suggestions/concerns:
 - Concern about the CEL form being too cumbersome and setting the bar too high -> discouraging
 - Recognized need for process to be formative; training
 - Concern about standing CEL designation for non-field/ applied experience classes due to:
 - quality control of community partnerships,
 - “forcing” faculty to engage in CEL when not prepared
 - Articulate purpose of pursuing the designation
 - Provide definitions and examples of "sticky" terms like reciprocal, just and equitable development
 - Add “sustainable” to "Just and Equitable Impact"
 - Confusion about CEL form also asking to list
 - other designations
- Next steps:
 - Do you have feedback before the CBLR Office moves forward with the proposed CEL designation process to be piloted during Autumn 2021?
 - Do you have feedback about the continued incorporation of faculty feedback into the draft CEL designation form and rubric as the pilot process is rolled out?
 - What role should the GFO EC have in this process as it moves forward?

Questions/Feedback

- Concern of process being too cumbersome could be remedied with training and guidance for faculty
- What are staff/financial impact for CBLR? Has this been vetted through Carolyn Brennan, head of Office of Connected Learning which oversees CBLR?
 - VCAA needs to be informed of how this process (admin support with faculty feedback) is going to be managed and the impact on staff. Faculty are delegating a curricular change process to staff. Need to take a closer look at that.
 - Faculty will shepherd review process and will be supported by CBLR staff and will receive some sort of release or stipend to do that work
 - VCAA cannot support moving pilot forward in Fall until impacts are better understood. Winter or Spring instead.
 - Since process will not involve GFO council support, unnecessary for EC to vote on anything but good to bring final plan back to EC in Fall for final feedback
- Is there a way to retroactively apply the CEL designation?
 - No, but hopefully one day
- What happens if a course is designated CBLR but partners back out?
 - CBLR office will help come up with a solution to ensure it stays a CBLR course
- In formalizing courses as CBLR is there an incentive for faculty? Why is this something they might want to do? How does this impact the organic way that a lot of community partnerships occur? What are the ethical questions issues that may arise in formalizing CBLR courses?
 - Work already being done, this is just moving it to a more transparent and formalized process

Chair’s summary and suggestion is that working group working directly with VCAA’s office to clarify questions and bring back the EC for review in Fall quarter for a perspective Winter pilot program.

Vote on Course Cancellation Policy

Policy has gone through iterations from schools and CAD and there are currently no remaining concerns for now. Once EC approves, policy will go on to Chancellor and VCAA for final review and approval.

NITTA MOVED TO APPROVE THE COURSE CANCELLATION POLICY

MARCH SECONDED

PASSED WITH DISSENT

EC 2021/22 Planning

Naranjo welcomed incoming GFO VC (EC chair), Shauna Carlisle and asked council to provide feedback on next year's EC meetings to include if meeting in person or online is preferred.

- Suggestion to have a mixture (some in person, some online) during meetings for flexibility and accessibility
 - Concern raised that such meetings are less productive and those remoting in are at a disadvantage. Those in the room will be tended to more.
 - Technology needed to effectively run an effective in-person/online meeting (i.e. good central microphone) is not available
- Concern raised that in-person meetings will be a health risk to those with compromised immune systems or those who are unable to get vaccinated
- Suggestion to meet once or twice in person during quarter and hold all other meetings online
 - Online meetings have shown to be more productive
 - People who are on campus can join from their offices
- Suggestion to commit to doing meetings online in Fall quarter and readdress for Winter quarter
- Suggestion to meet online but have a quarterly dinner as a way to connect
- Need campus guidance around what in-person is going to look like. Lot of stress around this

Chair summarized that conversation will have to continue as more clear direction comes from campus.

Naranjo thanked everyone for their service and recognized the work done and work started by EC in 2020/21

Meeting Adjourned

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:45am
The next EC meeting Oct 12