

Executive Council Meeting

May 4, 2020, 8:45 – 10:45am, via Zoom

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

Guests: Sharon Jones, Grace Lasker Paola Rodriguez Hidalgo, Kara Adams

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

Welcome, Check-in, Updates

Naranjo welcomed all, reminded council that 2 remaining EC meetings of year will focus on:

- Debrief sessions with GFO council chairs in order to be well-positioned for next year
- Naranjo and Nitta will meet with CAD, report back to EC regarding Course Cancellation Policy and Covid-19 Statement. Unsure if Course Cancellation Policy will go through this year.
- EC will review a Cybersecurity 1503
- Need to determine if EC will meet in-person or via Zoom next year.
 - Invite new GFO VC (Shauna Carlisle) to meeting in which that decision will be made

Nitta announced that the council on campus safety is holding two listening sessions regarding UWB renewing contract with Bothell PD, encouraged all to attend and provide feedback.

Adoption of Minutes: Minutes Approved

Update on COVID P&T Statement

Naranjo reported out the Provost has not reviewed Covid statement yet but Provost Office suggested following changes to ensure statement doesn't change expectations: a) provide preamble for intent of document, b) tighten language to UW Bothell specific c) ensure Chancellor and VCAA are both support
What can/should EC do now to focus on supporting colleagues currently going through P&T process while also considering down range implications? Naranjo opened discussion to council:

Discussion

- If UWB is not changing expectations, what is the purpose of the statement?
 - Intended to signal to all reviewers that UWB collectively recognizes impact of pandemic on professional trajectories (some more than others), hopefully signaling compassion
 - Schools/units currently revamping P&T policies to better articulate expectations which makes this more challenging as well
- Business EFC held emergency meeting on issues. Major themes:
 - What is the purpose?
 - Unanimous consensus that while statement recognizes impact of pandemic and conveys values, it doesn't help on it's own.
 - Need to provide internally-focused support structure for faculty currently going through P&T process (help writing dossiers, presenting case, etc.)
 - Using statement (especially without support from Provost) could be burden and create problems for candidates
 - Share statement with committees, Deans, EFCs but be explicit that not supported by Provost
 - Faculty have lost time during pandemic and should be given chance to make up lost ground.
 - Support would be needed to determine that on case-by-case basis
- Will including statement hurt faculty going up for P&T since Provost doesn't support it?
- Teaching-track aren't required to go up for promotion but are still impacted, still need raises/support

- Statement will remind everyone what happened (teaching suddenly moved on line, campus shut down, etc.). Statement addresses that so burden to explain doesn't fall on Deans or candidates. This is UW Bothell taking a stance, telling the story to external reviewers
- Statement is not a mandate. Idea is to put it in Interfolio and candidates can opt to use it or not
- Context provides lens from which a situation is understood. Statement provides UWB context without individual faculty having to relive traumatic experience
- Before Provost reviews, Provost Office suggested providing preamble for intent of document, tightening language to be Bothell specific, ensure chancellor and VCAA support.
 - UWB gets to define standards within faculty code. UWB standards ARE different than UW Seattle. Provost trying to put within context of guidelines.
 - Alignment is important. Could be challenging for UWB faculty to include statement not supported by Provost. VCAA confident that Provost office is open to discussion and listening
- School of Arts and Sciences at UW Seattle is using STEM draft of Covid19 statement as template.
 - Broader political value for UWB to support - circulate statement to build solidarity
- EC needs to consider two pieces: How to support colleagues going through P&T process right now and how to put collective pressure on system to recognize statement
- Need to ensure current version of statement is agreed upon by EC as the faculty draft and clearly marked as a working draft, explicitly stating it has not been seen by Provost, Chancellor
 - Newest/revised version clearly states that UW Bothell standards have not changed as a result of the pandemic. Do we want to commit to not changing standards?
- Statement intended to provide coverage this year and future years
- Council agrees (via non-binding vote) that newest revised version is agreed-upon working draft to be circulated again to EFCs, Deans, CAD and then to Chancellor and Provost and AAUP
 - Need to add statement describe remaining steps:
 - Full circulation and socializing in school EFCs, CCPT, CAD, to solicit input
 - Circulation to AAUP, Chancellor, Provost
 - Contingency plan for those going through P&T cycle now?
 - Circulate working draft to committee chairs and Deans (to provide to candidates) to be used as optional boiler plate language. Specify not formally approved.
 - Include disclaimer that there is a chance this could disadvantage candidates, if Provost ends up not approving
 - Language is well crafted but could be challenging for candidates to pull from. Still valuable to offer it to candidates
- Possible outcomes over the next few weeks:
 - Provost approves statement
 - Provost requests further revisions
 - Provost does not support. What would EC do in this case?
 - Marshal collective response, engage respectively in dissent, engage in mediated conversations with Provost
- Need to revise preamble to make it clear that it is not part of statement.
 - Suggest calling it "operation guidelines" rather than preamble

Naranjo summarized that the statement will be cleaned up, remaining steps added, and then circulated to EFC chairs, CCPT chair, CAD and then on to Chancellor, Provost, AAUP. Deans will be asked to share statement with candidates, letting them know they can borrow language for their dossiers.

Course CEL Designation

Kara Adams, Community Engagement and Paola Rodríguez Hidalgo, STEM

Adams and Rodriguez updated the council on the Community Engagement Council Curricular/Co-curricular working group draft of a Community-Engaged Learning (CEL) course designation process, form, and rubric.

- Designation important so students can find Community Engaged courses and so that courses can be tracked. Want designation to improve process, not present roadblock
- Need to have process in place before 2024 Carnegie review
- Two things happening:
 - Determining UWB internal process for designating CEL courses
 - Tri-campus working on CEL definition
- Have received feedback on rubric and other entities. Need to ensure definition aligns with the type of learning happening at UWB. This will take multiple iterations.

Discussion:

- Suggest getting feedback from Campus Council on Assessment and Learning (CCAL) since this would be used for assessing learning goals.
 - Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum (CCASC) has provided feedback but not CCAL.
 - This is 3rd iteration after CCASC reviewed and discussed levels/orders of approval (3 levels: CBLR, School, CCASC). Still need to get details ironed out, to include if CBLR would go through endorsement process as ASUWB does.
- Cannot use “CEL” as course designation due to it being 3 letters, other options are “S” (previously used for “service” learning) but all 3 campuses want to move away from “service learning” nomenclature), or use “E” for engage. Should be settled late Spring or early Fall. Want students to be able to find courses easily. Working on making visible in “My Plan” and searchable in time schedule.
 - Suggest challenging why 3 letters can’t be used. May not be actual policy.
- Still working on how requests will be submitted, who will review them, and in what order
 - Will be a different process for established courses vs. new courses. Still a lot of questions around process and functionality and how to best engage campus, tri-campus, etc.
- EC will need to see a clear pathway in the process before a vote can happen and have grandfathering process so faculty don’t have to go through unnecessary hoops.
 - Working group trying to be mindful in front end to make process streamlined.
- Suggested next steps from EC?
 - Coordinate with CCAL on rubric and standards
 - Work with CCASC to finalize process
 - Share final forms before Jun 1 EC meeting
 - Reach out to curricular committees in schools and divisions
 - Invite Pam Lundquist (registrar) into conversation

Nitta thanked everyone and adjourned meeting on behalf of chair, who had to leave meeting 30 minutes early due to another campus obligation.

10:45am: Adjourn

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri

Meeting adjourned at 10:45am

The next EC meeting May 18