GFO Executive Council Annual Report 2019/2020

Executive Council Meetings held in 2019/2020:
Autumn Quarter 2019
- October 8, 2019 - UW1 - 280 (Rose Room) - Joint EC/CCPB meeting
- October 22, 2019 - UW1 361
- November 5, 2019 - UW1 361
- November 19, 2019 - UW1 361
- December 3, 2019 - UW1 361

Winter Quarter 2020
- ~~January 14, 2020~~ - UW2 327
  Canceled - campus closed due to inclement weather
- January 28, 2020 - UW2 327
- February 11, 2020 - UW2 327
- February 25, 2020 - UW2 327

Spring Quarter 2020
- April 7, 2020 - via Zoom
- ~~April 21, 2020 - via Zoom~~
  Canceled in accordance with Governor's emergency proclamation issued 3/24/20 in response to Covid-19.
- ~~May 5, 2020 - via Zoom~~
  Canceled in accordance with Governor's emergency proclamation issued 3/24/20 in response to Covid-19.
- May 19, 2020 - via Zoom

Executive Council, Campus Council on Planning and Budget Joint Meeting
October 8, 2019, 8:45 a.m., Rose Room

Present:
Executive Council: Keith Nitta (Chair), SeungKeun Choi, Steve Holland, Nora Kenworthy, Minda Martin, Jason Naranjo, Alice Pederson and David Socha
CCPB: David Socha, Chair, Chancellor Yeigh, Interim VCAP Shankar, VCAA Jones, Segan Jobe and Jamie Shirley

Guests: Robin Angotti, Andreas Brockhaus, Ching-In Chen, Shari Dworkin, Dan Jacoby, Jeff Potter, Julie Shayne and Steve Walline

Nitta welcomed the Executive Council, the Campus Council on Planning and Budget and guests to a joint meeting for a discussion on the RCM budget. He opened the meeting with introductions.
- Keith Nitta, IAS faculty member and Vice Chair of the GFO
- Minda Martin, EC faculty representative for IAS
- Jason Naranjo, EC faculty for Educational Studies
- Steve Holland, EC faculty representative for Business (substituting Surya Pathak)
- Nora Kenworthy, EC faculty representative for Nursing and Health Studies
- Alice Pederson, EC faculty representative for FYPP
- Barbara Van Sant, administrative support for the EC and CCPB
- David Socha, STEM faculty, Chair of the GFO and Chair of the CCPB
- SeungKeun Choi, EC faculty representative for STEM
- Robin Angotti, STEM faculty, Interim Director of UWB Teaching and Learning Center
- Jamie Shirley, CCPB faculty representative for Nursing and Health Studies
- Shari Dworkin, Dean, Nursing and Health Studies

- Sharon Jones, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Gowri Shankar, Interim Vice Chancellor of Planning and Administration
- Wolf Yeigh, UWB Chancellor
- Andreas Brockhaus, Executive Director of the Office of Digital Learning & Innovation
- Dan Jacoby, IAS faculty
- Ching-In Chen, IAS faculty
- Segan Jobe, Senior Director, Planning and Administration
- Steve Walline, Planning Analyst, UWB: Institutional Planning and Budget
- Jeff Potter, Planning Analyst, UWB: Institutional Planning and Budget

Nitta opened discussion on the RCM budget with a brief overview of the consultation process. After 27 years of incremental budgeting, UW Bothell adopted the modified Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) model in FY18. Campus leadership, in consultation with the RCM Review Team comprised of the Deans of each of the Schools, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Learning (AVCUL) who oversees First Year & Pre-major Programs (FYPP), and the chair of the General Faculty Organization (GFO) supported a rebasing of the RCM model.

The EC, CCPB and others then reviewed the rebased RCM model:
- The State of the UWB Campus Budget (FY 2019)
- Schools Carryover for the Biennium
- RCM Model and the Need for Rebasing FY20 allocations
- Review Team recommendations on Rebasing FY20

Primary sources of operating funds are derived from state appropriations and tuition revenue and student FTE. Permanent funding distributions include salaries and benefits, compensation changes and institutional fixed costs. Sources of operating funds:
- State appropriation - 30%
- Tuition - 70%

Temporary funds sourced from carry over and other activities are used for the campus reserve and escalating mandated costs, leases, utilities and central funding gaps.

The RCM pool is derived from the tuition pool. Tuition is driven by enrollment or tuition increases. Student FTE pool will determine the allocation of funds to academic units.

EC, CCPB discussion points
- What is the RCM strategy? To align a funding mechanism to activity levels and address issues now before they become more pervasive.
- In AY 2018-19 there were surpluses in four Schools and FYPP and a deficient in one School (STEM).
- Carry over is healthy and the 2% increase in tuition will likely address merit and promotion funding.
- We will need to find funding to address salary equalization, compression and inversion issues.
- Where will funding come from, the campus does not want to remove services or programs? Units need to build reserves / pools to address funding issues.
- In 6 years, campus expenses will out weigh our revenue and temporary funds. RCM rebasing is activity linked budgeting based upon at enrollment (FTE), headcount and degrees granted.
- Graduate programs are more costly, although they bring in more tuition.
- Schools could choose to build graduate programs over undergraduate programs.
- There are equity issues on service courses. These courses provide services needed, enrollment is higher for these courses and they are usually taught by adjuncts or lecturers, often women and underrepresented minorities. Lecturers have higher teaching loads than tenure-track faculty. Equity issues need to be addressed.
- Schools will need to develop clear fiscal policies following the guiding principles and strategic priorities.

- What happens if a School does not go in the direction that faculty want? Who puts the brakes on?
- School elected faculty councils need to work with deans and bylaws should establish guidelines.
- We must know our parameters, what programs can we grow, which should be limited?
- The autonomy of RCM budgeting within Schools should provide more transparency for academic units. With this responsibility, school Faculty Councils should be proactive in Schools and budgets should be revisited every biennium. Faculty will need to work closely with their Deans.
- School bylaws should support strong governance within the Schools.
- How will faculty and staff rights be protected? Schools will need to adopt policies to protect these rights.
- Faculty Councils and shared processes in Schools should support partnerships between faculty, staff and Deans. The VCAA also acts in the best interest of Schools.
- The 10% institutional reserve is the UWB operating reserve. Can Schools also build a reserve fund? Schools could build a reserve fund to create investment funds or for other uses negotiated by the Faculty Council and the Deans.
- Are School carry over funds returned to the Schools? A 15% tax is assessed on School carry over funds to be sent to Central funding. 85% goes to the VCAA to be determined how to be utilized.
- School planning will need to align with enrollment.
- Why was the enrollment pause enacted? It was decided based on space constraints and operating support. Operating support to sustain students and programs was at capacity. State funding does not rise with FTE.
- Our guiding principles will inform our decision-making.
- One of the guiding principles: Incentivize cross/interdisciplinarity and the RCM model could lead to competition in practice. How will the principles be encouraged with the new model? Perhaps we could provide funding for Schools that are teaching outside their School.
- How might we remove barriers to crossdisciplinarity?
- Collaboration is necessary for the guiding principles to be prioritized, empower School autonomy to build in fairness.
- RCM rebasing recommendations:
  > Office of Undergraduate Learning (including FYPP) funded first
    - This retains some incentive structure for Schools to teach Discovery courses
  > $250k directly funded to each School (for Administrative support)
  > $1m set aside from total RCM pool for Subvention Funding
  > Rest of the RCM pool distributed on the following activity metrics:
    - Metrics (1 year retrospective, 1 year prospective, equally weighted)
      > RCM FTE – 80%
      > Major Headcount – 15%
      > Degrees Granted – 5%
      > Minor Headcount to be added within Degrees Granted portion
  > UG & Grad pools allocated separately to Schools
  > RCM Activity pool approx. 90% of total funding to Schools.
- Subvention $1 million set aside for mission allows us to support the mission of our Schools.
- There are different compositions within the Schools, lecture faculty, tenure track, expenditure guidelines will vary.
- Minor headcount needs to be factored into the model. Will it be prorated at 5%?
- There are administrative costs to running minors, advising, faculty, curriculum committees.
- The Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum could become involved in curricular matters reviewing competitive issues in the curriculum.
- Decision outcomes:
  o This model is…

- ▪ Dynamic: 90% of funding tied to activity
  - ▪ Slow(ish) moving: 50% retrospective
- Growth schools will struggle to bridge themselves due to limited reserves at an Academic Unit level.
- Schools below a certain enrollment threshold, will always need subvention support for their mission critical operations
- Since 90% of the funding is based upon FTE, the RCM allocation is basically modeling enrollment.
- In the short-term, the RCM model could result in reduced enrollments and reduced income.
- Schools could get less funding than last year, even with the same enrollment [Note: after the meeting, Gowri clarified that this statement was incorrect, that schools with the same enrollment should expect equivalent funding to the prior year]. 90% flows with activity.
- Is it a desirable outcome to cut School that are trying to grow? With the nature of our facilities, that may need to happen.
- Will the enrollment pause result in a deficit?
- We need to find reasonable resolution, that may mean we need to revisit allocations before the next biennium.
- One year of data points will help make informed decisions.
- We must have laser focus on growth. Growth, if any, will be very focused, e.g., for pedagogical reasons, or we pause our enrollments and do the best with what we have. We must be strategic and maintain balance. We don't have a pool to grow to fill our growth appetite. State funding is frozen.
- There must be constraint within the system so that a School does not lose enrollment or funding.
- Why is subvention funding based upon a fixed amount ($1 million) instead of a percentage of the pool?
- Set firm allocations to support a structure we are committed to.
- Look at the expenditure plan of Schools, is $1 million enough for subvention fund?
- Bridge funding was not identified in the budget.
- Decision making now will influence our budget in the future.

Processing moving forward:
- Chancellor
- Review team
- Leadership team
- School Councils

Nitta thanked all the participants.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant
Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am
Next EC meeting will be October 22, 2019

Executive Council Meeting
October 22, 2019, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), SeungKeun Choi, Steve Holland, Nora Kenworthy, Minda Martin, Jason Naranjo, Alice Pederson and David Socha

Guests: VCAA Sharon Jones, Robin Angotti, Becca Price, Carolyn Brennan and Maria Anderson

Adoption of Agenda, Approval of EC Minutes
The agenda was adopted. EC/CCPB minutes of October 11, 2019 were approved.

Socha thanked Professor Price for meeting with the EC to discuss a proposal for an amendment to the GFO Bylaws.

CCPT Check-In: Becca Price, Chair
- UWB GFO CCPT By-Laws Revision

Professor Price opened discussion on the GFO CCPT By-Laws Revision:

ORIGINAL: "Members of the CCPTFA shall recuse themselves from promotion and tenure cases originating from within their own Schools."

NEW: "Members of the CCPT shall recuse themselves from promotion and tenure cases for which they have participated in their division or school faculty's review and vote."

The amendment addresses some of the problems that the CCPT has been facing this year. It will help to streamline the review process and ease the workload of Council members. It allows members of CCPT from divisionalized Schools to vote on cases in divisions other than their own. It will also allow faculty to recuse themselves from votes within their division or School if their priority is to participate in the vote by CCPT.

Price opened discussion on other issues that the CCPT is addressing:
- The Council's letter to the VCAA on each candidate. A new template has been recommended to the VCAA to streamline the CCPT letter, outlining evidence in the dossier with bullet-points. Discussions have also been held on sharing the CCPT letter with the candidates as a feedback mechanism.
- Student Evaluations. UWB implements a practice of submitting evaluations from all of a candidate's classes for the year, UWS is requiring only one student evaluation per year from a candidate. UWB has set its own guidelines, units could adopt different guidelines.
- The Council would like to create a record of CCPT materials.
- Price stated that OEHR is working closely with the CCPT to streamline processes and avoid delays.

EC discussion points
- We need to consider where a website can be created to host the CCPT materials.
- One of the major problems the CCPT is facing is the composition of the Council and the requirement that members recuse themselves for cases originating from within their Schools. This has left the Council without a sufficient number of full professors to review cases this year since all full professors serving on the Council are from one School.
- In the past, a committee of the fulls was formed to review P&T cases from associate to full when Schools did not have an adequate number of full professors for P&T review.
- Can a separate committee be called to review cases? The CCPT representatives are elected by the GFO, how would a separate committee be constituted?
- It was recommended that the at-large representatives be full professors, but this recommendation was not adopted by the GFO.
- Further discussions are also needed on how to ensure the constitution of the CCPT will include some full professors.

EC motion
Holland moved to pass the motion:
> The EC approves the proposed CCPT amendment to the GFO Bylaws:

"Members of the CCPT shall recuse themselves from promotion and tenure cases for which they have participated in their division or school faculty's review and vote."

The motion was seconded.

Socha called the question, there was no further discussion. The motion carried, unanimously.

Socha thanked Professor Price.

UWB Center Authorization/Reauthorization Process: Carolyn Brennan, Office of Research
Carolyn Brennan, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Research gave a brief overview of the policy for the authorization and reauthorization of Centers at UWB. The policy, developed in 2007 implements the approval process for each new center or each existing center that is reauthorized for an initial period of five years, at the end of which time the center authorization will expire unless formally reauthorized. The Office of Research supports multi-disciplinary collaboration and helps coordinate the review process and works with faculty to guide institutional expertise to support new centers. The Office of Research will assist faculty in developing a proposal for a new center and all proposed centers must follow this process regardless of external designation. The charter for a new center would describe the purpose and proposed administrative and fiscal structure of the organization, in alignment with the mission of the campus. We have three centers at UWB, the Goodlad Institute, the Center on Reinventing Public Education (CRPE) and the Center for Information Assurance & Cybersecurity.

EC discussion points
- There were also two other centers, the Student Entrepreneurship Center and the Business Development Center.The Business Development Center was a fund-raising body.
- Centers are to be financially self-sustaining. They must not require campus resources.
- Centers are to be aligned with and supportive of the UWB educational mission.
- The center charter needs to state the impact on programs, curricula and other campus services.
- The re-authorization process will look at the accomplishments of the center and assess whether the center is self-sustaining at the 5-year mark.
- Can Schools support a center to get started?
- What is the value added of have a center on the campus?
- Some centers are a tri-campus endeavor. The Goodlad Institute is transitioning from a tri-campus institute to a UWB institute. Goodlad will be housed in Educational Studies, how will this impact faculty use and UW wide access?
- UWB uses policy guidelines from UWS.
- Opportunity grants are available for centers, the Office of Research assists faculty with finding these resources.

EC motion
Holland moved to pass the motion:
  The EC approves the UWB Center Authorization/Reauthorization Process.
The motion was seconded.

Socha called the question, there was no further discussion. The motion carried, unanimously.

Socha thanked Carolyn Brennan.

Campus Climate Survey: Maria Anderson
Maria Anderson, UWB Communications Director spoke to the EC about the UW climate survey for students, staff and faculty. The survey has a designated UWB section for our campus. Anderson stressed the importance of getting a high participation rate and asked the EC for feedback on how to encourage participation. There are incentives for students with gift cards to the UW Bookstore.

EC discussion points

- Some students and others have identity concerns. Anderson reassured the EC that all identifying information is removed. Survey results are sent to an external company, Rankin.
- The survey does not allow you to answer questions, pause and return to the survey. The survey must be completed at one sitting. This may be one reason that there have been low participation rates. Anderson stated that questions can be skipped which will allow participants to move through the survey faster.
- Email survey have the lowest response rate. It may be helpful to pair it with another method, focus group, phone survey.
- We need to look at the research methodology, data collected drives outcomes.

The EC will encourage participation within their Schools. Socha thanked Maria Anderson.

How work with UWT / UWS on the future of shared governance at each campus?

Professor Angotti shared information and updated the EC on the status of discussions with UWT and UWS on the future of shared governance at each campus. UWT has initiated dialog with UWS and formed a steering committee to work on proposing changes to the practice of shared governance within the tri-campus system. There are inequities between UWS and UWB/UWT in areas of faculty representation on the Senate, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget and other UW governance councils and committees. There are also inequities in UWB's representation on the Board of Deans and Chancellors. The Deans of UWB and UWT are not represented on this body, only the Chancellors. The question that the EC and leadership on this campus needs to consider is where is representation needed for our voice to be heard? UWB will need to make decisions on the structural balance we wish to have within the tri-campus system.

EC discussion points

- One of the critical areas that need the UWB faculty voice is promotion and tenure issues. There are inequities in working conditions and workload across the campuses.
- How do we set our criterial in these matters?
- There are also resource inequities.
- The Faculty Code governs all three campuses, we will need to amend the Faculty Code.
- What do we want to change? It is time to begin the dialog.
- Professor Angotti is the Faculty Senate Vice Chair and she is a strong advocate for UWB.
- Budgetary matters are decided for the tri-campus system without adequate representation from UWB and UWT.
- How do we define our association with UWS and UWT.
- We can begin to align around the UWB strategic plan.

The EC will gather input and feedback from their School to begin to strategize on this matter.

Reports from Program Representatives

A. Business – Steve Holland

B. FYPP – Alice Pederson

C. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo
The School will adopt bylaws and elect a Faculty Council on October 25, 2019.

D. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Minda Martin

E. Nursing and Health Studies – Nora Kenworthy

F. STEM – SeungKeun Choi

Good of the Order
Socha reported on the adoption of time blocking on campus. This change could shift class starting time.

EC members are invited to join the Campus Design Review Team on Facilities and Planning and the Technology Advisory Committee (TAC), Socha and Martin are currently members on TAC.

Holland is serving on an Interfolio review committee, he encourages faculty that have used Interfolio the last year to provide feedback on the P&T process using the platform to the committee.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant
Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am
The next EC meeting will be November 5, 2019

Executive Council Meeting
November 5, 2019, 8:45 a.m., UW1 361

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), SeungKeun Choi, Nora Kenworthy, Minda Martin, Jason Naranjo, Surya Pathak, Alice Pederson and David Socha

Guests: VCAA Sharon Jones, Robin Angotti and Grace Lasker

Adoption of Agenda, Approval of EC Minutes
        The agenda was adopted. EC minutes of October 22, 2019 were approved.

Nitta welcomed the new representative from the School of Business, Surya Pathak to the EC. He thanked VCAA Jones for meeting with the EC to discuss the re-organization of Academic Affairs.

Sharon Jones, Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs: VCAA Office Restructuring
VCAA Jones gave a brief overview of the re-organization process. She has conducted a review of organizational structures and has met with key campus groups to gather feedback to align academic goals with the mission of the organization. The VCAA is conducting ongoing listening sessions with School Deans, the faculty and administrative staff among other groups in a collaborative effort to determine the strengths and opportunities across campus and to provide an organizational structure in Academic Affairs (AA) that supports our faculty, staff, and students. She discussed the priorities that Academic Affairs is developing and opened discussion on the organizational chart and new administrative structure in AA.

EC discussion points
- There is about a 33% change in the organizational chart with new positions.
- New portfolios of academic staff will support faculty and staff development and student success:
    o Associate VCAA, Cross-disciplinary, Connected Learning & Community Engagement Initiatives
    o Associate VCAA, Faculty and Staff Excellence
    o Associate VCAA, Student Success
- Learning Communities, Pedagogy Advancement, Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
    o Teaching and Learning Center
    o Writing Center
    o Quantitative Skills Center
- The Writing Center and the Quantitative Skills Center will be separate from the Teaching and Learning Center.
- Graduate programs currently do not have someone overseeing programs for cross campus collaboration. Do we need support in this area?

- RCM budgeting will allow Schools to be more autonomous, but this budgeting model may also create competition for FTE. We need to work closely to be collaborative.
- Some services and support functions are better administered at a centralized level, some will work better at the School or decentralized level. We need to determine the balance.
- We also need to identify high impact practices for students. New administrative positions will help address this area.
- Community engagement will need to be supported.
- Diversity and equity are strong foundational principles of this campus, we need to maintain support for these.
- Metrics will be an important tool to determine how new administrative positions are delivering support and service.
- The VCAA will help to establish clarity on deliverables through dialog with the faculty.
- How will the administration support our work? The addition of new positions and cost will need to be factored over time. How is the function of these positions tied to outcome?
- What will success look like? How do we measure areas of improvement? What metrics do we use?
- The faculty voice must be integrated into the process across all ranks. Faculty engagement must be encouraged. Faculty involvement could be integrated into the system through hiring faculty in key positions.
- What are the best mechanisms to encourage faculty involvement while being aware of faculty workload? There are differences in Schools with workload issues, smaller Schools deal with higher service impacts on their faculty.
- There is the financial component to the re-organization plan. Academic Affairs is centrally funded from 30% of the campus budget, Schools receive 70% of the budget.
- One consideration in the re-organization is duplication of roles and effort. Are new layers re-distributing work that is being done on campus? We need to work more efficiently.
- There are Sponsored Research, Cross-campus Research Connections and the Research Centers and the Office of Research in the organization, how will these all be funded?
- We need a feedback mechanism to evaluate the impact of programs and initiatives.
- There are new positions to support undergraduate research programs, how can we fund these initiatives?
- The administrative structure will need to find resources, we need to be innovative as a campus. One area of funding could be online learning. Support for online learning needs to be strengthened. Strategic development and a strong collaboration with Academic Affairs is needed to consolidate support in this area.
- Create one functional work space for pedagogical development of online learning. A team dedicated in one place can direct help within the team to support faculty.
- Communication across the campus will foster a greater level of faculty engagement:
  - Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, Associate Vice Chancellors
  - Deans, Associate Deans
  - Faculty Councils (members can rotate service on committees)
  - Advisors
  - Library Administrators
  - Students and staff
- This is a governance issue; the EC is a conduit for the faculty voice along with Faculty Councils in the Schools.

The next step in the process will be for the EC representatives to gather feedback and input from their faculty and forward that feedback to VCAA Jones. The VCAA will come back to the EC with financials on the re-organization plan and review that information and any updates based on EC feedback. Nitta thanked VCAA Jones for meeting with the EC to discuss the re-organization process.

CCASC Check-In: Grace Lasker

Nitta welcomed Professor Lasker to the EC and thanked her for updating the EC on the Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum. Professor Lasker, Chair of the Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum (CCASC) gave a brief overview of the charge of the Council to review curriculum and program changes, ensuring that academic standards are maintained across the campus. The Council is also working on initiatives from last year including processing of program changes and course applications within the curriculum management system and the role of the CCASC and the VCAA in this process. Lasker also works with UW tri-campus systems for the coordination of curriculum. UWB has policies and standards and UWS has the Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). Neither UWB nor UWT has representation on FCAS currently, although that may change. Policies were created by FCAS without the approval of the Faculty Senate and there is a process underway to codify these policies.

EC discussion points
- It would be helpful to provide clarification on UWB's curricular policies and standards. Faculty could have a greater understanding of the CCASC's policies and requirements for curricular review if these standards were accessible to the faculty.
- What level of authority does the CCASC exercise over School's curriculum? Some School's courses have been returned to the Schools for revisions based on the CCASC's assessment.
- Some courses are tied to professional certification and State accreditation which mandates learning objectives and other requirements to be detailed in the syllabus and course application. The CCASC needs to be aware of these requirements.
- School standards should be respected in course development.
- The CCASC has a supportive role in curricular review and communication with Schools.
- A template syllabus, with annotated terminology of the requirements of essential elements composing a syllabus would be helpful, a best practices document for faculty to reference.
- How do we measure assurance of learning yearly at the campus level on service courses and other programs across the curriculum? These are foundational level courses.

Nitta asked Lasker how the EC could help support the work of the CCASC. Lasker will ask the Council for feedback and input on this and communicate with the EC.

Tri-campus Restructuring
VCAA Jones opened a discussion on tri-campus restructuring, Chancellor Yeigh is involved in ongoing dialog with UWS and UWT on the future of shared governance at each campus. UWB leadership has begun internal conversations on proposing changes to the practice of shared governance within the tri-campus system. The Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (FCTCP) is charged with facilitating a conversation on tri-campus governance and forwarding legislation to the Faculty Senate if changes to the Faculty Code are proposed. UWT has formed a steering committee to work on proposing changes to the practice of shared governance within the tri-campus system. There are inequities between UWS and UWB/UWT in areas of faculty representation on the Senate, the Senate Committee on Planning and Budget and other UW governance councils and committees. There are also inequities in UWB's representation on the Board of Deans and Chancellors. The Deans of UWB and UWT are not represented on this body, only the Chancellors. Another area of critical concern are issues of shared governance in our promotion and tenure system. UWB will need to make decisions on the structural balance we wish to have within the tri-campus system.

EC discussion points
- There are also resource inequities between the campuses. This should be a consideration in our decision-making process.

- The FCTCP has a timeline for the analysis of their findings, UWB does not have to make decisions based on that timeline.
- UWB can work on an analysis, gather input from faculty on the issues with the academy and work on UWB recommendations that serve this campus.
- UWB and UWT will have separate decision-making processes on these issues.
- How do we define our association with UWS and UWT?
- We can begin to align around the UWB strategic plan.

The EC will gather input and feedback from their School to begin to strategize on this matter.

Reports from Program Representatives

G. Business – Surya Pathak

H. FYPP – Alice Pederson

I. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

J. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Minda Martin

K. Nursing and Health Studies – Nora Kenworthy

L. STEM – SeungKeun Choi

Good of the Order

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant
Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am
The next EC meeting will be November 19, 2019

Executive Council Meeting
November 19, 2019, UW1 361

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), SeungKeun Choi, Nora Kenworthy, Minda Martin, Jason Naranjo and David Socha

Absent: Surya Pathak and Alice Pederson

Guests: VCAA Sharon Jones and Alex Musselman

Adoption of Agenda, Approval of EC Minutes
        The agenda was adopted. EC minutes of November 5, 2019 were approved.

Nitta opened the meeting and welcomed Professor Alex Musselman, Chair of the Campus Council on Assessment and Learning.

Alex Musselman, Chair, Campus Council on Assessment and Learning: Check-In
Musselman reviewed the goals and priorities of the Campus Council on Assessment and Learning (CCAL).

CCAL goals and priorities for 2019-2020:

- Student evaluations of Teaching

- o What is the purpose of Student Evaluations of Teaching? What are we assessing?
  - o Tangibles
    - A list of practices that are used for student evaluations of teaching
    - A list of research into effective student evaluations.
    - Idealistic: Align and map practices to modules that provide meaningful student evaluations of teaching
- Learning Goals
  - o What is the purpose for campus wide undergrad learning goals? Who are they for?
  - o Tangibles
    - A list of learning goals for each school
    - A list of learning goals that are synergistic between schools.
    - A list of best practices for learning goals.
    - Compare synergies to past assessment of learning goals.
    - Idealistic: Align and map learning goals based off synergies between schools
    - Idealistic: Align and map learning goals based off of best practices for measurable learning goals.
- Do student evaluation of teaching align with learning goals?
- Approving campus wide learning goal for Community Engagement.
  - o Consult with Community Engagement action plan assessment components

EC discussion points

- The CCAL has discussed faculty concerns regarding the validity of Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) and how the data from the evaluations is used.
- SET forms predate UWB's undergraduate learning goals.
- We need a better understanding of what our SET measure and how they align with the campus undergraduate learning goals.
- Are there more authentic methods of assessment of student learning? What could we do instead of the current practice?
- We can begin to measure assessment in meaningful ways.
- There are methods of assessment that can be used as a reflection tool, showing reflection of what students and faculty learn in the classroom. This type of tool can better show active learning behaviors.
- We can modify the SET forms used, we have the authority to choose what we ask on SETs.
- Diversity in teaching is not reflected in the current forms. Some UWB Schools have developed questions on Diversity in their SET.
- Open-ended student responses are better markers for learning
- Written comments are useful for faculty to get a sense of their teaching.
- It is useful to conduct mid-quarter evaluations as well as exit evaluations. Mid-quarter evaluations can provide valuable information on how to adjust teaching strategies for student success. Mid-quarter evaluations provide real time feedback rather than summative assessment.
- What is important is how the data from SET is used.
- Quantitative measurements from SET are used in promotion and tenure.
- Some of the faculty feel that student evaluations should not be linked to promotion and tenure.
- Another area of faculty concern is inequity in the SET process. UWB and UWS do not have the same standards or requirements for this process.
- Issues of student bias in SETs have been a long-standing problem. How can we address this issue?

Musselman met with Robin Angotti, Faculty Senate Vice Chair to discuss student evaluations. UWB implements a practice of submitting evaluations from all of a candidate's classes for the year, UWS is requiring only one student evaluation per year from a candidate. UWB has set its own guidelines, units could adopt different guidelines. A tri-

campus task force has been reviewing student evaluations forms that the UW uses. CCAL discussions on learning goals have focused on revisiting the campus learning goals and assessment practices at UWB. A UWB working group addressed assessment of student learning in 2015 looking at each campus wide learning goal and reported on current practices in assessing student learning, initiating campus discussion on the undergraduate learning goals and proficiencies in each area.

EC discussion points

- CCAL can report on assessment practices across the campus in alignment with the undergraduate learning goals.
- CCAL could also conduct a review of the UWB campus learning goals and the integration of the new community engagement learning goal into the campus-wide goals.
- With the new strategic plan, this may be a good time to hold a conversation on the campus learning goals.
- Most Schools don't have assessment plans for the campus learning goals.
- Does the CCAL work with the UW Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS)? FCAS has set policies and procedures for the University without Faculty Senate authorization. The Senate will now review those policies that FCAS has implemented.
- North West Association of Schools and Colleges will conduct an accreditation review Winter 2021, recommendations from the last review called for a more rigorous process in the assessment of learning goals. All students must attain certain outcomes for graduation.   UWB was not systematic in their approach to assessment.
- The work of the CCAL will be very valuable in building assessment practices at this campus.

Nitta thanked Musselman for meeting with the EC and updating the Council on the work of the CCAL.

Community Engagement Council: Post-Carnegie, next steps - Deanna Kennedy and Kara Adams
Director Adams and Professor Kennedy updated the EC on the Carnegie process. A Recommendations Working Group of the Community Engagement Council helped develop a Community Engagement Action Plan. The EC reviewed the action plan and the role that various campus groups including the GFO EC and other GFO Councils will play in the implementation of the plan. The Carnegie process initiated an assessment of School learning goals to find alignment with community engagement learning goals and also to discover gaps in assessment across the campus. The 2019-2024 Community Engagement Action and Responsibility Plan outlines key areas to further UWB's Community Engagement Mission.

EC discussion points

- How do we measure community engaged learning? What indicators can be converted to student evaluations?
- Gather data on the progress of our students, exit surveys at 1, 3 and 5 year intervals. How are career and academic outcomes measured? Do our students make a change in the world?
- We need to have a systematic policy in place for assessment of learning goals.
- The CCAL will submit a proposal and rationale for a community engagement learning goal to be added to the current campus learning goals.
- The CCAL will revisit the campus undergraduate learning goals and report to the EC on recommendations.
- There are discussions on re-phrasing the learning goals to be action oriented.
- The EC can take the proposed learning goals to their Faculty Councils and then to a faculty vote,
- Faculty Councils should be involved in the community engagement process.
- How will community engagement work impact School strategic planning goals?
- The Office of Institutional Research could be part of the campus effort to gather data.

- There should be consultations with the Quantitative Skills Center and the Writing Center.
- The campus retreat would be a good place for a dialog on the campus learning goals.
- We should develop a philosophy of why we have our learning goals.
- We will need to develop a program evaluation process for how we incorporate learning goals into our systems.

Nitta thanked Adams and Kennedy for meeting with the EC and updating the Council on the status of the Carnegie classification and community engagement efforts at UWB.

Reports from Program Representatives

M. Business – no report

N. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo
Educational Studies will hold a vote on the School bylaws this week. The School has been engaged in a reorganization of their governance structure. They will have an elected governance structure with no Associate Deans.

O. FYPP – no report

P. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Keith Nitta
IAS is conducting an instructional service audit on faculty service loads in the School. They are looking at hiring process expenditure guidelines, faculty composition, faculty/student ratio and hiring for an Artist in Residence.

Q. Nursing and Health Studies – Nora Kenworthy
Nursing and Health Studies has partnered with other organizations for a Behavioral Health certificate and also a Health Infomatics program in partnership with UWB's School of Business.

R. STEM – SeungKeun Choi
The School of STEM will begin a search for a Dean next Autumn Quarter with input from the faculty.

The EC held a discussion on equity in teaching loads within UWB Schools and within the University. UWS has smaller teaching loads than those of UWB faculty. Smaller Schools at UWB experience higher service loads. Further discussion is needed to address these issues of equity across Schools.

Time Block Implementation Work Group – David Socha, Co-chair
Socha opened discussion on the option of new teaching time blocks at UWB that would allow for a free time block just following in lunch hour. EC representatives gave feedback on time blocking at UWB:

- Earlier classes are difficult for parents, there is no daycare services offered at UWB. An 8:30 am starting time would be challenging for parents who need to take their children to daycare.
- Later time blocks at the end of the day may present problems with public transportation.
- Hybrid classes might offer options: classrooms availability for activities and a time block open.

Socha asked the EC to gather feedback from their School faculty on beginning time blocks at UWB.

Socha announced that the next EC meeting, December 3rd will incorporate a quarterly GFO meeting into the coffee social time from 8:45 – 9:30 am hosted by the School of STEM.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant
Meeting adjourned at 10:55 am
The next EC meeting will be December 3, 2019

Executive Council Meeting
December 3, 2019, UW1 361

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), SeungKeun Choi, Nora Kenworthy (phone), Minda Martin, Jason Naranjo, Surya Pathak, Alice Pederson and David Socha

Guests: VCAA Sharon Jones, Cinnamon Hillyard, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Learning and Avery Shinneman

Adoption of Agenda, Approval of EC Minutes
The agenda was adopted. EC minutes of November 19, 2019 were approved.

Nitta opened the meeting and welcomed Professor Hillyard and Professor Shinneman.

Avery Shinneman, FYPP representative, First Year Discovery Core revision
Professor Shinneman reviewed the UWB Discovery Core 2018-2019 Assessment Committee Report with the EC and summarized the committee recommendations for the FYPP Discovery Core (DC). There has been a substantial decline in the number of students taking Discovery Core and students who are taking Discovery Core courses do not complete the three-quarter series. Shinneman stated that FYPP is recommending a change to the structure of the DC in order to return to a first-year experience that provides universal access to college transition skills and practices and introduces students to the interdisciplinary mode of inquiry valued on our campus.
Recommendations:
- In-coming pre-major students take 5 credits from a DC I course
- In addition to DC I course, FYPP will continue to provide second and third quarter interdisciplinary courses, no longer treated as DC courses which could meet AoK.
- FYPP will work in partnership with Deans and faculty to develop 2-credit portfolio courses.
- The AOC will explore the developed of linked courses
- The AOC will create an improvement plan of the Discover Core for feedback and assessment.
- FYPP creates a faculty development plan with incentives for faculty work in contributing to the DC.

EC discussion points

- FYPP has found that students that complete the DC I course have better retention rates, a one-year retention rate of 87.7%. Students that did not take the DC I course had a one-year retention rate of 70.2%.
- The Discovery Core has a positive influence on one-year retention.
- There is a need for foundational learning.
- The DC teaches writing skills, reading skills, team work and the interdisciplinary approach to learning.
- More than half of our students are first generation students, they need the DC as a path to success.
- This is part of our mission and values.
- Feedback from students show that they benefit from small classes and faculty that are accessible and helpful.
- The interdisciplinary approach also helps students to explore other areas of learning, different disciplines, this can lead to further exploration of interests.
- The Career Center will partner with FYPP to enhance these opportunities.
- We need to have a broader conversation, articulate options for students.
- College skills are embedded in the Discovery Core, some colleges teach it separately.

- Interdisciplinarity is a tool to understand and solve complex problems, it can be a lens to see complex issues.
- Students are making economic choices, it is important that our programs meet their needs.
- Should DC I be a mandatory requirement, an entrance requirement?
- FYPP can partner with Schools to create courses, Business could develop an entrepreneur course and other Schools could also develop courses to stimulate interest.

Shinneman asked the EC for input on the implementation of the restructured Discovery Core and how to get at least 40% of incoming students top register for the DC I course. The EC will consult with faculty in their Schools and provide feedback. She also asked for ideas on how to encourage faculty to teach in the Discover Core. The EC discussed pilot classes for faculty development of DC curriculum.   Nitta thanked Shinneman and Hillyard for meeting with the EC and updating the Council on the restructuring of the Discovery Core.

David Socha, Chair, Campus Council on Planning and Budget check-in
Socha updated the EC on the work of the Campus Council on Planning and Budget. One of the goals of the CCPB is to increase faculty understanding of the financial state of the campus. Escalating costs are exceeding permanent budget increases for central activities and have generated concern about a budgetary shortfall in the next six years. We need to find funding that is not dependent on identified permanent and temporary funds. How do we change the current projection?

EC discussion points
- Within the next six years our known permanent and temporary funds will no longer cover our costs. What do we need to do to create an economically viable UWB?
- Have we mapped cost drivers? We need an itemized list of the cost drivers.
- Faculty will need to be engaged in navigating the future of this campus.
- Costs need to decrease but we also need to increase revenue, we need to do both.
- Where can we decrease costs? Schools will need to provide accounting for revenue costs list.
- Why is there a deficit on temporary funding? Why are funding needs increasing?
- Funding needs are increasing due to many causes that, in aggregate, are increasing faster than our income:
    o Real estate leases
    o Utilities
    o System overhead and mandated costs
    o Taxes paid to UWS
    o Operating fees
    o Costs of different programs
- Faculty need to understand the landscape.
- What does it take for a course, a program to be offered, we need to look at the funding going to Schools.
- How can the faculty in collaboration with Deans, Faculty Councils, staff and the administration work toward a financial outcome that will allow the institution to thrive?
- What are revenue sources within the Schools?
- We could benchmark cost efficiencies, innovation.
- Faculty/student composition may need to be adjusted.
- We need to maintain the excellence of our education and the UWB mission, this is imperative.
- We could also consider shared services, administratively and in other areas.

- We need to become aware of what constraints will limit the decisions that are pending in terms of sustainability and maintaining the quality of the institution.
- Faculty will need to stay engaged at all levels of the budgetary and strategic planning process to ensure an equitable and successful outcome.

Socha outlined some of the critical areas of work that the CCPB will prioritize over this academic year, the CCPB will meet with School Deans and look for ways to engage the faculty and communicate across the campus.

Reports from Program Representatives – no reports

S. Business – Surya Pathak

T. Educational Studies – Jason Naranjo

U. FYPP – Alice Pederson

V. Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences – Minda Martin

W. Nursing and Health Studies – Nora Kenworthy

X. STEM – SeungKeun Choi
GFO updates: Tri-Campus restructuring, learning goal and CCPT recusal ballots, time schedule revision – Keith Nitta
Nitta informed the EC that tri-campus restricting discussions are ongoing.
Nitta announced that Barb Van Sant, the GFO program coordinator is retiring the end of December, a celebration will be held on December 12 for Barb. The EC thanked her for her support of the Council.

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant
Meeting adjourned at 10:45 am
The next EC meeting will be January 14, 2020

JANUARY 14 EC MEETING CANCELED. CAMPUS CLOSED DUE TO INCLEMENT WEATHER

Executive Council Meeting
January 28, 2020, 8:45am-10:45am, UW1-327

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), David Socha, Seungkeun Choi, Jason Naranjo, Nora Kenworthy, Alice Pederson, Gowri Shankar, Surya Pathak, Minda Martin

Guests: Christy Long, Penelope Moon, Carolyn Brennan

Approval of Minutes: EC minutes from Dec 4, 2019 approved

Provost's Annual Review
Gowri Shankar, Interim Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration opened discussion regarding provost report, provost asking for a "what's happening in your unit" narrative annually from all colleges/campuses that report to provost. Shankar asking leadership bodies what should be reported to provost. Provost questions include:
- What are your strategic goals for the year?
- What obstacles are you facing?
- What's your financial situation?
- Faculty/staff recruitment, hiring, retention issues?

UW Bothell plans to ask for more funding, making the argument that despite having more students than UW Tacoma, UW Bothell receives less funding. In regard to strategic plan, UW Bothell will make the case that the new strategic plan will begin in coming months with 3 initiatives and resources are needed to fund those initiatives.

Shankar asked the council what else should be highlighted?

- Current tri-campus structure causes disadvantages, makes it difficult to meet strategic objectives by hampering an increase in diversity and causing personnel (recruitment, hiring, retention) issues. Issues decided locally won't be included in provost narrative.
- Funding to support underserved, vulnerable and marginalized student populations (food, medical, childcare) and support access and diversity. UW Bothell has made investments in these areas but it's not enough, funding is needed.
- More space for instruction. UW Bothell has 90 square feet per student vs. 150 square foot minimum at Tacoma and Seattle
- Financial support and resources to implement and carry through on commitments initiated in accordance with new strategic plan
- More frequent visits from President and Provost to UW Bothell campus
- Conditional pre-approval at campus level for faculty hires during the summer or late spring would be beneficial since formal approval by provost can has delayed searches

Shankar thanked group for feedback.
Nitta thanked Shankar.

Online Learning Strategy Initiative
Christy Long, Asst. Vice Chancellor for IT and Chief Information Officer, and Penelope Moon Assistant Director of Online Learning, IT
After a round of introductions, Long shared that her team has been meeting with faculty and staff across campus regarding the Online Learning Strategy Initiative and that the feedback and information gathered in that effort is what informed the presentation, which covered:
- What is meant by "online"?
  - Initiative explores the idea of "fully online", which means students can earn a credential without coming to campus. Explores capabilities and investments needed to serve fully remote students. Does not mean UW Bothell will become online school or that every school has to offer an online credential.
- What does online look like today?
  - Much anxiety surrounding online teaching and learning stems from unfamiliarity, bad experience, or dated experience. Online has changed radically over the past 15 years. *Video shown to illustrate what fully online looks like today.* UW Bothell should consider fully online because research and students suggests it works.
- National and regional context
  - National enrollment is declining while demand for online is increasing. Online is of interest across UW. Provost is sponsoring an exploration of online program management vendors (OPM). Helps universities quickly launch online programs then those services would, eventually, be brought in house.
  - Conversations happening at broader UW about online institutional strategy
    - Seattle currently geared toward graduate and technology & engineering
    - UW Bothell wants to identify "What is our online identity?". 3 stages of strategy initiative:
      - Phase I: Identify key stakeholders via one-on-one and group interviews. Summary of what is learned will be shared broadly
      - Phase II: Strategy goals. Hold workshops to help understand what is needed to do online well. Results will be shared
      - Phase III: Take top priorities from Phases I & II and work to define value, investments, outcomes, and the measures. Deliverables to campus and CET estimated to be done in Spring 2020.
- Insights from initial feedback received at UW Bothell

- o Conducted 43 one-on-one 1-hour interviews with 10 different groups and 130-140 people. Concept of access identified as connective tissue between online and UW Bothell's mission and values. Access means ensuring students who cannot come to campus feel as much a part of the Husky community as those who can.
    - Complex institutional effort that will require enhancing areas on campus to ensure online students are not marginalized. Other institutions that have made these changes enhance overall student experience
    - In Phase I, ideas were gathered as to which programs would be good candidates for fully online. Will be discussed further in Phase II.
- Overview of online learning strategy initiative

EC Discussion
- Suggest using "100% online" vs. "online" or "fully online"
- With trend of enrollment falling and demand for online increasing, if UW Bothell doesn't participate they are effectively opting out
- Helpful to know who has been interviewed and take info back to schools. That information is available at this website: https://sites.google.com/uw.edu/uwb-ols/campus-feedback
- Important that change not feel forced, even if it is the "right thing". Faculty need to see reward/value and feel confident that due diligence is being done and curricula is bubbling up from schools

Nitta thanked Long and Moon and invited them back to future EC meetings for updates
Long thanked the group and invited council to reach out with questions

Scholarship Research & Creative Practice Grant Fund and UWB Office of Research Support Model
Carolyn Brennan, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Research
Brennan opened discussion on the Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty with Externally Sponsored Grants draft, explaining the purpose to clearly define services provided by the Office of Research (OR). Very similar to the Centers Support Model previously reviewed by EC. OR is reorganizing and will soon exist solely on research recovery dollars with no institutional support. Important that the campus is aware of what support the OR can now consistently provide. VCAA has been instrumental in helping to describe support models. Shopped draft around to units to assure all are aligning resources to support faculty research. Model highlights wrap-around services, adjusting support to individual faculty as needed. EC review is final step before finalized.

EC Discussion
- Make sure draft gets before CAD for review

EC motion
Nitta moved to pass the motion:
> The EC approves the UWB Roles and Responsibilities of Faculty with Externally Sponsored Grants support model.

The motion was seconded.

The motion carried, unanimously.

Brennan proceeded on to next discussion of Scholarship Research & Creative Practice Grant Fund, which would provide campus-based seed grants for research ($30,000 per proposal, $250,000 annually). Proposed deadline of March 3rd, 2020.

EC Discussion

- Launch as soon as possible once proper processes are in order.
- Recruit reviewers from each school, voting members
- Charge by VCAA
- Clarify evaluation criteria around involving undergraduates in research. If faculty engage undergrads in other ways (workshops, outreach, etc.) does that count?
- Clarify evaluation criteria around diversity, equity, community engagement, and 3 pillars. How are those defined? Explicit definitions need to be included. Included in charge letter okay for now
- Massive campaign to schools as soon as VCAA approves
- Move deadline to first 2 weeks of Apr

Nitta thanked Brennan

Ballot Items
- **Change to recusals for CCPT** - Technical change that allows for divisions in STEM operated independently for CCPT

- **Community Engagement: Adding a sixth learning goal**. Kara Adams, CE, requests this item be on the GFO ballot in order to make it transparent and engage as many as possible, would like EC to be spokespersons

- **Community Engagement: Promoting inclusive scholarship statement** – requested by deans and VCAA to be included on ballot in order to make it clear that this is part of promotion and tenure guidelines. Adams will add another Q&A regarding what is happening at tri-campus area and asks that EC take info back to schools so that everyone is informed when the vote comes around

EC Discussion
- Business requests more time to discuss sixth learning goal – will get back to Kara before the end of February
- EC needs to reach out to divisions, get CE ballot items on division meeting agendas to educate
- Adams will send updated one-page description of ballot items to EC, Deans, Division Chairs, Associate Deans for circulation

Tri-Campus Restructuring
Nitta will have update at next EC meeting. For now, Nitta requests EC collect problems or issues that faculty have had with provost office or UW Seattle to transmit to faculty senate. Bring those stories to the next two EC meetings.

Nitta thanked everyone.

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:50 pm
The next EC meeting will be Feb 11

Executive Council Meeting
February 11, 2020, 9:45am-10:45am, UW1-327

Present: Keith Nitta (Chair), David Socha, Seungkeun Choi, Jason Naranjo, Alice Pederson, Surya Pathak, Minda Martin

Not Present: Nora Kenworthy

Approval of Minutes: EC minutes from January 28, 2020 approved

School Reports

- School of Educational Studies (Naranjo): no full faculty discussions on any of the recent items brought to GFO, but gathered faculty feedback in more informal discussions:
    - SES faculty are excited about the new UWB faculty research award
    - No objections or concerns expressed about the new Community Engagement learning goal or Inclusive Definition of Scholarship statement
    - SES is open to more discussions about 100% online initiative
- Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (Martin): solicited feedback online and in the February IAS faculty meeting.
    - No concerns about CE learning goal or Inclusive Definition of Scholarship
    - Significant feedback on time schedule proposal to create community blocks. IAS faculty and students expressed great concern about: 10-minute passing periods may not be sufficient for some students (disability and access concerns), earlier start time and end time (some bus lines do not run late), and in particular about not being involved in decision.
- STEM (Choi)
    - Shared similar faculty concerns about time schedule change, in particular about shorter 10-minute passing period time.
    - STEM faculty also had questions about the proposed Community Engagement learning goal, which will be voted on later this month: is the new learning objective necessary? It either seems not like a learning goal or is already covered by other learning goals.
- Business (Pathak): scheduled meetings with Business elected faculty council to gather feedback on ballot items, which will occur next week.
    - Business faculty echoed many of the concerns raised earlier about time schedule change.
    - Some business faculty also had questions about the proposed Community Engagement learning goal: How will progress toward this goal be measured? Short of everything, what can students/faculty do to satisfy this goal?
    - Business faculty are concerned/interested in criteria for selecting Scholarship Award winners. Worried criteria are not inclusive of their research agendas.
- FYPP (Pedersen): solicited feedback at a recent AOC meeting
    - FYPP faculty also share many of the concerns raised earlier about time schedule change, especially on issues of equity and access.
    - FYPP faculty are enthusiastic about Inclusive Definition of Scholarship and proposed Community Engagement learning goal.
    - Finally, questions about process for GFO ballot: when, how, what kind of voting rules?

EC Discussion

- Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Sharon Jones reassured EC members that no change to the schedule will take place in the next academic year, 2020-21. This quarter, campus leadership will determine whether and how to move forward with time schedule change.
- Several EC reps expressed a desire for formal training on faculty shared governance and the role the GFO plays in the campus decision-making processes.
- Nitta explained the details for the upcoming GFO ballot. It will be opened during the last week of February and voting will be on-line, solicited through an email from the GFO. GFO by-laws state that a majority of eligible faculty must vote for the vote to be official (reaching a virtual "quorum"), and a majority of those

voting must vote yes for a measure to pass. In practice, this means an "abstain" vote is the same as a "no" vote.

Minutes submitted by Keith Nitta
Meeting adjourned at 10:50 pm
The next EC meeting will be Feb 25

Executive Council Meeting
Feb 25, 2020, 8:45 - 10:45am, UW2 - 327

Present: Keith Nitta, David Socha, Seungkeun Choi, Jason Naranjo, Alice Pederson, Surya Pathak, Minda Martin, Sharon Jones

Guests: Ed Buendia (Dean, School of Education Studies) and Carolyn Brennan (Asst. Vice Chancellor, Research), Sophie Leroy, Deanna Kennedy, and P.K. Sen (School of Business)

Approval of Minutes:
Minutes approved

Goodlad Charter
- Buendia opened discussion about re-chartering of Goodlad Institute
    - Buendia and Brennan have engaged various key stake holders on campus, EC review is culminating point before charter renewal goes to VCAA
    - What is Goodlad? What is its purpose and function on campus?
        - Established by Tom Bellamy in 2000 to advance research in education renewal
        - John Goodlad, UCLA - educational sociologist focused on on-the-ground work with schools/educational institutions to impact education success for all students
            - Author of A Place Called School – examined schools as key agents for improving society
            - Viewed educational enterprise as not only expanding skill sets and social capital but also a space of agency, a place for social good
            - At UW Seattle later in career
            - Goodlad's ethic of educational renewal corresponded to how UWB SES thinks about spaces/enterprises of education
        - Tom Bellamy established Goodlad Institute at UWB after moving from VCAA to academic position in SES
        - Goodlad falls within the portfolio of the VCAA
        - Goodlad has been, unofficially, a space of innovation for the SES. All faculty involved in the enterprise, PIs, and director have been SES faculty
            - As work moved from concept to funded project, distillations of pedagogical ideas that find their way into the curriculum.
                - Example: Seeds of earlier Goodlad grant work can be seen in science methods structure
    - Re-charter seeks to realign Goodlad as a clear delineation with SES as opposed to VCAA
        - Rationale: Goodlad has already been operating within that space of innovation, providing delineation would be beneficial to Goodlad and SES
            - Help to clarify nebulousness – particularly since SES is allocating resources for Goodlad (Example: course buy outs)
            - Help clarify relationship/alignment of researchers to SES
            - Allow SES to use school resources to prompt/seed grants

- o Goodlad has been fiscally robust space of activity for terminal funding
  - Mission and vision statement of how they work to position themselves
  - Looking to bolster seed grant initiatives, working in tandem with initiatives from VCAA's office as part of strategic planning

EC Discussion:
- With the exception of course buyouts, Goodlad budget is Research Cost Recovery dollars
- Goodlad PI board composed of faculty, think strategically about direction and key initiatives. No course release, except for director, to participate. Opportunities to take teaching replacement money if a grant is structured to facilitate that.
- Students do not currently participate but director is focusing on that for future as well as getting faculty from other schools involved
  - o Previous Goodlad charter recognized as part of triad whereas new charter specifies UWB.
  - o Center redesign makes it easier construct sustainable structure for involving students
- Currently one .75 and one .25 FTE staff members that help with pre/post grant awards
- Goodlad works in tandem with UWB Office of Research (OR) on approval process:
  - o OR works to help Goodlad plan, purpose, mange, and closeout grants
    - Roles and responsibilities of OR support for centers available on OR centers page
  - o Goodlad provides focal point for incoming faculty looking for collaborators and makes faculty grants more competitive since submitted with collaborative backing of a center
  - o When faculty submit grants through Goodlad, 40% of RCR dollars goes back to center.
    - Hope to attract collaborators from across schools and share RCR dollars
- Goodlad poised to tell the stories of community engagement at the core of the work.
  - o Need marketing and communication plan, systematic effort to capture and share
  - o SES launched advancement board and working to link to Goodlad, strategic plan
- What metrics will be used to evaluate center in 5 years?
  - o In early stages of shaping goals, tactic, and metrics, using the strategic plan
  - o Goodlad annual reports available on web reflect previous metrics
  - o New director, new reporting structure so new metrics will be used for reauthorization
    - Charter states fee-based courses will be developed to create revenue. That is a heavy lift, will be seen as metric. Ensure director really wants that included
- Comments provided by EC could lead to iteration of charter. If EC has changes, make them formally to Asst. Vice Chancellor, Research who will share with Goodlad Director
  - o Hope to have charter to VCAA by the end of the fiscal year
  - o EC provide feedback on mission, vision and fiscal pieces and include note that metrics are needed in order to track progress when re-authorization happens in 5 years
- Goodlad currently has space in Husky Hall, no extra space being requested in new charter
- PI council membership is set, all SES
  - o Once charter is set, director will do grand tour of schools and discuss what Goodlad is and work to find/create links across schools
- Formal feedback from EC needed stating recommendations for Goodlad charter. Memo will suffice.
  - o If there are significant changes, charter would need to come back to EC again.
  - o Semi-final memo drafted and circulated to EC before Spring break, vote at Apr 7 meeting

Ed thanked the group and said he would share feedback with director.

EC Discussion on centers continued…
- EC should treat center evaluations same as program evaluations for school renewals

- Focus on how it aligns with campus mission/vision and metrics
- Vote and provide feedback, rationale, suggestions for improvement
- Develop processes and objectives.1-page policy document/pre-checklist
  - VCAA will provide grad school checklist to use as example
- Someone could follow Goodlad on grand tour, talk about center generalities; culture, identity, opportunities for faculty to get involved.

New Leadership & Strategic Innovation Option and Changes to Accounting Option

- Deanna Kennedy opened by describing the 1503 process
  - Proposal reviewed within area, area endorses, brought to undergraduate council who sends it to all faculty for review, goes to faculty for vote.
  - No budget changes. Only changed learning goals and packaging of classes
- P.K. Sen described changes to accounting option
  - Organic change that came about based on two realities:
    - Businesses are no longer singular, now all mergers, acquisitions, etc. Consolidation is major part of such transactions - should not be elective
    - Nature of accounting changing. Data analytics much bigger part of accounting, needs to be in curriculum
  - Compressed existing materials in order to include in intermittent accounting sequence, so as to avoid creating new courses

EC Discussion

- Summary of change to new learning goals?
  - Learning goals were compressed to reflect changes in course syllabi
- CCASC needs to review

Nitta moved to pass motion:
   "The EC approves proposed change to the accounting option."
Motion was seconded
Motion was carried (7-0)

- Kennedy and Leroy opened discussion about new Leadership & Strategic Innovation option
  - In School of Business, students all get BA in business admin and can choose an option; Marketing, Supply Chain, Accounting (transcripted). Students can also choose one of several concentrations (4-5 classes with specific theme, not transcripted). Hope to turn concentrations into options.
  - Options create paths for students and creative incentives to map and not just have a collection of courses.
  - Took a year to review courses
    - Where is the most value? What is the most critical?
    - Talked with stake holders and did a lot of benchmarking
  - Found nice synergies within the courses we had that could build upon each other
  - No new courses being proposed but, rather, existing courses will be packaged
  - Creating new option helps school think about pathways, helps with planning/scheduling courses, and helps students understand electives, core, enrichment

EC Discussion

- Students can declare option at any point but should do so before taking 400-level courses so they have priority. Student must pick at least one option or concentration before they can graduate
- Creating options creates pathways, make it easier for students to see/navigate
- Why change name from Management in Organizations to Leadership and Strategic Innovation?
  - More specific for students

- o Reflect concentration on human capabilities of business management
- o Reflect reality of economic region – innovation
- Status of campus-wide Leadership Minor and how it interacts with new option
  - o Minor will provide different perspective on leadership than new option
  - o Sufficient diversity of courses to allow students to take LSI option AND Leadership minor
  - o LSI students can get into Leadership minor classes once they've taken the core classes
- Will School of Business capacity to house Leadership Minor be impacted due to new option?
  - o Not anticipating more students, existing students would move to option
  - o Can help minor by rationalizing and simplifying
- Have new learning objectives impacted your changes?
  - o Mapping of courses helped identify diversity, equity, decision-making/teamwork pieces in existing course work. Moving courses forward that address more of the learning goals
  - o Thinking about sets of courses in intentional way enables better mapping to learning goals
  - o School of Business currently working on getting courses to fulfill diversity credit
  - o Community-engaged courses in every program in the School of Business

Nitta moved to pass motion:
    "The EC approves new Leadership and Strategic Innovation option."
Motion was seconded
Motion was carried (7-0)

Nitta thanked the School of Business guests

GFO Updates
- GFO Ballot
  - o Ballot open Feb 26th - Mar 4th. Email will go out to voting faculty with links to fact sheets
  - o Encourage faculty to vote. Need majority of faculty to cast ballot
- Quarterly GFO Meeting
  - o Scheduled for Tues, Mar 3, location TBD
  - o Will discuss ballot issues
- Scholarship, Research, and Creative Practice (SRCP) Seed Grant Program
  - o Going to CET for final review/approval
  - o Deadline will be in April
- Funding Opportunity Announcement from Jason Naranjo
  - o Tri-campus program focuses on disability in human rights and arts
  - o Awards up to $5,000 to faculty research on disability/impairment. Student travel awards.
  - o Applications due March 10, decision early April
- Interfolio update from David Socha
  - o Committee looking at faculty review mechanism concluded that Interfolio is the best option available, will be used again this year
    - There were concerns but having faculty and admin in same room helped all to understand concerns/issues
    - Using systems like Interfolio substantially reduces admin loads
    - Faculty involved in recent cycle didn't have complaints about Interfolio
  - o **EC Discussion on Interfolio**
    - Issue around what platform was designed to do vs. what faculty are asking it to do
      - Problem for those who work in various multi-media, or in performance spaces, or even linking
      - Platform struggles to accept the volume of work
      - Need customizable front page to accommodate needs of each school

- Small committee will be formed to meet monthly to continuously improve issues
- Some improvements have already been made by OE/HR
  - Light templates, school can enter in what makes sense
  - Clearer language better naming
  - Contact Beth Beam with any issues from faculty
- Heading toward inclusive scholarship, that evidence differs from evidence of traditional research. How will that be handled on this platform? How are artifacts enable?
- Limitation of platform - Provost and VCAA will not see the parts the schools add
  - Provost and VCAA metrics made very clear so faculty understand what the school will see vs. what provost and VCAA will see
  - Faculty letters can address what might not be accessible to Provost/VCAA
- Unit Adjustment
  - David Socha proposed that EC write to Gowri Shankar and request for unit adjustment.
    - Shouldn't be too prescriptive
    - If chancellor approves, could give units list of options or limit it
    - VCAA stressed importance of understanding the demographic aspects of what is being proposed to ensure no diversity and inclusion issues.
    - Socha will draft letter and share with EC prior to Spring break

Action Items:
  - Nitta and Moncalieri draft memo stating EC recommendations for Goodlad Charter, circulate to council for review. Will be voted on in Apr 7 meeting
  - VCAA provide copy of grad school academic program review guidelines to help inform EC guidelines on center reviews
  - Socha draft letter from EC to Gowri Shankar requesting unit adjustment, circulate to council for review. Discuss Apr 7 meeting.

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:47am
The next EC meeting will be Apr 7

Executive Council Meeting
Apr 7, 2020, 8:45 - 10:00am, Zoom
Emergency meeting called in order to address issues directly related to COVID-19

Present:
Keith Nitta, David Socha, Seungkeun Choi, Jason Naranjo, Alice Pederson, Surya Pathak, Minda Martin

Guests: Sharon Jones, Steve Syverson, Cinnamon Hillyard, Robin Angotti

Approval of Minutes:
Minutes Approved

COVID-19 Emergency Exception to Admission Document Requirements
- Steve Syverson, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management, opened discussion regarding temporary emergency exceptions related to COVID-19 for student admissions policies:

  Short-term Test-Optional Admission Policy

Due to cancellation of spring ACT/SAT test administration in response to COVID-19, first year and low-credit transfer students may not be able to provide required test scores. Office of Admissions requesting a short-term exception allowing candidates to be considered despite absence of SAT/ACT scores. Nationally, several institutions adopting similar short-term policies. A permanent test-optional admission policy also being considered at UW Bothell but this exception **only** applies to applicants for Autumn 2020 and Autumn 2021.

EC Discussion:
- Institutional Research previously conducted assessment, determined predictive validity of ACT/SAT test scores for students is very low
    - High school grades are best predicter of performance in college
    - Strongest correlation with ACT/SAT scores is affluence & education of parents
- Temporary measure to remove barriers for students during unprecedented circumstances. Independent from permanent test-optional policy being considered
    - Students considered/admitted as part of temporary measure not a good test case for permanent policy since they will face unique barriers
    - Permanent test-optional admission policy will continue to be considered separately, vetted on school/program feedback, eventually to EC
- UW Faculty Senate permanently removing mandatory testing from scholastic regs
    - Although an individual campus issue, UW FS decision opens door for other UW campuses to follow

Temporary Acceptance of Additional English Proficiency Exam Scores
Due to increased cancellations and reduction in administrations of TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) and IELTS (International English Language Testing System) in response to COVID-19, some international students are unable to submit required test results. Office of Admissions requesting E3PT (English 3 Proficiency Test), Duolingo, and iTEP (International English Proficiency Test) exam results temporarily accepted to satisfy English proficiency requirements. Same standards secured from a different exam. Proposal to permanently accept tests to satisfy admission requirements also being considered but this exception applies **only** to applicants to any quarter, Summer 2020 through Autumn 2021.

EC Discussion:
- Connect with advising to ensure students are getting into correct classes

Acceptance of Credit/No Credit Pre-Req Coursework Completed Winter & Spring 2020
Due to many community colleges abruptly changed to on-line coursework in Winter & Spring 2020 in response to COVID-19, some faculty opted to change from numerical grading to C/NC or P/NP. Office of Admissions is requesting that the EC strongly encourage programs to accept courses graded on a C/NC or P/NP basis during those quarters, rather than requiring specific grades. This would apply to any applicant to any quarter, Summer 2020 - Autumn 2022. This would apply both to transfer applicants and to FY applicants with Running Start credits from those two quarters. Each program needs to identify to the Admissions Office whether or not they will adopt this policy so that accurate information can be relayed to prospective students.

EC Discussion:
- Deans are fully aware, joint message from VCAA and EC will help move process along
- Should be recognized permanently for those 2 quarters. Students might take years off
- Programs should respond as soon as possible to ensure accurate info to students
- Schools might consider placement tests to ensure students gained the knowledge
- Student's performances, experiences, skills will inevitably be impacted by COVID-19, important to come up with strategies to support, adjust, remove barriers as needed

- o Robust discussions around standards & state mandates to ensure those are being met
- o VCAA and Enrollment Management will draft letter to Deans & EFC Chairs
  - EC will review and comment before letter goes out
- o Each EC rep should talk with EFC chairs and Deans now

Nitta moved to pass motion:

> Vote to endorse these COVID-19 emergency exceptions to admission requirements; short term test-optional admission policy, temporary acceptance of additional English proficiency exam scores, and acceptance of credit/not credit pre-requisite coursework completed in Win & Spr 2020

Motion was seconded
Motion was carried (7-0)

Teaching Evaluations and COVID19

- David Socha, GFO Chair, opened discussion on school policies around teaching evaluations and how COVID-19 may impact Spring 2020 evaluations

Teaching Evaluation School Policies

UW bylaws require at least one student evaluation per academic year. Each school at UW Bothell has a different policy but the culture has been an evaluation for every class. UW Senate has stated that current common practices will become the expectation if not documented otherwise. Timeline of when that would take effect is unknown. EFC chairs have been asked to work with faculty and Dean to explicitly document what they really want their school's evaluation policy to be.

Teaching Evaluations and COVID-19

Faculty concerned about potential negative teaching evaluations as a result of sudden changes to Winter/Spring 2020 format in response to COVID-19. Negative evaluations could impact promotion/tenure. Should there be an exception for Winter/Spring 2020? Need to talk to EFC chairs as this is school level.

EC Discussion:

- o Office of Educational Assessment has developed mid-quarter evaluations, 7 questions, straight forward, if schools are interested
- o UW Bothell's culture has been to do an evaluation for every class but that is not mandated, only one per academic year is required
- o Remember that evaluations should be done to make courses the best they can be
  - Suggest evaluating throughout course, make students partners in construction, open and ongoing discussion
- o Students want to provide feedback on what is happening with COVID-19
  - VCAA plans to survey students at week 4 and week 8 to give them a way to be heard without it reflecting poorly on instructor

Future GFO Meetings and COVID-19

- Nitta announced that, in accordance with the current OPMA restrictions under the governor's emergency proclamation, the GFO will not hold any future meetings until those restrictions are lifted. Emergency meetings may be called if necessary.

Action Items:

- o VCAA and Enrollment Management will draft joint letter to schools encouraging acceptance of credit/no credit pre-requisite coursework completed Winter & Spring 2020. Nitta will circulate letter to EC for comment.

Minutes submitted by Dawn Moncalieri
Meeting adjourned at 10:05
The next EC meeting *TBD*

APR 21 AND MAY 5 MEETINGS CANCELED DUE TO COVID 19 RESTRICTIONS

MAY 19 MEETING INFO WILL BE ADDED TO REPORT ONCE MINUTES ARE APPROVED BY EC IN FALL 2020