

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes**

May 14, 2018 12:30-1:25pm GWP 320

***Present:*** *Lauren Montgomery, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Nicole Blair,Mark Pendras, Sushil Oswal, Justin Wadland, DC Grant, Jie Sheng, Jutta Heller, Jill Purdy, Michelle Garner, Greg Rose, Denise Drevdahl, Arindam Tripathy, Eugene Sivadas, Ji-Hyun Ahn*

***Zoom:*** *Charles Costarella, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Menaka Abraham*

***Guests:*** *Lauren Pressley, Rebecca Disrud, Bonnie Becker, Elizabeth Hansen, Marcie Lazzari, Riki Thompson*

***Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Ellen Moore, Leighann Chaffee*

***Absent****: DC Grant*

1. **Consent Agenda, Recording Permission, & Approval of Minutes**
* The agenda and the April 23, 2018 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved.
* Recording permission for the minutes was given.
1. **Announcements**
	* Projected preview agendas for 5/25 and 6/4
		+ Hope to vote on academic plan on 6/4
		+ Feedback on year – send ahead of time and turn in anonymously (like course evaluations)
	* Spring FA meeting: 5/25/18 – *please note the new date. Time: 1-3pm. Location: Carwein Auditorium.*
		+ This meeting will be focused on the results of the Academic Planning Exercise and the feedback received from student panels.
	* Unit reports: SAM is working; fill out form – resend; SOE finalizing; resend – some reservations in MSB, refer to dean for that; CAC, etc.
2. **Learning Commons Presentation –** *Lauren Pressley, Library Director, Justin Wadland, Associate Director and Head of the Digital Scholarship Program, & Rebecca Disrud, Writing Center Associate Director*
	* This is meant as a broad conversation – high level overview
	* A learning commons task force met over summer 2017 and fall; met to talk through issues of what learning commons are and what it should look like here; that group made preliminary document and has vetted through various groups
		+ They have a document to share if people want more information
	* Students have voiced needing a flexible space for learning – a common academic space and for community building
		+ Example: Faculty member, Rachel Hershberg’s, students photo voice project:
			- “Gather” – come together and work as a community – but lack space
			- “Nothing to do but wait” – time that students could be actively engaged between classes
			- “The distance between all of us” - more community spaces might bridge the distance between us
		+ No place to engage – students value the diversity, but find it difficult to connect; lack of connection and lack of persistence tied together
	* These reflect research around HIPs; the features of learning commons are shown to increase retention and engagement
	* The Learning Commons are supported by student desire and large bodies of research
	* The Learning Commons could include a seamless student experience:
		+ Remove friction, increase accessibility, personalized/collaborative/flexible
	* What it might look like:
		+ Learning commons are customized to meet local needs; not ready-made model; hence using a UWT task force
		+ Integrated spaces with multiple services; students don’t have to carry cognitive burden of figuring out what kind of help they need; staff can help students collaboratively
		+ Collaborative space – group tables and booths
		+ Quiet and loud spaces; hide-away and connect with peers; service points, help from experts; tech options, printing, library resources; quiet space, working together space; quality of space changes depending on time of day based on needs at that point in time
		+ Booth with wrap around, technology, collaborating, public room, but furniture allows it to feel more focused
		+ Furniture choices can influence behavior and cognition
		+ They are not yet at the point of architectural rendering; just painting picture of types and options
		+ The learning commons ties into 5 out of 6 of the impact goals in the strategic plan
			- Increases availability of support services
			- Strengthen collaborations, communities a part of campus
			- Equity – increasing access to services and tech. academic support for all students; impact students who might not have it off of campus
		+ UWT library and TLC share the LARC (learning and resource commons) – so what would be different?
			- Library is operating in one space while TLC in another; though collaborative, they operate as two offices
			- Students are often unclear about where to go for what kind of help they need
	* Integration of services:
		+ Workshops for students and faculty development
		+ Recursive process of writing and research
		+ Writing as a social process – need space to support
		+ Just-in-time services: advising and financial aid – central hub for support – partner to provide seamless support services
	* Task force recommendations:
		+ TLC, library, academic technology
		+ Also, value of central space – for point of need services – might not be in depth, but starting point for students
		+ Large common space; easy access to services and tech; collaborative services; flexible tech and furniture
		+ Secure, central, space to meet student need of increased hours
		+ Make support services more visible and accessible
		+ Technology and digital scholarship – tech to support student work –thorough understanding of types of assignments students have in order to provide the services/tech needed; along with providing faculty with workshops on how to design assignments with access to learning commons tech that is available
	* Interested in faculty perspective: Q & A:
		+ Q: Working with assumption that space is in current library building?
		+ A: Depends on what campus wants; is that where we should be starting, or a different space? Library is already central – so that’s good; needs further discussion
			- During peak times, library is already at capacity
		+ Q: Remember grad students and evening classes, spaces for projects
		+ Q: Quietness and calmness of a library has wonderful benefits – wouldn’t want to lose – pictures indicated bright and busy – put a plug in for old, quiet calm, quiet colors
			- Yes, students want more quiet spaces too; most libraries are doing both
			- 2nd floor Tioga – some comfy chairs by windows – a good example of it
			- Some students come to TLC to study by themselves where it is vibrant and loud
			- Important to maintain a diversity of spaces
			- UWS – Odegaard Library – loud on bottom floor, quieter as you go up
			- Provide opportunity for different kinds of learning
			- Value about learning commons in comparison to TLC: tutoring can be seen as remedial; but learning commons is seen as a space for everyone – doesn’t have connotation of “help offered because you need fixing”
				1. Space around building on strengths instead of deficiencies
	* Please share further feedback with Library and TLC as they work toward making the learning commons a reality
3. **Draft Academic Plan Review - APPENDIX A**
	* Put together because of period of rapid growth and entering a period of slower growth
	* Want academic life in the hands of faculty and coordinated across units
		+ financially informed and sustainable
	* Campus-wide request for feedback from all faculty – refined to use criteria
		+ Since meeting with APCC, also met with VC Finance, Tye Minckler, and Deans/Directors – it was clear that within the 3 year timespan we’ll have 1 new program – just to put it all in perspective (in addition to any program that comes fully funded by legislature)
	* Expansions of existing programs is separate
	* Staging was largely based on how far along these programs are already developed (PNOI, 1503, etc.)
	* Reminder: just sequencing; not approval; approval process remains unchanged
	* 12 new programs moving forward
		+ One is actually a program change
		+ One is a minor
		+ 26 program change requests – largely about resources
			- Will be negotiated between Dean/Directors, EBC, and CBC
			- ALL IN CONTEXT OF CONSOLIDATION AND CENTRALIZATION OF BUDGET; will experience over next year; increase in transparency
			- Facilities request will go directly to Tye Minckler and his group
				1. Request for 50 total faculty over next 3 years
				2. This year – one new line and replacements
				3. Next year only replacements
				4. Third year, maybe 1-2 new lines and replacements
	* There is support for all of the proposed programs AND also the need to have the reality of our resource picture
	* 3 were deferred because proposals stated that they were in aspirational stage
	* Moving forward actually doesn’t mean a whole lot
	* Main point: APCC and EC have big tasks moving forward; representation on APCC and EC needs to be considered very important moving forward
	* Over summer the team will write how oversight of plan will work (giving a lot of power to APCC and EC)
	* SPCC joining us today to give input

**FEEDBACK / Q&A:**

* + Where did the strategic plan come into play? Did it? Or in the criteria?
		- Not very much at all; this is the skinny version of the academic plan; didn’t have time to vet in meaningful way
		- All of it is un-prioritized
		- Because of how things emerge, inappropriate to dictate what comes first; also, large and complex approval process; approval is not place of planning team
		- Criteria will be used by APCC
	+ In submitting new programs, will it be a “free for all” or race for whoever gets in first? Is there a mechanism to help with this?
		- This has come up in multiple conversations; we need to develop policy and process over the summer to deal with this issue
	+ Place for advisors in implementation plan?
		- APCC has developed criteria to help guide the demand question so that when proposers write a PNOI and 1503 so there will be some consistency in data; some will come from admissions and advising; student demand is only a piece of the data, we have an obligation beyond that; asking for systematic demand analysis; in past, all looked great and penciled out; there is no way to evaluate because it’s not your field, etc.
		- A good point that we should make sure to work with advisors
	+ Will the plan/slides be shared? Yes; over summer will write out implementation, deadlines, etc.
	+ This is a forward looking plan – but also needs to be backward looking to see situation – are we reviewing existing programs (enrollment)?
		- Tree diagrams (coggle): undergraduate & graduate degrees and number of people enrolled; picture of where we are
		- Yes, we need to make room for aspirational programs – i.e. music; we’ll look at building into the process a program that has no existing faculty, etc.
	+ Part of this to be an assessment of programs?
		- Did that in phase one
		- If faculty want more than 1 new program in next three years, faculty need to decide if they want to use resources from a current program to fuel a new one
		- 5 degrees that are different flavors of vanilla: this doesn’t serve community and isn’t in line with the idea of being a University
		- It’s possible for faculty to decide to discontinue a degree; better to decide than have it forced because of resource constraint
		- Hands off approach from academic planning team; not yet in situation to cut, and want to avoid that situation, be wise stewards of resources
	+ Would you like reassessment of existing programs (in the future) again?
		- The activity was viewed as needing to defend what we already have; so it wasn’t an honest look at functioning and aspiring; it’s not a conversation people wanted to have; it will take iterations to get there
		- Sense of defensiveness about the process vs. what do we really want? We’ve had this program for 20 years, is it working? What is struggling?
		- Hard because it was the first attempt at this conversation
		- Small does not mean that it’s struggling; some small but service is high
		- Historical sense of growth-mode (“we will get more”), so it’s hard to consider the upcoming years when we won’t grow (as much; programmatically)
	+ A suggestion for messaging around this: anticipate that some will see this and say “we have all these requests and only one will go through, so we’ve wasted our time”; with previous practices, ALL OF THESE WOULD HAVE GONE THROUGH; so ultimately, it’s saving everyone time
	+ Continue to collect feedback via email
	+ Concern about where strategic plan came into play – concern among faculty
		- Strategic plan was part of criteria; also, planning team didn’t use criteria because not they are not approving; APCC will use criteria (& strategic plan) in deciding approvals
		- Diversity of programs is the most important piece for faculty to consider
	+ The criteria for the evaluation of proposals in the academic plan were approved by the Executive Council on 4/23/18 as follows:
		- Alignment with strategic plan
		- Community/Student/Market demand and impact
		- Resource impact - plus or minus
		- Campus-wide balance of academic disciplines and programs, building on our existing expertise and interdisciplinary emphasis.
	+ The next steps are:
		- 5/8/18 - Academic planning team creates draft of first plan.
		- 5/9/18 - Draft plan is presented to APCC for review and feedback
		- 5/10/18 - Semi-finalized plan is presented to Deans and Directors for review
		- 5/2018 -Semi-finalized plan is reviewed by VCFA Tye Minckler and staff for financial impact assessment.
		- 5/14/18 - Draft plan is presented to EC (with APCC) for review, integration of feedback, and approval
		- 5/25/18 - Finalized plan is presented to Faculty Assembly in the Spring quarterly meeting.
		- Summer 2018 - Planning team reviews process and writes Academic Plan policy and process guidelines.
		- Autumn 2018 - Guidelines presented to APCC for review and feedback, then to EC for review, incorporation of feedback and approval.
		- Ongoing - academic plan is used as a guide to the creation of new programs at UW Tacoma, with a renewing planning cycle every three years.
1. **Adjourn**

**APPENDIX A:** Academic Plan Presentation

Planning Team:

Ali Modarres – Chair, Council of Deans and Directors

Lauren Montgomery – Chair, Faculty Assembly

Jill Purdy – Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

Ka Yee Yeung – Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly

Purpose: To ensure that the continued growth of the academic programs at UW Tacoma is:

* Determined by the faculty
* Coordinated across all units on campus
* Financially sustainable & resource informed

Pursuant to Section 23-43 of the Faculty Code, the faculty of the University of Washington Tacoma:

A. Shall, with respect to academic matters,

1. Determine its requirements for admission and graduation;

2. Determine its curriculum and academic programs;

3. Determine the scholastic standards required of its students;

4. Recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the

 University degrees;

5. Exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and

 supervision of its students.

We needed a way for faculty to gain a campus wide perspective on academic program development.

Summary of Academic Plan activity to date:

* Autumn Quarter – Assessed existing degree programs using rubric and data provided.
* Winter Quarter – Faculty worked with Dean on new program requests, and program change requests. Faculty reviewed and EC approved evaluation criteria.
* Spring Quarter – Planning team assembled new plan. Draft reviewed by APCC, EC, Deans/Directors, VCFA
* Feedback integrated into this presentation.

Criteria Used in Planning (unranked):

*Developed via campus wide faculty process, approved by EC*

* Alignment with Strategic Plan goals:
	+ (Students, Scholarship, Communities, Equity, Culture, Growth)
* Campus-wide Balance of Academic Disciplines and Programs,
	+ (building on existing expertise and interdisciplinary emphasis)
* Community/Student/Market Demand and Impact
* Resource Impact (+/-)

As we worked with the feedback this spring, we discovered several layers of complexity that will need to be negotiated.

Resource Requests for Existing Programs

* Global Honors in BA Healthcare Leadership
* Global Honors in BA Business Administration
* Honors, Global Honors and Faculty in lower division courses in BS Computer Science & Systems
* Faculty in BS of Information Technology
* Global Honors in BA Urban Studies
* Faculty for Two Year Track in Masters of Accounting
* Faculty for MS Business Analytics
* Faculty for Masters in Business Administration
* Faculty for Master of Cybersecurity and Leadership (Business)
* Faculty for Master of Cybersecurity and Leadership (Institute)
* Program improvements to Master in Education
* Faculty and Staff for Advanced Standing MSW
* Staff for online Criminal Justice BA and new Tracks
* Integrated pathways in Global Honors pathways
* Additional faculty in MS in Geospatial Technologies
* Staff in MS in Geospatial Technologies
* Staff in MA in Community Planning
* Faculty in Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)
* Faculty in Master of Nursing
* Faculty in BA (major) in Healthcare Leadership
* Faculty for BA Ethnic, Gender and Labor Studies
* Faculty for Interdisciplinary options in BA History

Facility Requests for Existing Programs

* Designated computer classroom where SPSS software is installed - BA Psychology
* GIS lab - MS in Geospatial Technologies
* Studio space in TPS - BS in Urban Design
* Larger Classrooms (80 students) - BA in Urban Studies, BA in Sus. Urban Development
* Flexible furniture and space refresh - BA in Urban Studies
* Network lab in BS Information Technology
* Simulation lab, hardware and software in Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

Existing Program Changes

* These requests will go through existing channels:
* Discussed by the EVCAA and the respective Dean or Director.
* New faculty or staff positions require approval from Executive Budget Committee.
* Facilities requests will be shared with the VC for Finance and Administration.

*The consolidation of these requests has already been useful for budgeting purposes.*

Total of 15 New Degree Program Proposals.

**Proposed New Graduate Programs**

\*PhD in Computing

DNP Doctor of Nursing Practice

\*EdS in School Psychology

\*MS in Environmental Science

\*+MS in Information Technology

\*MS in Elec. & Computer Engineering

MA in Public Affairs

MA in Criminal Justice

M in Healthcare Leadership

**Proposed New Undergraduate Programs**

#BS in Mechanical Engineering

#BS in Civil Engineering

\*BA Economic and Policy Analysis

\*BA in Art

BA in Education Studies

BA Philosophy, Religion and Ethics

\* = existing PNOI

# = dependent on state funding

+ = self supporting

**Recommending that 12 move forward in this planning round, in two *quasi*-stages:**

Stage One:

\*EdS in School Psychology

\*MS in Environmental Science

\*BA Economic and Policy Analysis

#BS in Mechanical Engineering

\* = existing PNOI

# = dependent on state funding

+ = self supporting

Stage Two:

DNP Doctor of Nursing Practice

\*PhD in Computing

\*MS in Electrical and Computer Engineering

\*+MS in Information Technology

\*BA in Art

BA in Education Studies

BA Philosophy, Religion and Ethics

#BS in Civil Engineering

\* = existing PNOI

+ = self supporting

# = dependent on state funding

**Deferred to Next Academic Plan** (2020/2021):

MA in Public Affairs

MA in Criminal Justice

M in Healthcare Leadership

**Special Cases:**

The International Studies new program proposal will be considered as a program change to the existing Global Studies degree.

Undergraduate Minor in Business Analytics as well as all certificate programs will proceed through regular curriculum channels.

**The Critical Step:** matching New Program Requests with Budgetary realities.

Budgetary Realities:

We will realize 3-4% margins in operating costs if we:

* Incur 4% growth in student enrollment per year (about 200 students/year)
* Hire 1 new faculty next year: 2018-19 (plus replacements)
* Hire no new faculty the following year (2019-20) (replacements only)
	+ Hire 1 or 2 new faculty in 2020-21 (plus replacements)

(Note that fully funded programs like Mechanical and Civil Engineering may, if

funded, be additional to the above.)

**Conclusions**

1). Of the 15 new program proposals in this round, realistically only one or two will be realized.

2) In order to determine which one(s) APCC will need to see ALL POTENTIAL 1503’s at the same time.

3) Hence the timing complexity - tbd

4). Faculty should be thinking about reallocation of resources in the next round of Academic Planning.

**Current and Next Steps:**

* Faculty Assembly: Reviews draft plan and provides feedback. May 25th
* Planning Team: Assimilates recommendations from above and creates a final campus-wide Academic Plan. May 28-June 1
* Executive Council: Final review and vote. June 4

Summer Quarter, 2018

**Planning Team:** Reviews feedback and develops policies and processes for implementation of the plan and future planning cycles.

Autumn Quarter 2018

**Executive Council:** Reviews and makes recommendations to the Academic Plan policies and processes and codifies them through Faculty Assembly legislation (Class B).

Ongoing

Academic Planning becomes part of our campus culture and operates on a cyclical basis.