****

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

October 13, 2017 1:00-3:00pm GWP 320

***Present:*** *Lauren Montgomery, Sushil Oswal, Katie Haerling, Ji-Hyun Ahn, Michelle Garner, Nicole Blair, Greg Rose, Charles Costarella, Leighann Chaffee, , Jutta Heller, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Ellen Moore, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Menaka Abraham, Laura Feuerborn, D.C. Grant, Jill Purdy, Eugene Sivadas, Justin Wadland, Jie Sheng, Mark Pendras.*

***Excused:*** *Arindam Tripathy, Mark Pagano.* ***Guest****: Tye Minckler.*

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

The agenda was approved and permission was given to record for the minutes.

* + **Approval of Minutes**

The September 25, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved with the following edits:

-Date correction from January 2017 for upcoming winter FA meeting to January 2018

-Request to spell out acronym RCEP

-Grammatical edits submitted by member, Menaka Abraham

1. **Budget Literacy Workshop–** Tye Minckler, VC for Finance & Administration

Jan Rutledge, AVC for Finance, did not attend due to other responsibilities.

* Reviewed [Primer 1](https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B6UZQn6IzUKKbXNkd0x4b3VCamc):
  + This Primer was developed to document state and national trends in higher education funding. It is essential for faculty to understand and be involved as the trends (rising costs and decreasing state support) cause a profound change in how universities have to pay attention to budget. Another goal of the Primer is to help people understand the terms that are used.
  + The Campus Budget Committee (CBC) has been charged with finalizing the Primer and educating campus.
  + EC was asked to send Tye questions or feedback on Primer 1.
  + Primer 1 focused on the national and UW Tacoma funding situation; Primer 2 will focus on budget philosophies and best practices.
* Reviewed budget terminology:
  + All funding could be considered temporary, but to the extent that it is projected, it is all funding that is being counted on; thus “temporary” is a misleading term in this regard.
  + A best practice is to base hires on ongoing money if the position is meant to be ongoing
  + Funding: there may be some limits as to what funds can be used for which specific purpose, but otherwise, it does not matter what resources fund various items.
  + Budget: is submitted, prioritized, and approved. In Primer, budget generally means the entire campus budget.
  + Transparency: to see everything, all funding sources.
  + Projection: “If’s” are a big part of budgeting, but it is still important to have a plan. Budgets are estimates, not set in stone, and should have some flexibility. Each unit/institution should have contingency money (profit/margin/contingency).
  + Service Level Agreements: Institution pays for services and thus should work with service providers to create agreements around reasonable level of service, i.e. response/process time expected of staff in particular office.
* Reviewed budget process:
  + EC/Faculty input occurs in the Autumn (formulate recommendations) and in the Spring (review, discuss and advise Chancellor on 2018-19 budget)
    - Faculty need to take responsibility for financial decisions
  + A best practice is to document the budgetary approach with its rationale so that it can be reflected on over the years.
  + Goal of transparency and clarity – all institution constituents in shared governance should be aware of initiatives and where funding is going.
    - EC will need more learning when the task starts to involve reviewing spreadsheets, i.e. clarity of budget.
  + Keeping track of and reviewing services is a constant and complex process:
    - First step: share what the budget currently is and has been over time (though there is limited data)
    - Second step: conduct meetings, focus groups, surveys asking about gaps in service, services desired, etc.
    - In previous iterations of budget process on campus, a decision would be made about a budget item, but the decision wouldn’t be communicated to requester until the entire budget process was completed. What was missing was some way of updating requesters/submitters throughout the process. If a decision is made on an item, whether it is affirmative or negative, it needs to be communicated to the requesters/submitters as soon as possible so that they can plan in light of the decision.
  + The budget process interlocks with other processes, i.e. approval process for new programs, through the Academic Plan
    - Tye will supply some analysis and options in regards to the data collected through the Academic Plan
* EC is acting as the Faculty Budget Committee as pilot project this year. The hope is to understand the campus budget to allow for informed faculty recommendations. EC will review the work at the end of the year and make recommendations for the future.
  + EC will host open meetings for faculty in regards to the budget, the first being the FA winter meeting (1.22.18)
  + If EC requires confidentiality during a specific discussion, an Executive Session may be called during a regular or special meeting, stating the purpose of excluding the public and when the Executive Session ends. Non-voting members and attendees will leave the meeting. They may wait outside the meeting if they wish. When the Executive Session ends, it will be announced and the meeting will be re-opened to any non-voting members or attendees. If an extension is needed, the Executive Session can be extended, announcing the extension to any non-voting members or attendees. This is in accordance with [Washington State’s Open Public Meetings Act (OPMA), RCW 42.30 and 42.32](http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=42.30).

1. **Group Photo and Break** - Group Photo will be posted to [Faculty AssemblyBlog](http://blogs.uw.edu/assembly/2017/10/executive-council-group-photo/).
2. **Academic Plan Rubric & Message -** Message and Rubric will be finalized and sent to units later this month.

* Reviewed the draft Academic Plan Rubric and Message to Campus Suggestions were made for refinements of the rubric.
  + The Rubric is not weighted. Instead, it is providing ways for faculty to look at their programs. The weighting is up to the faculty within the degree program.
    - It is a standardized qualitative rubric.
  + The Rubric is meant to be helpful a tool used by everyone, but it is not to judge faculty decisions.
    - It needs to be clear that the Academic Planning Team (FA chairs, interim EVCAA, Council of Deans and Directors Chair) will not be giving scores.
  + Data will be provided and faculty will do the work of assessing. Relying on faculty to be critical of their own programs
  + If no data is available, areas can be left blank
  + EC members voiced the importance of not equating size with quality.
  + The relationship between the internal evaluation (step 1) and step 2 need to be clear on the outset.
  + In gathering all of the information together, a timeline will be made that will include everything planned for; it will extend as needed to accommodate. Then, it will go back to faculty for review again.
  + Program reviews are often a standard part of an institution.
  + In the part of the rubric asking about resources needed from internal service units (i.e. TLC, Library, etc.), faculty will respond based on their own knowledge and then the service units will look at the draft to adjust based on their knowledge.
  + Once the Academic Plan is finished more intensive work on a Sustainability Plan can begin as it will require the Academic Plan to inform it.
  + The “bird’s eye view” is good, but it was acknowledged that faculty may still have some anxiety around this process and that there needs to be room for a values and priorities discussion. The decisions need to be and will be based on the articulated values of the faculty.

1. **Review and Vote for Approval of Memo: Review of Select New Appointments, from APT Committee**

Appointments are a part of the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee’s charge, thus, APT has recommended that they focus on reviewing the appointments where the rank of the appointment is higher than the current rank of the applicant. APT’s role would be to review and give advice to the unit. APT and Academic HR will need to work out the mechanics as a short-turn around is often needed.

VOTE: EC voted to approve the recommendation outlined in this memo (Appendix A). Katie Hearling moved to accept, Mark Pendras seconded: 17 yes, 1 no, 1 abstain, 1 absent, 20 eligible to vote.

1. **Review and Vote for Approval of the PNOI Instructions**

APCC had a PNOI subcommittee during the 2016-2017 academic year. They were asked to create clear and holistically thoughtful instructions for this important part of proposing a new program. The group also worked closely with Academic Affairs so that the PNOI Instructions would match the UW Tacoma New Undergraduate Program Review Process. APCC voted to approve these Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) Instructions on June 6, 2017. Moving forward, this is the process for new programs added to the Academic Plan. Other curriculum-related UW offices have been impressed with the thoughtful documents and process. There was one small spelling correction: compliments needs to be corrected to complements within the Internal Alignment section. Once approved, the PNOI Instructions (Appendix B) will be posted on the APCC curriculum development webpage, Program Administrators and Curriculum Coordinators will be briefed, and EC and APCC representatives will be asked to help disseminate information about the instructions and process.

VOTE: EC Voted to approve PNOI process submitted by APCC. Mark Pendras moved to accept, Ellen Moore seconded: 19 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 1 absent, 20 eligible to vote.

1. **Review and Vote for Approval of Paulsen Committee Procedures Document Revisions**

Tabled until 10.30.17 EC meeting agenda due to time constraints.

1. **Adjourn**

**APPENDIX A:** *Approved by Executive Council 10.13.17*

October 10, 2017

To: Jill Purdy, Interim EVCAA & Ali Modarres, Chair, Dean’s Council

Cc: Alison Hendricks, Lauren Montgomery

From: APT Committee (Sivadas, Gawel, Stevens, Rios, Dierwechter, Furman, Nascimento)

Re: Review of Select New Appointments

The Appointment, Promotions, and Tenure committee met and pursuant to its charge and in keeping with the practices of other units in the UW has decided it shall review and make an advisory recommendation to the EVCAA and Chancellor on certain new faculty appointments.

The APT committee shall review cases when an appointment offer is made to a faculty member at a higher rank than the rank they are holding at another institution.

1. For tenured ranks, the APT committee shall review cases and give recommendations where a faculty member who holds the rank of an Associate Professor rank at another institution is appointed as a Full Professor at any unit within UW Tacoma. And likewise the APT committee shall review cases if an Assistant Professor at another institution is appointed as a tenured Associate Professor at UW Tacoma.
2. For lecturer ranks, the APT committee shall review new appointments of senior lecturers who currently hold the rank of lecturer at this or another institution.
3. At this point, we do not seek to review any new appointments of faculty who are brought in at the same rank as what they were holding at another institution and nor shall we seek to review appointments at the “first rung” of the ladder (such as Assistant Professor or Lecturer).

We promise a timely and quick review of such cases. Keeping with the practices of other units in UW, we request the following documentation to be provided to us in these cases:

1. The Dean/Director’s memo requesting appointment and justification for the hire and which includes unit faculty (and in the case of tenured appointments senior faculty) vote results, CV, application materials, and letters of recommendation.
2. Offer letter (without any salary information).

Thank You.

Sincerely,



Eugene Sivadas

Chair, APT Committee

On Behalf of the APT Committee

**APPENDIX B:**

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINTON, TACOMA

NEW UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS

**PLANNING NOTICE OF INTENT (PNOI) INSTRUCTIONS**

*Approved by APCC 6.6.17. Approved by EC 10.13.17.*

**Purpose:** The Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) is a preliminary step in the proposal of a new undergraduate degree program. It precedes the formal proposal (1503) and serves to fulfill several objectives including the following:

* Provide an efficient mechanism to communicate to the stakeholders within the UWT community of the ***intention to propose*** a new undergraduate degree program
* Assist faculty in assessing the feasibility of a possible program prior to a significant investment of time in proposal development
* Create a forum for feedback and collaboration within the larger UWT community which will help to align the future proposal with on-going initiatives and programs already developed or in development

**CONTENT OF THE PNOI**

***STEP 2*** *in the* [*Process Steps*](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/curriculum-development)

**Fill Out Coversheet** ([found here](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/curriculum-development)):This form provides an overview of the program that will be proposed.

*Compose a narrative addressing the following categories:*

**Internal Alignment:** This section describes how the program fits into the portfolio of undergraduate offerings at UWT. New undergraduate programs should be aligned with the mission, values and goals of the campus. Additionally, new programs should ideally align with existing programs in ways that facilitate sharing of limited and vital resources of space and talent. To that end, the internal alignment section of the PNOI should include a brief overview of the following discussion points:

* How the program supports the [unique role, mission and Strategic Plan of the institution](https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/strategic-planning)
* How the program complements existing programs; Identify any areas of potential synergy in terms of student pathways, dual majors, shared faculty expertise and interests
* How the program competes with other programs in terms of overlap or duplication of course offerings
* How the program is unique and ways in which the program seeks to differentiate itself from others within the institution

The following resources are available to assist in assessing the above:

* [UW Curriculum Management/Kuali Website](https://uw.kuali.co/cm/#/programs) to search for curricular overlap
* [UW Tacoma General Catalog](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/catalog-17-18/uw-tacoma-general-catalog-2017-2018) for overview of undergraduate programs offered
* [Find Program Tool in MyPlan](https://myplan.uw.edu/program/#/orgs?states=N4IgCgTg9g5hCGBbAQtA7gZwKYGUAuUEWIAXCMADogAm8e8AalhBgJZQB2VJVAjFQBoqGenizdKIAGaFEAETrwJAXyEhWGAIIBjPOw5gsHaqw4xuU+ABtsa+Lv2HjpmABUsADzzcqVZcpABEAB5CBhUKExiMklaeiYWfR8QfkDhUXFSSRkIeUUVNQALeAwFegtrWyoNHT1OJxMzCpssOwd6o0a3T29SXzT1DBwAV21tLAwMZqq)
* [Maps of UW Tacoma undergraduate programs](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UW_Tacoma_Undergraduate_Majors_2708_Declared_Majors_in_Fall_2016.pdf) offered, including enrollments
* [UW Tacoma Undergraduate Majors list with Major codes](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UW_Tacoma_UG_Majors.pdf)

**External Supply and Demand for the Program:** This section describes the recent statewide number of graduates in the field of study and prospective student interest in it. Such an analysis helps assess the sustainability of the proposed program and which undergraduate degree programs are most important to the on-going development and social welfare of the South Puget Sound region and beyond. Supply and demand information is needed on existing degree production as well as the documented intentions of students to seek specific degrees and major fields of study. To that end, the external market section of the PNOI must include a brief summary of information from the following external data sources:

* The current degree production in the past 5 years in Washington State ([National Center for Education Statistics with IPEDS DATA](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Home/UseTheData))
* The current degree production by Institution within Washington State ([National Center for Education Statistics with IPEDS DATA](https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/Home/UseTheData))
* The current degree production specific to Community and Technical Colleges that might compete, augment or supply matriculating students ([State Board of Community and Technical Colleges](https://www.sbctc.edu/our-colleges/search-college-programs/default.aspx))
* The intended college major data as detailed in data collected by the [College Board Search Services](https://collegeboardsearch.collegeboard.org/pastudentsrch/login.action)

Summary Narrative: Once data is compiled, include a brief narrative that characterizes the external supply of and demand for competing degrees in the relevant market, as well as how the proposed degree program will differentiate itself as unique from others in the region and nationally.

([See Sample provided on APCC website](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/New_Program_Demand_data_example.pdf))

**Potential Value to the Greater Community:** This section describes how the program might impact the community. Considerations of community value includes both instrumental improvements such as employment as well as individual and societal enrichment based upon intrinsic and aesthetic values.

***Instrumental Value:*** Consider employment projections for graduates. Evidence can be gathered utilizing public data sets as well as preliminary interviews and partnership options gathered through personal networks ([Washington State Employment Security Department Salary Data](https://www.esd.wa.gov/labormarketinfo) ; [Occupational Outlook Handbook](https://www.bls.gov/ooh/))

***Community and Personal Enrichment***: Consider the role of the degree program in providing a catalyst for a richer cultural experience in the South Sound Community as well as an appreciation for the area of study.

**Anticipated Resource Needs:** This list is an ***initial*** step that is not meant to provide exact financial values. Budgeting and financial forecasting is not a "bid" or request for funds. The Anticipated Resource Needs list identifies the *kinds of resources* that the program will likely need in order to successfully meet its objectives. It should not be developed with a "low cost" mindset but with an "appropriate resources" mindset. Program budgets will be evaluated relative to the campus portfolio of academic programs, and not every program must quickly become self-supporting. A comprehensive presentation of the budget will be required only in the full proposal.

Indicate in the following categories both any ***new*** resources that will be necessary, as well as how any ***existing*** resources will be utilized to meet the program's goals. You do not need to assign dollar values to the resource needs identified in the PNOI. Dollar values will be provided by Finance and Administration in STEP 4 (which is to meet with Finance and work on the preliminary budget together).

* Faculty and type of position(s) (tenure-track, lecturer)
* Academic Staff - include program staff as well as campus-wide staff (Academic Technology, Library, Teaching and Learning Center)
* [Library Resources and Collections](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/library-resources)
* Equipment and Software
* Facilities/space needs: labs, classrooms, student study/work space, offices, studios, computer classrooms

**Funding Sources:** The PNOI should reflect the source of intended funding for the degree program.

* For state funded programs, indicate the tuition tier in the narrative.

See the [Office of Planning and Budgeting website](http://www.washington.edu/admin/pb/home/opb-tuition.htm) for information on tuition schedules:

* For fee-based programs, include anticipated fee schedule for the program, as well as any possible or committed outside sources of funding

Once the coversheet and content of the PNOI has been written (STEP 2) continue by soliciting stakeholder feedback (STEP 3).

For your reference, use the UW Tacoma New Undergraduate Program Review Process Steps & Flowchart