

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)
Agenda

Thursday, October 7, 2010

CP 206

12:30-2:00 p.m.

Attendees: Marcie Lazzari, Chair; Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair; Donald Chinn, Marjorie Dobratz, Linda Dawson, Charles Emlet, Ehsan Feroz, Emily N. Ignacio, Diane Kinder, George Mobus, Kent Nelson, Mark Pendras, Tracy Thompson, Peter Selkin, Larry Wear, Charles Williams, Beth Rushing, ex-officio

Guests: Divya McMillin, Director of Global Honors; Jim Posey, Director of the Office of Institutional Research and Planning; Ingrid Walker, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Education

1. The minutes from Faculty Assembly Executive Council Retreat September 27, 2010 will be revised and sent via email to be approved by the EC.

2. Faculty Assembly updates

- a. Marcie Lazzari, Chair and Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair, are working on drafting bylaw changes regarding the terms of service for all standing committees.
- b. The EC has invited Nauman Mumtaz, ASUWT President to EC meetings as a student liaison. Mumtaz cannot attend EC meeting because they conflict with ASUWT meetings. The Faculty Assembly office will send Mumtaz EC meeting minutes.
- c. Lazzari and Barsness are meeting with the Staff Association next week.
- d. Lazzari and Barsness are still working on meeting with John Banks, Director of International Programs.
- e. Standing Committee Buyouts
The maximum is \$5000.00. Faculty should talk about faculty who are irreplaceable should notify Star Murray, Faculty Assembly Office Assistant.
- f. The FA office will post the EC agenda and the most recent EC meeting minutes on the FA list serve to increase awareness about EC business and encourage faculty feedback.
- g. Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reminded about the upcoming campus wide events. They included Patty Murray's rally with Vice President Joe Biden, Slade Gorton's visit broadcast with 60 Minutes, ABET the accrediting body (site visit is Sunday through Thursday).

3. Discussion of the roles and responsibilities related to the CORE and lower division curricula, Ingrid Walker

- a. Ingrid Walker sent out several documents via email to the EC members

(attached). Walker met with Lazzari and Barsness. Faculty and staff worked on the learning objectives. The biggest changes are included in the cohort model, with building the concept of the learning community, and encouraging that students need should be connected to UWT. These changes are meant to ensure students will be more accountable and faculty will be better informed. Added the core lab – are things like the TLC, SHAW, and the library.

b. The Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) has also been responsive to programs. Last year they worked with writing faculty who decided they wanted an improvement at UW Tacoma in writing and reading skills. Now there are two writing cohorts and this is similar with the new science cohort.

c. OUE faculty has also worked hard on the learning objectives, thus the twenty credits for the pilot cohorts. The larger issue is the other 40 undergraduate credits. Other issues such as working students, for example class availability, where students are not getting what they need, in the sequence they need it. Walker expressed this as an example of the 60 general education credits and the total of 90 credits before an undergraduate enters into a major.

d. Programs are needed to contribute their recommendations about the Core and undergraduate credits in order to consider how the area of knowledge courses are understood and function. Linda Dawson noted that faculty input will depend on their willingness to volunteer their area of expertise. Thompson suggested developing an independent advisory board which might include a representative from each program to look at the 100-200 level non-core courses.

e. Some EC members were concerned about what problems exist and what should be addressed. Emily Ignacio asked about the course attributes such as VLPA and whether this considers the UW system course requirements, which Walker confirmed it had. Ehsan Feroz noted that Tacoma look at both Seattle and Bothell's organizational structure.

f. Barsness referenced UW Bothell's General Faculty Organization. At UW Bothell, there is a steering committee that acts in lieu of program faculty, and fulfills the same role as a program committee. The Center for University Studies & Programs (CUSP) has the responsibility for developing the curricula, oversight, responsibility, and accountability. They discussed this in the context of the Core. Walker noted that all of Bothell's lower division courses are launched out of CUSP. EC should be concerned with the remaining 40 credits in addition to the 20 Core credits. Program advisers can provide information regarding high demand undergraduate courses.

g. There was a lengthy discussion about undergraduate education, which included questions about infrastructure, administration, credits, faculty approach, criteria and models, what counts as a problem, and what type of new committee can address these issues appropriately. Here are some highlights from that discussion: George Mobus, Chair, Academic Policy Committee added that faculty need to be concerned with the quality of the courses. Faculty Assembly should oversee this, and look at Bothell, Seattle for organization. APC is supposed to look into OUE, Global Honors and International Programs. Mobus said he will meet with Walker and prepare to bring their discussion to the EC. Lazzari and Barsness agreed that they will continue to work with OUE to address the holes regarding

undergraduate credits. Beth Rushing suggested that assessment should be addressed. Ignacio noted that it will be helpful to get the academic advisers involved so faculty can understand how to advise the students about moving into particular majors and address transfer students to the junior level. Charles Emlet suggested that faculty might sit on a taskforce/committee without teaching in the Core. Walker noted that the OUE is also looking at the different needs of sophomores and agreed with Ignacio, that advisers must be involved in that conversation.

h. Donald Chinn noted that UW Tacoma faculty should be representing the university. Thompson added that with growth, there are new challenges for university faculty which are important to consider, they are resources, directors' input, funding, allocation, freeing up staff for more work. So faculty must interface with Academic Affairs and Beth Rushing.

i. Director of Global Honors, Divya McMillin noted that the Global Honors Advisory Board (GHAB) can give some history, to provide oversight on curriculum issues, academia, and scholarships. In the past, the GHAB has worked with a senior global honors student and has contacted faculty when developing new course proposals.

j. Barsness noted that the input from the advisers will help show what it looks like from the students' perspective. This input will relate to tuition, student credits and their knowledge of graduation requirements, and is important for addressing issues at the institutional level.

Action: Lazzari, Barsness, and Mobus will continue this discussion with Walker and report back to EC. In the meantime EC members should communicate with their programs to encourage feedback. Walker would like feedback about whether new courses are offered.

3. Office of Institutional Research and Planning (OIRP), Jim Posey, Director

Posey's office conducted a survey about overall satisfaction with OIRP services. Across the board, OIRP had exceptional satisfaction, except with faculty. In the survey faculty's perception was that Posey works for administration and not in their interest. While Posey reports to Chancellor Patricia Spakes and Ysabel Trinidad, he wants like to bridge the gap, and hear how to meet the Faculty Assembly mission.

Shared Governance and OIRP: Lazzari and Barsness are on the Executive Policy Committee, and since OIRP data is given to the EPC it can be passed on to the EC. One of the difficulties is atomic level data, sharing the aggregate level is not a problem, but atomic level information of the faculty becomes problematic. The only exceptions for release of data are Human Resources data and information that addresses ethnicity/ race.

In the recent past OIRP worked on the new Quick Search, for student classes, which is located under the admissions webpage. They have also developed the

class schedule matrix, provided data for 100- 200 level courses, program self-studies, ABET, Business, individual faculty (Josh Tenenberg, data on community colleges; Anne Beaufort, study of writing; Katie Baird, student credit hours).

If faculty have the need for data OIRP can help with such things as collecting data, creating a data mart, do calculations, a specific view of the data, a report in Microsoft reporting services, student FTE-by program, enrollment, capacity, academic cap, physical cap (program administrators have access to this).

OIRP requires that faculty have FERPA training.

Posey also explained that he hopes he can dispel the misconceptions about class sizes. For example, last fall, there were many conversations about increased class sizes, which was true of some courses. But the faculty-student ratio actually decreased because there was more new faculty. There were less new students. UWT's distribution of students who enrolled in lecturer courses and independent research lab courses was another factor. Then there was the budget aspect. Posey explained he would like to more data used to keep the campus informed about the whole story.

4. Teaching Evaluations

Ehsan Feroz brought up the issue of teaching evaluations, explaining that there are fundamental issues with evaluating faculty that EC needs to address. Students are concerned about academic integrity. Mobus suggested that the Rushing, VCAA might be interested in working with faculty on addressing this problem. Feroz will send a document to be distributed to EC members.

5. The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Attachment A, from Ingrid Walker
UWT Core Program 2010-11

Program Purpose

The Core program serves UWT's incoming freshmen who come straight out of high school without introductory college credits (especially composition). Its focus is to provide an introduction not just to disciplinary methods and knowledge, but more so to the university's practices and expectations as an academic community. As an evolving four-year urban commuter university, UWT has identified its need for a strong foundational year for students entering with little college experience. Research demonstrates that student retention and success is directly correlated to the expectations established and support given to develop critical skills in the first 6 to 15 weeks of university experience. Because critical skills take longer than 10 weeks to develop, a first year program focused on the development of those skills has been proven essential to the success of students straight out of high school.

Core Faculty and staff work with students closely to help them develop the critical reading, thinking, writing, and research skills expected of college students. The Core is focused on a discrete series of faculty-designed learning objectives that address what students are expected to know and be able to do by the end of their first year. In Autumn quarter 2010, the Core will pilot a support "lab" in which students will meet with an instructor and peer adviser to facilitate the acculturation process of becoming an active citizen of the university, learning and engaging cultural norms, resources, and practices.

Core Structure 2010-11

The Core program has undergone curricular and structural changes every year since its inception in 2004. These changes were due to the anticipated learning curve for UWT faculty and staff in working with lower division students, challenges associated with staffing an interdisciplinary program faculty in a context of budget reductions, concerns about student retention, and feedback from Core faculty, staff, and the Foundations of Excellence self-study.

The Core remains a cohort model, with student groups taking 20 credits of general education requirements together across the first year (3 areas of knowledge and a composition course). On a commuter campus, this model helps establish a learning community for students straight out of high school who need both an introduction to university expectations/practices and courses that support them in developing the academic and life skills required of university study.

With the spring 2009 recommendations of the Foundations of Excellence Study the Advising Task Force, and Core faculty (past and present) the Office of Undergraduate Education revised the Core structure to reflect these needs/recommendations:

- maintain cohorts/learning community across the first year (Core faculty and FoE recommendation)
- de-couple writing from other courses (faculty recommendation – although most enjoyed it, team-teaching was found to be too labor-intensive)

- shift Core to regular course schedule (Core faculty and FoE recommendation)
- maintain 22 student sections (Core faculty and FoE recommendation, writing faculty requirement)
- establish mandatory advising (FoE and Advising Task Force recommendations)
- continue to fulfill each of the Areas of Knowledge and a composition course (FoE and Core faculty recommendation)
- staff with FT / tenure-track faculty from across campus programs (FoE and Core faculty recommendation)
- increase professional development opportunities for faculty/staff to enhance learning community (Core faculty, FoE, and staff recommendation) – faculty attended 4 workshops in winter/spring (8 hours total) instead of two full days (16 hours total) in summer for the same compensation (\$500).
- build learning community with campus resources and staff collaborators (University 101-type course) with the Core Lab (FoE, student, campus staff, and Core faculty recommendation)
- continue with assigned academic and peer advisers (FoE, Core faculty, student recommendation)

Additional features of Core 2010-11

- Core Class Learning Objectives – as part of the spring development series, faculty identified what they thought first year students should be able to do and know by the end of the first year as learning objectives. They then committed to teaching to those learning objectives as a set of outcomes for the cohort, across the year, by identifying which ones students would learn in their courses. This alignment of outcomes across the cohort is new to Core.*
- Core Lab – a required 1.25 hour lab on Fridays in which Core students are introduced to a series of campus resources, support services, and study/life skills. UWT staff will act as facilitators as Core collaborators come in each week to introduce students to needed resources. Peer advisers also attend and help facilitate everything from peer review sessions to library research orientation.
- A common Core experience: October 2010, all Core students will attend a talk by Marc Elliot, who focuses on issues of diversity and social awareness of difference. The Core Lab that week functions as a discussion space for this event.
- Stretch Composition cohorts – in response to the Writing and other Core faculty (and FoE) recommendations to increase writing instruction for first year students, the Writing faculty and OUE collaborated on a pilot model for such instruction. Two of the eight Core cohorts will receive two terms of composition back to back (autumn/winter) from the same instructor. They receive 5 credits for each course, but the model allows the instructor to stretch writing instruction across 20 weeks, setting the context for greater developmental gains in writing skills for those students. This is a common model nationally, as it reinforces learning and allows the instructor to work at a different pace with students. Based on their SAT scores

and high school grades, we placed students most in need of extra writing instruction in these cohorts.

- Because the Core was staffed early in the year, faculty were able to work together as a cohort in development workshops and students were able to identify their top choices of cohorts by course title/content. Prior to this year, students selected cohorts based only on the fall course.

***Metrics for assessing cohort learning:**

Initial: Students demonstrate an introductory awareness of concept or an entry-level with a skill.

Emerging: Students have familiarity but require extensive review and/or practice with skill or concepts.

Defined: Students have basic knowledge and competency but require directed practice and feedback to improve.

Highly Defined: Students exhibit a strong facility with skill or knowledge and can self-evaluate to improve.

Attachment B

Core Cohort Staffing 2010-2011

	Autumn	Winter	Spring	Autumn Core Lab
Co hor t 1 Adv iser: Eric a Cok er	Ginger MacDonald, I&S - M/W 1:30 “The Social Science of Family Studies” Nicole Blair, W (stretch) - M/W 10:20 “The Formation of Identity in/Through/Against Culture”	Ruth Vanderpool, NW - M/W 1:30 “Origami Math” Nicole Blair, W (stretch) - M/W 10:20 “The Formation of Identity in/Through/Against Culture”	Anne Beaufort, VLPA - T/TH 1:30 “Seeking Our Identities”	Megan Bentley F 8:00-9:20 PA: Jeff Bleckert
Co hor t 2 Adv iser: Kar in Dal esk y	Nicole Blair, W (stretch) - M/W 8:00 “The Formation of Identity in/Through/Against Culture” Natalie Jolly, I&S - M/W 10:20 “Barbie vs. GI Joe: Gender in Society”	Nicole Blair, W (stretch) - M/W 8:00 “The Formation of Identity in/Through/Against Culture” Anthony Falit- Baiamonte, VLPA - M/W 10:20 “Representations of differences and inequality in cities”	Donald Chinn, NW - M/W 10:20 “Logic, Argument, Science, and Truth”	Karin Dalesky F 9:30-10:50 PA: Jen Llarenas
Co hor t 3 Adv iser: Vall i Reb sam en	Matthew Weinstein, I& S - T/TH 10:20 “Science in global perspective” Cynthia Duncan, VLPA - T/TH 1:30 “Latino USA”	Tara Nesbit , W – T/TH 8:00	Jennifer Gogarten, NW - M/W 10:20 “Introduction to Science:Evolution”	Heather Galloni F 9:30-10:50 PA: Gladys Mondragon
Co hor t 4 Adv iser:	Michael Kucher, NW - M/W 1:30 “A Natural History of SH!T: Social, Cultural, and Ecological dimensions of Human Waste”	Cumi Ikeda, W - M/W 10:20 “The University Student in the 21 st Century”	Evy Shankus, I&S - T/TH 10:20 “Business and Society”	Jo Enscoe F 8:00-9:20 PA: Jaime Toyoda

Valli Rebsamen	Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, VLPA - M/W 10:20 “Representations of differences and inequality in cities”			
Erica Coker				Erica Coker F 11:00-12:20
Erica Coker	5 Riki Thompson, W - T/TH 10:20 “Blog me! Writing in the Digital Age”	Julie Nicoletta, VLPA - T/TH 1:30 “Pilgrimage Sites - Sacred and Profane”	Thea Drescher, I&S - M/W 10:20 “Stories of Social Justice”	PA: Steven Souriyadeth
Erica Coker				
Erica Coker	6 Riki Thompson, W - T/TH 8:00 “Blog me! Writing in the Digital Age”	Jerry Finn, I&S - T/TH 1:30 “Digital versus Grapevine society” the social impact of information technology” Julie Nicoletta, VLPA - T/TH 10:20 “Pilgrimage Sites - Sacred and Profane”	Ruth Vanderpool, NW – M/W 8 AM “Origami Math”	Bo Bae F 1:30-2:50 PA: Joseph Franco
Erica Coker				
Erica Coker	7 Julie Masura, NW - M/W 10:20 “The Earth is Burning!”	Tara Nesbit, W – T/TH 10:20	Rich Furman, I&S - T/TH 8:00 “Men and Masculinities, in Global America”	Heather Galloni F 11:00-12:20 PA: Shaun Dulay
Erica Coker				
Erica Coker	8 Michael Kucher, NW - M/W 10:20 “A Natural History of SH!T: Social, Cultural, and Ecological dimensions of Human	Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, I&S - T/TH 10:20	Merna Hecht, VLPA – T/TH 10:20	Valli Rebsamen F 1:30-2:50 PA: Tyler Pederson

iser: Waste”
Vall Cumi Ikeda, W – M/W
i 8:00
Reb “The University
sam Student in the 21st
en Century”

Attachment C

Learning Objectives for Core Lab

(Friday Core lab instructors and Core collaborators)

These are the specific Core lab learning objectives that Core collaborators have identified in recent meetings. Below, these learning objectives are ranked (based on a Catalyst survey completed by collaborators). As the Core lab will only meet once a week for one quarter, we cannot introduce everything that a course such as this would ideally address. However, this common set of goals for the lab portion of the learning community will serve as a shared set of knowledge that all Core students are introduced to in order to complement the skills they will be practicing in their Core classes.

Students will be able to

- maintain academic integrity.
- manage and use time effectively.
- think critically.
- take notes effectively.
- read scholarly texts.
- maintain personal wellbeing.
- demonstrate classroom etiquette.
- demonstrate an understanding of the financial aspects of college.
- navigate the library and its resources, including library databases.
- effectively communicate with faculty and staff.
- assess sources
- use style guides
- identify available resources and when/how to use them.

Attachment D

Student Learning Objectives for Core Classes

(W, I & S, VLPA, NW)

These are the specific learning objectives that Core faculty have identified based on the work in the second Core development workshop (i.e., this is the condensed and organized version of the dozens of filled out sticky notes). Below, these learning objectives are categorized by UWT's student learning goals. We realize that not all five university SLGs are represented here (Diversity and Civic Engagement are missing) and that all of the learning objectives you have for your students may not be listed, but this does not mean that we do not value what is not listed. What this document represents are the specific student learning objectives that we, as the Core faculty, will be sure to address in our classes to ensure that our Core students will, across the board, be introduced to and trained in the skills that we have collectively identified as being central to our teaching.

Students will be able to

Communication/Self-Expression

- formulate an original thesis-driven argument and sustain it in both written and verbal communication.
- express ideas clearly in writing and speaking in order to synthesize and evaluate information before presenting it.
- enter/place themselves into an existing dialogue (intellectual, political, etc.).
- identify, analyze, and summarize/represent the key elements of a text.

Global Perspective

- think outside of cultural norms and values, including their own perspectives, to critically engage the larger world.
- analyze the ethical implications of actions on the part of individuals and institutions.
- recognize the value of obtaining a historical perspective of events as being relevant and useful to guide future decision-making.

Inquiry and Critical Thinking

- self-assess personal strengths (personal, academic, social) and how they can help overcome weaknesses.
- approach complex issues by taking a large question and breaking it down into manageable pieces.
- make meaningful connections among assignments and readings in order to develop a sense of the “big picture.”
- collect, evaluate, and analyze information and resources to solve problems or answer questions.