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

June 3, 2019 (12:30 p.m. – 2:20 p.m.)

GWP 320 – Dawn Lucien Board Room

***Present****: Menaka Abraham, D.C. Grant, Katie Haerling (present up to Item 5), Lauren Montgomery, Etga Ugur, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Eugene Sivadas, Leighann Chaffee, Mark Pendras, Jill Purdy, Charles Costarella, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Sarah Hampson, Marian Harris, Danica Miller, Sushil Oswal, Jenny Sheng, Michelle Garner, Justin Wadland, Nicole Blair* ***Attending Remotely****: Kathy Beaudoin* ***Excused:*** *Rupinder Jindal, Arindam Tripathy* ***Guests****: Serin Anderson, LeAnne Laux-Bachand, Robin Evans-Agnew, Jim Thatcher, Yonn Dierwechter, Rajendra Katti*

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

* Recording permission for the minutes was given.
* The agenda for June 3, 2019 was approved.
  + *16 yes, 0 abstention, 0 no*
* The meeting minutes from 4/22/19 were approved.
  + *13 yes, 1 abstention, 0 no*
* The meeting minutes from 5/6/19 were approved.
  + *14 yes, 0 abstention, 0 no*

1. **Announcements**

* The incoming Standing Committee Chairs for Faculty Affairs Committee; Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure; and Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee were introduced to EC.
* Two faculty and one staff are preparing to launch the Higher Education Budgets Study Group. This study group will aim to understand higher education budget issues using the UW Tacoma budget as a case study. An email announcement will be sent to faculty on June 4, 2019.

1. **EVCAA Report**

* Academic Affairs Budget Adjustments – Following-up from the Chancellor’s Town Hall on May 28, 2019, the EVCAA gave an overview of the summary of budget adjustments that will occur in FY20 within Academic Affairs.
* While no money is being cut from Schools, various support areas within Academic Affairs will receive budget cuts in the amount of $769,192. This money will be reallocated to Schools and different support areas within Academic Affairs as part of a larger amount of newly funded areas. In the newly funded areas, Schools will receive $1,063,550 and support areas will receive $321,865.
* The EVCAA provided a handout summarizing this information, which will be dispersed to EC electronically after it is updated to include more details.

1. **Academic Plan (vote) (See Appendix A)**

* After the May 6, 2019 EC meeting, the draft Academic Plan was dispersed to the ‘uwtfac’ and ‘uwtfacpt’ mailing lists so faculty across campus could submit feedback. EC members also shared the draft Academic Plan with their units. Feedback was collected between May 7, 2019 and May 25, 2019.
* The EC Chair gave committee members an overview of how feedback was collected and incorporated, which, given this is UW Tacoma’s first Academic Plan, resulted in the creation of an FAQs and Lessons Learned document.
* Motion to approve Academic Plan

*18 yes, 1 abstain, 0 no*

1. **Task Force on Tri-Campus Relationship (vote) (see Appendix B)**

* After the May 6, 2019 EC meeting, the draft Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships document was dispersed to the ‘uwtfac’ and ‘uwtfacpt’ mailing lists so faculty across campus could submit feedback. EC members also shared the draft Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships document with their units. Feedback was collected between May 7, 2019 and May 20, 2019.
* The EC Chair presented an overview of changes made to the Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships document including the newly created FAQs document describing how campus feedback was addressed.
* Committee members expressed concerns over faculty members for this steering committee being appointed instead of elected. These discussions resulted in the creation of an election mechanism.
* Actions: Nominations for the Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships will be solicited via catalyst through June 7, 2019 at 9 a.m. Candidates will submit a 1-page statement addressing how they meet the criteria for selection. EC members will vote on the final two faculty selected for the Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships via catalyst before the quarter ends.
* Motion to approve Task Force on Tri-Campus Relationships with the following changes: Prioritized criteria for selection; faculty members to be elected instead of appointed.

*19 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no*

1. **Executive Session – Election: Research Advisory Committee members (vote)**

* After the May 6, 2019 EC meeting, EC voting members used the previously approved Research Advisory Committee (RAC) rubric to evaluate the 17 RAC nominees using cover letters and CVs submitted by each candidate. Evaluations were conducted via catalyst before the June 3, 2019 EC meeting where final votes of the top seven candidates were cast.
* Discussions took place to ensure top candidates being voted upon met the rubric criteria (e.g. at least three units represented and balanced representation from qualitative and quantitative methodologies).
* Voting processes resulted in the election of the five faculty members to the RAC.

1. **End of Year Report from Standing Committee Chairs**

* Faculty Assembly’s three Standing Committees, as well as the ad hoc Lecturer Affairs Committee, gave an overview of their End of Year reports.
  + Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee
  + Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee
  + Faculty Affairs Committee
* Committee members expressed appreciation for the work of each standing committee chair.
* End of Year Reports from Standing Committees will be available on the Faculty Assembly website.

1. **Lecturer Affairs Committee in 2019-2020 (vote)**

* Lecturer Affairs Committee will return in 2019-2020 as an ad hoc committee with the same charge.
* Motion to approve Lecturer Affairs Committee in 2019-2020

*14 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no*

1. **Key Topics**

* 2018-2023 Academic Plan (vote)
* 2018-2019 Standing Committee Reports
* Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships (vote)
* Election of Research Advisory Committee members (vote)
* Lecturer Affairs Committee: Returning for 2019-2020 as an ad hoc committee (vote)
* EVCAA Report – Explanation of FY20 budget adjustments in Academic Affairs

Passed 2 Policies:

* 2018-2023 Academic Plan
* Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships

Thanks to all who served on Executive Council with terms ending in 2019!

1. **Adjournment**

* The meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.
* This was the last Executive Council meeting of the 2018-2019 academic year. The next meeting of Executive Council will be September 30, 2019 from 12:30-1:20 p.m. in GWP 320.

**Appendix A**

**University of Washington Tacoma**

**2018-2023 Academic Plan**

*Approved by the Faculty Assembly Executive Council on 06.03.19*
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**University of Washington Tacoma**

**2018-2023 Academic Plan**

**PURPOSE**

UW Tacoma is a public university that fosters a thriving and equitable society by educating diverse learners and expanding knowledge through partnership and collaboration with all our communities. We seek to expand access to higher education in an environment where every student has the opportunity to succeed. We foster scholarship, research, and creativity to address the challenging problems of our time and place. We partner and collaborate for the common good, and we catalyze the economic and social vitality of the region.

UW Tacoma’s first five-year academic plan is the product of two years of work focused on assessing existing academic programs, evaluating student and community needs, and identifying opportunities for new and revised academic offerings and related support. It was created through a faculty driven, campus-wide evaluation of the scope and nature of our academic offerings and initiatives. Creating the plan also required looking outward to emergent issues and opportunities and envisioning possibilities for new avenues of discovery, teaching, application, and integration of knowledge. In the absence of an academic plan, the curricular offerings of UW Tacoma might be driven by market forces and legislative initiatives to fund STEM offerings. Our academic planning process recognizes the importance of balancing growth and improvement of our existing academic activities with the creation of new trajectories for learning. The campus-wide planning process allowed identification of synergies and opportunities for collaboration to better support academic excellence in teaching, learning, and knowledge creation.

The 2018-2023 academic plan aligns our priorities and resources with the campus mission, vision and strategic plan. The strategic priorities and impact goals reflected in this academic plan are as follows:

1. Students – The UW Tacoma experience empowers students to achieve their dreams.
2. Scholarship – We champion publicly engaged scholarship.
3. Communities – Our community partnerships are transformational and synergistic.
4. Equity – We are grounded in social justice and embrace the assets of our diverse communities.
5. Culture – Our campus is respectful, accepting, productive and inclusive.
6. Growth – Our innovation drives our growth, energizing us and our region.

Source: [UW Tacoma Strategic Plan](https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/strategic-planning/strategic-priorities-impact-goals)

**PLANNING PROCESS**

In summer of 2017, while planning the faculty agenda for the year, the Chair of Faculty Assembly identified academic planning as one of four priorities for the coming year. The interim leaders of Academic Affairs had also recognized the need for academic planning. The intention for an academic plan was introduced at Faculty Assembly retreat on September 25, 2017 followed by a faculty discussion.

Stage 1 of academic planning was conducted in autumn 2017. It involved assessment of existing academic programs. Faculty in each school or academic unit evaluated their academic offerings using a rubric with criteria regarding strategic alignment, program productivity, internal and community demand, program quality, resources, and future potential (see Appendix 1). For each degree program, institutional data was provided to support assessment of factors such as enrollment trends, faculty to student ratios, and external demand for graduates. In addition, faculty assessed the success of graduates, national or international indicators of program quality, and the adequacy of facilities and technology. Program faculty provided self-evaluation of their orientation toward emerging changes in the discipline and their capacity to generate creative ideas. At the conclusion of each assessment, faculty made a recommendation to grow, maintain, redesign, or phase out the degree program. To ensure transparency, assessments and recommendations were posted to be available to all members of the faculty.

Stage 2 was conducted in winter and spring of 2018. It involved the development of action steps related to the recommendations proposed in Stage 1 to grow, maintain, redesign, or phase out current degree programs. This involved identifying curricular, pedagogical, and outreach actions to achieve the desired results. Stage 2 also included identifying opportunities for new program development based on student, community and industry demand. Faculty then determined how existing resources could be mobilized or reallocated to facilitate changes, and also what new resources would be needed. Deans and unit heads provided comments on these assessments and plans, and offered their recommendations for the overall direction of their schools or academic units. This stage concluded with public presentation of the proposed changes and new programs, and identifies associated resource requirements (see Appendix 2).

Stage 3 emphasized curriculum planning for new undergraduate and graduate degree programs. It was conducted in spring 2018, autumn 2018 and winter 2019. A collaborative process was adopted to solicit feedback from all faculty members regarding criteria to assess new programs. Brief proposals for new programs were developed by unit faculty and reviewed by the Academic Planning and Curriculum Committee of Faculty Assembly (APCC) using the approved criteria.

**CURRICULAR PLAN**

The review of proposed academic offerings was designed to gather the ideas of the faculty and provide an opportunity for all of campus to view them. The academic planning process is separate from the curriculum approval process and is not meant to duplicate the rigor of that process.

**New Academic Offerings**

Fifteen (15) proposals for new degree programs were submitted by faculty and the Academic Plan Steering Committee recommended twelve (12) be reviewed and possibly included in the academic plan. Inclusion in the plan does not indicate approval of a proposed degree program. Rather it identifies which programs may move forward through the curriculum review process, and priorities among a group of programs that may move forward at different times during the implementation period of the five year plan. Three (3) proposals in the earliest stages of development were deferred to the next academic planning period (see Appendix 2 for details).

Four unranked criteria were identified by faculty and approved by the Executive Council for assessing the brief proposals:

1. Alignment with the strategic plan

2. Community/student/market demand and impact

3. Resource impact

4. Campus-wide balance of academic disciplines and programs

Eleven (11) brief proposals were submitted for review by APCC for possible inclusion in the academic plan. The review by the APCC placed the programs into the following categories of priority:

High: M.S. in Environmental Science

M.S. in Electrical and computer Engineering

Ed.S. in School Psychology

B.A. in Art

B.A. in Educational Studies

Medium: Ph.D. in Computing

B.S. in Mechanical Engineering\*

B.S. in Civil Engineering\*

Low: B.A. in Economic and Policy Analysis

Doctorate in Nursing Practice (Leadership)

M.S. in Information Technology

\*contingent on legislative funding

The categorizations of proposed programs into high, middle and low do not eliminate the possibility of the program entering the curriculum approval process; however, the program’s category will accompany the program throughout stages of review as a reflection of the Academic Plan’s priorities.

The curriculum approval process includes a series of faculty, administrative, UW, and statewide reviews that involve detailed evaluation of:

* the impact of the program on diverse students and communities,
* financial and resource implications for campus,
* similar degree offerings regionally and statewide,
* additional supports needed to ensure student success,
* market demand and job prospects for graduates, and
* overall supply and demand of educational offerings in Washington

These evaluations occur during the curriculum approval process rather than during academic planning. This ensures evaluation occurs as close in time as is possible to the possible launch of a program so that assessment is based upon review in the contextual and fiscal conditions then in place rather than those in place during academic planning.

The Academic Planning Policy and Process approved by the Executive Council on January 28, 2019 allows one opportunity per year in the autumn for additional proposals for new degree programs to be reviewed for possible inclusion in this plan.

**Academic Program Changes**

Faculty proposed twenty-six possibilities for modifications to existing programs and curricula. The proposed changes are in four categories:

1. Expansion of existing programs with new options (areas of focus) and/or new audiences (e.g. practicing professionals).
2. Honors designations for multiple undergraduate degrees.
3. Ideas for new minors, certificates and options. These programs were not included in APCC Academic Plan review, which was limited to new degrees for this plan cycle only.
4. Facility and technology enhancements to remain current and enhance student learning.

The curricular changes identified in the first three categories above will proceed through the regular curriculum approval process. This process includes assessments of demand, academic quality, and resource needs. Depending on the nature of the change, proposals may be required to undergo UW tri-campus review, a state-level comment period, and accreditation review by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

The facility and technology needs ranged from software upgrades to multi-million dollar facilities such as laboratories. Implementation of proposed changes began in Spring 2018. Investments will be made throughout the plan cycle as resources permit, and large and/or long term needs will be added to the campus capital plan.

**ACADEMIC SUPPORT PLAN**

The elements of an academic plan must include a framework for supporting the success of the institution in its academic endeavors. Curricular offerings are the heart of this plan, and the faculty, students and staff who engage in them should be supported through initiatives that support access and excellence. The areas of focus for academic support include student learning, scholarship, and faculty development.

**Student Learning**

The 2018-2023 Academic Plan emphasizes student success that results in persistence, deep learning, graduation, and positive post-graduation outcomes. We will focus on three general areas to support teaching, learning, and student success:

1. Access and Inclusivity: Efforts will support expansion of inclusive pedagogy training for faculty and staff, high-quality digital learning, and multilingual writer support. We will create additional learning support through the Teaching and Learning Center and Library to support all academic areas as well as new degree programs. We will enhance support for graduate students.
2. Innovation: We will pursue development of the Global Innovation and Design initiative to support interdisciplinary, problem-based learning. We will seek to create a Learning Commons that integrates academic support for research, writing, library and information services, quantitative analysis, and technology.
3. Career-Connected Learning: Our efforts will expand the availability of High Impact Practices for all our students (including internships, research, study abroad, community engaged learning). We will improve the clarity of major pathways and support the creation of career-connected curriculum.

In conjunction with these priorities, Academic Affairs is developing an Academic Retention Plan to identify a number of focused actions to improve retention and post-graduation success of our students.

Our ongoing efforts at assessment of student learning will continue. Over the next five years, we will expand our central coordination and support for measuring and improving student achievement, especially for programs that are not assessed via accreditation.

**Scholarship**

UW Tacoma supports a multitude of scholarly approaches built upon humanistic and scientific traditions as well as indigenous ways of knowing. Our commitment to use-inspired research emphasizes the importance of academic knowledge creation to the world in which we live. As a public university, we support scholarship that is guided by the potential use of its results, and we strive to respond to problems or needs of our communities.

UW Tacoma faculty approach the complex challenges of a globalized world from a range of disciplines. Our scholarly endeavors, many of which engage our students and communities, span from cutting edge discoveries in emergent fields to multidisciplinary explorations that leverage UW Tacoma’s interdisciplinary roots.

We will implement three initiatives to enhance research, scholarship and creative works:

1. Research Advisory Committee: We will launch a faculty council to guide all forms of scholarship to enhance the impact and productivity of our community of scholars.

2. Office of Research: Our efforts will improve support for funded research with additional services that ensure successful initiation, completion, compliance and post-award assistance.

3. Community Engaged and Public Scholarship: We will leverage the Library and the Office of Community Partnerships to support research, scholarly and creative expression that leverage the transformative power of these approaches. Our efforts will enhance the infrastructure including organizational processes, communication channels, staffing, and funding that enable these kinds of scholarly work.

**Training and Development**

Support for faculty and staff learning and growth are paramount to the success of this academic plan, and to the long term success of UW Tacoma. While many opportunities for learning exist across campus, we lack a coordinated framework to offer these opportunities systematically or to recognize participation and achievement. We will create and launch a learning and development program that addresses essential areas linked to the six priorities of our strategic plan (see page 1). These areas include:

1. Teaching: We will support learning in areas such as classroom and digital pedagogy, writing and quantitative skill development, open educational resources, and student success.
2. Scholarship: Our efforts will support learning around grant writing and management, manuscript writing and publication, community engagement, and digital scholarship.
3. Equity and Inclusion: We will improve knowledge of inclusive pedagogy, classroom civility, anti-bias practices, and the mentoring, recruitment and retention of diverse individuals.
4. Leadership: We will support development of capabilities in shared governance, management in academic settings, employee relations and fundraising.

**Appendix 1. Stage 1 Criteria and Rubric for Existing Program Evaluation**

1. **Alignment with Mission and Strategic Plan**

* Advancement of UWT’s vision and mission as an urban serving university
* Relationship to the impact goals identified in the strategic plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Is a distinctive element of UWT’s mission | Supports UWT’s mission | Has limited connection to UWT’s mission | Is unrelated to UWT’s mission |
| Program directly advances multiple impact goals of the strategic plan | Program directly advances one impact goal of the strategic plan | Program supports strategic plan but does not directly address an impact goal. | Program is unrelated to advancing impact goals of the strategic plan |

Comments: (optional; 250 word limit)

1. **Program Productivity**

* Five year enrollment
* Number of graduates
* Student credit hours
* Student to faculty ratio (average by headcount)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Top quartile enrollment of majors | | Second quartile enrollment of majors | | Third quartile enrollment of majors | | Bottom quartile enrollment of majors | |
| Top quartile enrollment of degrees granted | | Second quartile enrollment of degrees granted | | Third quartile enrollment of degrees granted | | Bottom quartile enrollment of degrees granted | |
| Top quartile student credit hours | | Second quartile student credit hours | | Third quartile student credit hours | | Bottom quartile student credit hours | |
| 15 or less | 15.1 to 20 | | 20.1 to 25 | | 25.1 to 30 | | 30.1 or more |

Comments: (optional; 250 word limit)

**3. Internal and Community Demand**

* Enrollment growth
* Coursework serves other programs
* External demand (If no data available, do not respond)
* Community engagement (If no data available, do not respond)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Very high enrollment growth | Growing enrollment | Stable enrollment | Shrinking enrollment |
| Courses required by other programs | Courses are electives for other programs | Courses serve general education needs and non-majors | Courses primarily for majors/minors |
| Very high external demand | Growing external demand | Stable external demand | Shrinking external demand |
| Very high external engagement | High external engagement | Moderate external engagement | Limited external engagement |

Describe what benchmarks you used to assess external demand (e.g. graduate Employment in field of study, transfer rates, turndown rates for competitive programs, high school student demand, Bureau of Labor Statistics or state data).

Describe what data you used to assess community engagement (e.g. community partnerships, research and teaching, internships, etc.).

Comments (optional; 250 word limit)

**4. Program Quality**

* Implementation of program assessment
* Success of graduates (If no data available, do not respond)
* Recognition of program quality (If no data available, do not respond)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Thorough internal program assessment fully implemented and ongoing | Assessment is developed but not fully implemented and/or not ongoing | Assessment is in development | Assessment is limited to UW or external review |
| Graduates consistently work or go on to advanced study in their field or a related field. | Graduates are likely to find employment or may go on to advanced study in their field or a related field. | Graduates are unlikely to find employment or pursue advanced study in their field or a related field. | Graduates are very unlikely to find employment or pursue advanced study in their field or a related field. |
| National/international recognition of program quality | Regional recognition of program quality | Local recognition of program quality | Limited outside recognition of program quality |

Describe data used to assess the success of graduates

Describe data used to assess recognition of program quality

Comments (optional; 250 word limit)

**5. Human, Physical and Technical Resources**

* Sufficiency of faculty and staff to support quality instruction and timely student success
* Adequacy of facilities and equipment
* Adequacy of technology and information resources

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Personnel are optimal for course delivery, instruction, and research. | Personnel are acceptable for course delivery, instruction, and research. | Personnel need additions/improvements to meet faculty and student needs. | Personnel are unacceptable for meeting instructional needs. |
| Facilities are optimal for course delivery, instruction, and research | Facilities are acceptable for course delivery, instruction, and research. | Facilities need improvements to meet faculty and student needs. | Facilities are unacceptable for meeting instructional needs. |
| Technology and information services are optimal for course delivery, instruction, and research | Technology and information services are acceptable for course delivery, instruction, and research. | Technology and information services need improvements to meet faculty and student needs. | Technology and information services are unacceptable for meeting instructional needs. |

Comments (optional; 250 word limit)

**6. Future Potential for the Program**

* New opportunities for development
* Innovation around emerging changes in the discipline

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program can demonstrate significant new opportunities. | Program can demonstrate some new opportunities. | Program can demonstrate few new opportunities. | Program can demonstrate no new opportunities. |
| Program has strong orientation toward emerging changes in the discipline and frequently generates creative ideas | Program has an average orientation toward emerging changes in the discipline and generates some creative ideas | Program has a limited orientation toward emerging changes in the discipline and generates few creative ideas | Program has little or no orientation toward emerging changes in the discipline |

Comments (optional; 250 word limit)

**Overall Recommendation for the Degree**

Based on your assessment of the six categories above, what do you recommend?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grow | Maintain | Redesign | Phase Out |

**Appendix 2.** **Stage 2 Outcomes Presented to Faculty in Spring 2018**

Academic Plan – Stage 2

Faculty Assembly Spring 2018 Meeting

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

* Determined by the faculty
* Coordinated across all units
* Financially sustainable

Criteria Used in Planning (unranked):

* Alignment with Strategic Plan
* Campus-wide Balance of Academic Disciplines and Programs,

building on our Existing Expertise and Interdisciplinary Emphasis

* Community/Student/Market Demand and Impact
* Resource Impact

**Total of 15 New Degree Program Proposals Received:**

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

The Steering Committee recommended that 12 move forwardin this planning round, in two stages:

Stage One:

\*EdS in School Psychology

\*MS in Environmental Science

\*BA Economic and Policy Analysis

#BS in Mechanical Engineering

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

Three programs deferred to Next Academic Plan:

MA in Public Affairs

MA in Criminal Justice

M in Healthcare Leadership

Special Cases:

The International Studies new program proposal should be

considered as a program change to the existing Global Studies degree.

Undergraduate Minor in Business Analytics should proceed through

regular curriculum channels.

**Existing Program Changes**

We received 26 program modifications. We ask that programs supporting curricular changes proceed with submitting their proposals.

* Resources associated with these changes will be discussed by the EVCAA and the respective Dean or Director.
* Requests for new faculty or staff positions require approval from Executive Budget Committee.
* Facilities requests will be shared with the VC for Finance and Administration.

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

Network upgrades to Joy

Classrooms with disability support for better access

Larger reading room Global Honors

Simulation lab, hardware and software in Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN)

**Appendix B**

**Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships**

*Approved by the Faculty Assembly Executive Council on 06.03.19*

At the Winter 2019 Faculty Assembly meeting, Secretary of the Faculty Mike Townsend indicated that as the remaining academic units on the UWT campus are transitioning to schools, there is a need to explore and propose an updated shared governance structure for the Tri- Campus system. In discussing concerns about conflicts in the Faculty Code and other UW policies, Dr. Townsend noted that the President and Provost would welcome proposals from the Tacoma and Bothell campuses regarding a new relationship structure with Seattle, and that these proposals may be distinct for each campus.

To initiate work on developing a proposal for a new relationship structure, a Steering Committee on Tri-Campus Relationships, consisting of two administrative leaders and two faculty members, will be commissioned by the Chancellor. This committee will be responsible for two functions:

1) To coordinate and communicate with the Seattle and Bothell campuses on issues that are of interest to all three campuses. Collaboration across all UW campuses is required because if approved, this work would result in changes to the Faculty Code and/or new legislation requiring approval of the Faculty Senate.

2) To identify and coordinate work groups of faculty and staff that explore and propose new structures and processes for the UW Tacoma/UW Seattle relationship and Tri-Campus relationships more generally. These work groups might address topics such as:

* Schools and Faculty: APT authority, status of Schools relative to Schools in Seattle, authority for workload, other Code issues;
* Curriculum and Academics: course and program approvals, transfer equivalencies, control of summer school;
* Systems and Operations: financial aid, student databases, registration and transcripts, financial authorities, Title IX, fundraising;
* External Relationships: relationships to Board of Regents, legislature, alumni relations.

To ensure transparency, this committee will solicit feedback from all faculty and report progress to the Executive Council. To identify the faculty members who will serve on the Steering Committee, a nomination and application process will be conducted. All voting faculty members are eligible to be nominated and those who are interested in serving will be asked to write a short statement to address how they satisfy the prioritized criteria listed below. Executive Council members will vote to elect two faculty members and the Chancellor will appoint two administrative leaders.

Prioritized criteria to serve on this steering committee include the following:

1. Established experience in academic leadership roles.
2. Broad knowledge of tri-campus policies and practices (faculty, administrative, etc.) including Faculty Code, administrative procedures, and decision rights;
3. Ability to work collaboratively with faculty, administration and staff to lead a complex, multi-year project;
4. Cross-campus relationships that support information gathering and exchange across UW;
5. Awareness of federal and state legislation, compliance requirements for universities, and shared accreditation issues;

The anticipated term of service on this steering committee is 3 years. Faculty members on the Steering Committee will be provided with compensation in the form of supplemental pay or course release to support their leadership roles in this work. The exact nature of the compensation will be recommended by the Steering Committee, as they define the scope and scale of the work.