



Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

November 2, 2016 12:30-1:25pm GWP 320

Present: Jutta Heller; Mark Pendras; Matt Kelley; Lauren Montgomery; Melissa Lavitt; Greg Rose; Ji-Hyun Ahn; Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee; Jeff Cohen; Marion Eberly; Michelle Garner; Katie Haerling; Jennifer Harris; Sushil Oswal; Marian Harris; Charles Costerella; Vanessa de Veritch Woodside; Jim Gawel. **Excused:** Julia Aguirre; Nicole Blair; Marcie Lazzari; Ellen Moore; Mark Pagano. **Guests:** Karl Smith

1) Consent Agenda

The October 21, 2016 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved. There were not any changes proposed to the agenda. The agenda was approved.

2) Announcements:

- i) UW YMCA Collaborative Opportunities: contact – Brianna Kidd: bkidd@ymcapkc.org; 253-534-4724
(1) Excel doc. found at: <https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/conversation/assembly/976013>
- ii) Volunteer Call for Student Activities Fee Committee Ex-officio Faculty Representative
(1) There were no EC members interested; call will go out the faculty at large

3) EVCAA Report

- a) **Budget Reallocation, Appendix A:** EVCAA, Melissa Lavitt, projected a letter regarding budget reallocation. See Appendix A. Campus is being faced with a challenging budget exercise of identifying Tier 1 & 2 budget priorities by January 13th, 2017. The deadline came from the desire to synch with other biennial requests. This reallocation's focus is not regarding the Strategic Plan (monies were identified for that effort), but is about filling in deficits. This two part assignment (see Appendix A) represents a significant amount of work.
 - What should reallocation look like? How can we do it in a way that is positive and about building and unifying?
 - There is language in the Faculty Code regarding the procedures for reallocation and reorganization in general. Though it does not specifically address reallocating funds, perhaps this language may guide faculty consultation in the reallocation process
 - EVCAA is meeting 11/10/16 with deans and directors and will ask them to rely on their faculty councils for guidance in this
 - Q: What was the source of these deficits?
 - A: There is not a specific source, but in part this comes from the 2 years of tuition reduction at the state level. The state will not raise tuition anytime soon, either. Therefore, the tuition reduction + inflation + salary increase (not state funded) + state legislature not increasing their funding + small, steady rise in facility maintenance costs = continuous budget shortfall (if not raising tuition)
 - Q: If this reallocation is not tied to the Strategic Plan funding mechanism, then how was the money found to support the Strategic Plan (1% of budget)?
 - A: Exceeded enrollment
 - Comment: We need to think about what we are cutting and what we are investing in
 - What should be held harmless? What budgetary priorities should be safeguarded while not diminishing new strategic priorities?
 - Q: Do we need to make budget cuts for this reallocation and for the Strategic Plan?
 - Q: \$450,000 was found to support the Strategic Plan and we need to make \$400,000 in cuts?
 - A: These questions need to be brought before the Chancellor and he was unable to attend this EC meeting.
 - Deans and directors make resource decisions, but there is also an overall campus budget – how can Faculty Assembly and the Executive Council have input on this?
 - Some units are bigger or smaller than others
 - Deans and directors need to make budget decisions in consultation with their faculty
 - Seems like there is little that EC can do other than encourage deans and directors to talk with their Faculty Councils

- EC members should be talking with their deans/directors and faculty councils
- EC does need to discuss their role in the budget process for safeguards and oversight
- Suggestion: Identify initiatives that are already happening that align with the Strategic Plan and attach a dollar amount to them

This discussion could have continued, but was cut short due to the limited amount of time and the other agenda items. It will be continued at the 11/18/16 meeting which the Chancellor can attend.

- b) **Law School:** The consultant report is in the process of being made available. Thus far, the job forecast isn't promising, there is capacity in other local law programs, and the budget forecast isn't positive. There have been contentious meetings regarding this with community members that would like to see a law school at UW Tacoma. UW Tacoma leadership will get the full report at the end of November.
- c) **Equity Audit on Merit Increase:** The EVCAA requested data from Seattle about the most recent round of faculty merit increases at UW Tacoma and was denied access. Instead, they will do the analysis in regards to gender, race, and ethnicity. This will limit the extent, though, to which the EVCAA can identify discrepancies. The workaround would be to ask UW Tacoma program administrators for the identifying data of faculty in their academic unit. The goal is to assess if there are systematic differences in merit increases by rank, gender, or underrepresented minority status within each academic unit.

4) Admissions Update *Appendix B*

Presentation/ Discussion: Karl Smith, Co-Interim Vice Chancellor for Student & Enrollment Service and Chief Admissions Officer, presented about the *Undergraduate Admissions Review Process*. See Appendix B.

He also passed out the *Autumn 2016 UW Tacoma Admissions Report*. Please email the FA Admin at assembly@uw.edu if you would like a pdf copy of this document or inquire with Karl Smith for a different format.

5) Chair's Report and Discussion Items

APT Charge & Revisions of Appendix A & C – APT chair, Jim Gawel, highlighted the revisions that APT has proposed for the Handbook Appendices A & C. In particular, APT worked to make the wording compatible for all faculty ranks and roles. Previously, the wording has been only directed toward tenure-line positions. He asked that EC take a close look at the revisions that they proposed to Appendix A and to consider Appendix C. The APT committee has not proposed any revisions to it as of yet, due to it seeming out of place and perhaps not even serving a meaningful function. He welcomed suggestions for the APT committee in regards to keeping or discarding Appendix C. He asked that when EC is able to have time to discuss these, that comments be sent to him. EC must vote to approve these changes before the full faculty can vote to approve these changes. EC will discuss these revisions at a future meeting, TBD, and send feedback/comments to Jim. When EC has been able to review these revisions, then a vote to approve them may be discussed.

- a) Strategic Plan Funding Mechanism – Due to the limit of time, EC did not get to this agenda item. They discussed it somewhat in relation to the Budget Reallocation within the EVCAA's report. The Faculty Role in the Budget Process discussion will take place during the 11/18/16 EC meeting and will include discussion of the Strategic Plan Funding Mechanism.

6) Adjourn

Appendix A:

Projected by EVCAA, Melissa Lavitt at the 11/2/16 EC meeting:

On Nov 1, 2016, at 8:37 AM, Mark A. Pagano <mpagano@uw.edu> wrote:
Good Morning VC's,

I thought I would send out a clarification just to make sure we were all clear after the discussion during yesterday morning's VC meeting.

First, we clarified that the strategic plan funding and the budget reallocation exercise are not related in any way. It has been expected that the strategic plan funding would be included in the 2017-18 budget cycle since we first started the strategic planning exercise over a year ago. The only unknown was the magnitude of the funding level for the first year. The budget reallocation plans, while being considered for some time, have not been seen as necessary until initial budget estimates were completed for this biennial budget cycle. The first pass budget estimate predicted approximately a half million dollar short fall in year 2017-18 and an approximate three million dollar short fall in the second year, 2018-19. With robust enrollments this fall and additional budget assumptions being clarified, these estimates now are approximately an even balance in 2017-18 and an approximate two million dollar shortfall in 2018-19. I have prepared and included a simple spreadsheet to clarify strategic plan funding identified thus far.

Assignment – Part 1:

Vice Chancellor's will work together to identify \$400K worth of Tier #1 (highest priority) items to be made available during this year's EBC budget deliberation process should we decide to reduce spending in some areas to allow for new spending in other areas. At this point in time, we are not necessarily making a determination that we will not fund these items. We are just beginning the process of identifying a list of items that we could decide to not fund during the next budget cycle as we also contemplate new budget items. In addition, I asked the VC's to identify a list of Tier #2 (lower priority) items to be made available during this year's EBC budget deliberation process should we decide to further reduce spending deeper than the first \$400K identified as higher priority.

Dr. Lavitt will lead this exercise with staff assistance from Jan Rutledge. There is no expectation that these be proposed "across-the board" with respect to the five VC Units and Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor's Office will contribute to the pool early in the deliberations (i.e. I will also work with Jan to identify areas of spending that I can contribute to the process in both the Tier #1 and Tier #2 domains). The due date for this exercise is January 13th, 2017.

Assignment – Part 2: (We did not have time to discuss this part of the assignment so we will talk about it further next time we meet)

I have also asked the group to prepare an assessment of the new initiatives that were added to each of our unit's budgets over the last three budget cycles (2013-14, 2014-15, and 2015-16). We will prepare a template and a common set of assessment criteria for each of the six major units to use. Each Vice Chancellor can determine how they wish to involve their units in this exercise. We will discuss this in more detail during the upcoming EBC meeting.

I hope this clears up some of the questions about the budget processes that are underway. Thank you, Mark

Budget Year	Recurring Allocation	One-time Allocation	Cumulative Recurring
2016-17	100K	50K	100K
2017-18	200K	200K	300K

Appendix B:

Powerpoint and RTF formats of Karl Smith's presentation slides are available by following this link to the 11.2.16 EC Resources Catalyst Page

<https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/conversation/assembly/976013>

Executive Council Meeting: Undergraduate Admissions Review Process

Karl Smith
Associate Vice Chancellor
Student and Enrollment Services
Chief Admissions Officer

Freshmen and Transfer Increasingly Holistic Review

The University of Washington Tacoma will use an increasingly holistic admissions review process. The process will be used to determine if an applicant is academically prepared and committed to completing a degree program. The review process is broken into the three phases: Initial Assessment, Threshold Review, and Holistic Review; thus the term increasingly holistic.

Freshmen Review: Minimum

First, each application will be reviewed to determine if an applicant meets the minimum College Academic Distribution Requirements (CADRs), has above a 2.0 cumulative GPA and has taken the SAT or ACT. An applicant who has below a 2.0 cumulative GPA, or does not meet the intermediate algebra or world language CADRs will be denied admissions.

Transfer Review: Minimum

Initial Assessment

First, each application will be reviewed to determine the number of credits earned, transferable credits, and transfer GPA. Applicants who have a transfer GPA below a 2.0 will be denied admissions. Applicants with above a 2.0 GPA will proceed to threshold review.

Freshmen Review: Threshold

All applicants who satisfy CADRs and meet the below thresholds are admitted to the UW Tacoma. Thresholds will be periodically validated to determine that current thresholds are connected to educational outcomes.

Current Thresholds:

GPA: 2.70+

SAT Math: 510+

SAT Evidence Based Reading and Writing: 490+

Essay contains no or minimal errors

Applicants who do not meet all requirements during threshold review, but have above a 2.0 GPA are reviewed holistically.

Transfer Review: Threshold

Threshold Review

Thresholds were first established as part of an Agreement with Washington Community and Technical Colleges and have always been part of the UW Tacoma admissions process. The terms of this agreement give highest admissions priority to Washington community and technical college students earning an associate of arts, an associate of science degree, or a major related program-DTA.

Current Thresholds:

- Earn an approved transfer degree,
- 2.5+ transferable GPA,
- Complete intermediate algebra with a minimum grade of 2.0
- Essay contains no or minimal errors

Applicants who do not meet all requirements during threshold review, but have above a 2.0 GPA are reviewed holistically.

Holistic Review: Academic Preparation

The first step during holistic review is to evaluate an applicant along a set of cognitive criteria. Applicants will be evaluated based solely on their demonstrated academic ability.

This phase of the review process is driven by the central question: Does the applicant possess the essential academic preparation to be successful at the UWT?

Academic Variables

Freshmen

- GPA,
- SAT or ACT Test Scores,
- CADR requirements
- College preparation curriculum,
- Grade trend,
- Writing quality,
- Notable academic recognitions

· **Transfer**

- GPA,
- Credits Earned,
- Meets English and intermediate algebra requirement,
- Educational journey
- Grade trend,
- Major related course work,
- Writing quality,
- Notable academic recognitions

Holistic review Commitment to Educational Goals

Commitment to Educational Goals Recommendation/Summary: After evaluating the applicant’s non-cognitive variables the reviewer will make a recommendation on the applicant’s commitment to completing their educational goals as defined by their likelihood to be engaged, personal background, and past experience.

Commitment Variables

· **Freshmen**

- Engagement,
- School involvement,
- Community involvement
- Work experience,
- Participation in pre-college program,
- Personal background and experience

· **Transfer**

- Engagement,
- School involvement
- Work experience
- Community involvement
- Major and/or career goals,
- Personal background and experience,

Holistic Recommendation

After the reviewer has evaluated both cognitive and non-cognitive factors the reviewer will give a holistic recommendation. The holistic recommendation takes into consideration an applicant's academic preparation and commitment to their educational goals. The score is not a summation nor is it direct correlation to one of the two previous assessments. The sub-scores of academic preparation and commitment to educational goals should be considered notes collected in support of the holistic recommendation. The reviewer is to consider all of the evidence collected throughout the review process and make a recommendation on the admissibility of the applicant

[Program Direct Admit Transfer Criteria](#)

[Admission Validity Report: Freshmen](#)

Q&A
