

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA  
FACULTY ASSEMBLY  
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 9, 2008  
CARWEIN AUDITORIUM  
12:50-2pm

In Attendance: Greg Benner, Donald Chinn, Sam Chung, Sian Davies-Vollum, Joyce Dinglason-Pandillo, Marjorie Dobratz, Laura Feuerborn, Jerry Finn, Kelly Forrest, Sharon Fought, Jim Gawel, Cheryl Greengrove, Diane Kinder, Janice Laakso, Nita McKinley, George Mobus, Stern Neill, Julie Nicoletta, Jennifer Quinn, Ruth Rea, Beth Rushing, Eugene Sivas, Pat Spakes, Marcy Stein, Riki Thompson, Daniel Zimmerman

Guests: Jim Coolsen, Jim Posey

The meeting was called to order at 12:55 pm

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes from March 4, 2008
3. Report from the Chancellor
4. Report from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
5. Report from the Chair of Faculty Assembly
6. Report from the FCTCP
7. New Business:
  - a. Strategic Growth Plan
8. Old Business:
  - a. Peer Institutions
9. Adjournment

---

**1. Approval of Agenda:**

The agenda was approved.

**2. Approval of Minutes:**

The minutes from March 4, 2008 were approved.

**3. Report from the Chancellor:**

Pat Spakes saved her remarks for the discussion of the proposed strategic growth plan.

#### **4. Report from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:**

Beth Rushing said that UWT will participate in the Foundations of Excellence. This program will provide a comprehensive assessment of first-year students with some assessment of second-year students, as well. Participation will be across campus. Deirdre Raynor will serve as one of two co-liaisons.

PARC review of proposals for new programs continues. Faculty can look under the Academic Affairs website under PARC to see where specific proposals are in the review process. The Academic Policy committee has also been involved in reviewing proposals.

Budget recommendations for Academic Affairs for 2008-2009 will be sent to Chancellor Spakes after UWT's FTE count is finalized for spring 2008.

#### **5. Report from the Chair of Faculty Assembly:**

Michael Forman has agreed to run as Chair of Faculty Assembly for 2008-2009. We still need a Vice Chair.

The various standing committees of the Faculty Assembly will be reviewing the goals they established at the beginning of the academic year and assessing their accomplishments in the spring quarter.

Marcy also discussed the Executive Council's goals. First, the LCVI study is not dead. We still need to review the "scrubbed" comments that were part of the study. Marcy has invited Beth Warrick who is running the next LCVI survey at the university to meet with the leadership of Faculty Assembly and the UWT Staff Association. Another goal was to review potential bylaws changes and other changes, which may include having fewer Faculty Assembly meetings. The EC's goals are listed on the Faculty Assembly website at:

[http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/faculty\\_assembly/standing\\_committees/source\\_docs/EC\\_goals\\_2007\\_08.pdf](http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/faculty_assembly/standing_committees/source_docs/EC_goals_2007_08.pdf).

President Emmert may be visiting UWT this spring. The ASUWT has been working to arrange this visit. Marcy would like the faculty to be able to meet with him, if and when he comes to visit.

#### **6. Report from the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP):**

In Janet Primomo's absence, Marcy reported that FCTCP has been working with the Faculty Senate on the revision of RCEP and on the cross-campus credit policy. Work proceeds regarding getting UWT and UWB representatives on the UWS Senate Executive Committee and on the Senate Planning and Budgeting Committee.

## **7. New Business:**

### a. Strategic Growth Plan (see attached plan)

Pat first provided some background regarding the drafting of this plan. Growth at UWT has been uneven over the years; this plan would provide a path for planned, even growth. The plan includes President Emmert's statements regarding UWT, including that UWT should reach 5000 FTE in the next five years in order to achieve some economies of scale. UWT would also need to build the required facilities to serve this number of students.

So, how would UWT go about achieving this growth? The plan includes UWT's growth pattern from 2000-2008, which has been uneven. Pat believes that presenting a plan to the Board of Regents and the State Legislature might bring UWT more support for planned growth over time.

The plan proposes growing to 5000 FTE over seven years, which would offer an annual average growth rate of 9.4%. The plan would be reviewed every two years and if the assumptions in the plan are not holding, then this rate of growth would be abandoned. We would keep the proportion of students as follows: 10% freshman, 18-20% graduate students, and the rest transfer students. New programs that are expensive, but potentially attractive to students (a "whiz-bang" program), would bring in FTE above the 9.4% rate.

Questions regarding the plan included the following: how FTE numbers would translate into new faculty positions; why past growth has been so varied; how can we avoid being penalized for not meeting growth targets; how can facilities meet this growth given how long it takes for new buildings to come on line; will UWT really get the resources it needs to grow rapidly; how can we grow more graduate programs and bring in a higher percentage of graduate students than that proposed in the plan; can we change the percentages for students; is it realistic for us to expect that we can have steady growth given the variables in the past; can we move new program approvals along more quickly; can we shore up the foundations of a four-year curriculum that are not necessarily tied to new programs; can we strike a balance between developing new programs and the curricula for existing programs?

This plan is intended to provide general guidelines as a starting point for further discussion regarding growth at UWT. The Chancellor's office will have discussions across campus with each unit, including academic programs, and with the Faculty Assembly and the Staff Association, among other groups. Comments regarding the plan may also be sent to Pat Spakes or Jim Posey.

## **8. Old Business:**

### a. Peer Institutions (see attached documents)

Jim Posey introduced the discussion of peer institutions by explaining the defining peers for UWT can help establish benchmarks for growth, budgeting, development, etc. The Leadership Council selected and ranked variables for determining our peers. A discussion ensued regarding establishing peers: is this about who we are or who we would like to be or who we should be or all of the above? There is a difference between predetermined (current) peers, competitive peers, and aspirational peers. In addition, peers will vary among units and academic programs, so we will need more than one set of peers. Suggestions of additional variables to consider are looking at new campuses and campuses with similar rates of growth to UWT.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

# UWT Biennial Operating Budget Development Process

## Step 1. Unit Heads develop Unit Budget Requests

### Academic Affairs:

Using a process developed by Academic Affairs in consultation with the appropriate administrators, faculty and staff, the VCAA recommends potential academic budget requests. Taking into consideration the UWT Strategic Plan, the Campus Growth Plan, and the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan, the VCAA provides recommendations on:

- any additional FTE request that is over and above the Baseline FTE\* required to sustain current enrollment,
- New, High Demand enrollments requested
- New Programs planned in the “low cost” and “medium cost) ranges, with estimates of anticipated budgets required and timelines. (“Low cost” programs require few new resources, and may be partially funded through reallocation of resources or by using space in existing courses. “Medium cost” programs are those that involve 1-3 new positions over time and a limited amount of new resources. Medium cost programs may be developed in part through reallocation of resources, but there would be some new costs involved.
- Extraordinary request for new high cost program growth that can be justified by documented demand and evidence of strong community *and* legislative support. Such programs would be those that require a significant infusion of new faculty lines, new operating funds, and/or a new kind of dedicated classroom or laboratory space. Examples of programs that evidence strong community and legislative support include Engineering (especially Civil and Environmental, possibly Construction); Speech Therapy; anything that expands Nursing.

### Other Administrative Units:

Using consultative processes developed by the Vice Chancellors and heads of other administrative units, each Unit Head submit requests for significant budget increases or for extraordinary funding. An extraordinary request should be designated for special institutional needs that have historically been handled by the legislature through additional allocations to campuses. An extraordinary request should also be justifiable on the basis of Seattle’s existing funding model. (In other words, UW Seattle has received additional funding in the past for such a purpose.) Such requests in the past have included, for example, extra funds for Student Affairs to address risk management and campus safety concerns, funds to address the state’s need for research, and significant new program expansion funds that cannot be covered by regular operating funds.

## Step 3. Chancellor level review and prioritization

Chancellor reviews and prioritizes requests with Vice Chancellors to develop a list of priorities that can be presented to Seattle. Priorities are shared with campus, including Academic Directors and Faculty Assembly.

**Step 4. Chancellor submits recommendations to Provost.**

**Step 5. Submission to Regents**

The Provost's office reviews campus requests and submits the University's entire budget proposal to Regents and then to the Governor's Office and the legislature. Information on the budget items submitted on behalf of UWT is shared with academic directors and faculty.

**Step 6. Legislative Process**

Biennial budget is worked out by Governor, House, and Senate. UWT budget is shared with campus and Campus Budget Committee for allocation.

---

Note: \*Baseline FTE is the number of FTE that is required to sustain the current enrollment as students move through the entire four years (if freshmen) or two years (if transfer or graduate students). This is a "replacement" figure, rather than an expansion figure. The Office of Institutional Planning and Research will be responsible for providing this figure.

**University of Washington Tacoma  
DRAFT Strategic Growth Plan  
2008-2015**

A steady pattern of growth at the University of Washington Tacoma is expected by the state and by the community the campus serves. In addition, President Emmert indicated to the Board of Regents at their March, 2008 meeting that the University’s intention is to “aggressively” grow UWT. His comments to the Regents were consistent with the benchmarks of success he articulated to UWT Advisory Board members on February 8, 2008. Over the next five years, UWT is expected to:

- Reach 4,000 to 5000 FTE
- Build out required facilities
- Hire sufficient faculty/staff to serve enrollment targets
- Maintain the unique educational qualities of each campus
- Promote faculty and student research focused on relevant regional issues
- Build appropriate resident facilities for students and student activity centers.

Historically, the pattern of growth at UWT has been established through the biennial budget process. Several factors have determined the amount of growth in each biennium, including the availability of state funding and changes in legislative intent. While fluctuations have occurred, the overall rate of growth has averaged 9.4% annually since 2000/2001. The following chart illustrates the pattern of growth and reflects changes in the state’s available resources over time.

<b>UW Tacoma Total FTE by Academic Term</b>							
<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Autumn</b>	<b>Winter</b>	<b>Spring</b>	<b>Annualized FTE (3 QTR)</b>	<b>Actual Growth</b>	<b>Percent Growth</b>	<b>Avg Growth Per Year</b>
<b>2000-2001</b>	1260.7	1281.1	1256.6	1266.13	202.67	19.1%	
<b>2001-2002</b>	1554.9	1567	1554.4	1558.77	292.63	23.1%	
<b>2002-2003</b>	1714.1	1677	1609.2	1666.77	108.00	6.9%	
<b>2003-2004</b>	1605.8	1620.8	1518.9	1581.83	-84.93	-5.1%	
<b>2004-2005</b>	1694.6	1643	1566.5	1634.70	52.87	3.3%	
<b>2005-2006</b>	1753.7	1687.2	1581.8	1674.23	39.53	2.4%	
<b>2006-2007</b>	1861.9	1813.07	1692.9	1789.29	115.06	6.9%	
<b>2007-2008</b>	2172.8	2132.6	2050*	2118.47	329.18	18.4%	<b>9.4%</b>

(NOTE: \* The Spring 2008 total is an estimate)

Fluctuating growth rates can create difficulties in terms of planning. Sustained, predictable growth allows for deliberate, careful expansion and offers a number of advantages:

- More degree choices for students
- More colleagues for faculty and more opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching and research
- More positions for staff with more job security and more opportunities for professional advancement
- More research support
- More faculty to share the service responsibilities of faculty
- Increased diversity
- Increased student fees to support student life and campus cultural events
- Residence halls
- Greater workload equity and efficiency for faculty and staff
- Greater opportunities to create a “student-centered focus” by expanding access to services on evenings and weekends and by providing more services students need
- More opportunity to be compared positively with our aspirational peers

The Strategic Growth Plan for UWT is based upon a number of assumptions articulated below. The intention is to accommodate carefully planned growth and expansion of the campus that reaches the goal of 5000 students by the year 2014/2015. In planning for future biennial budgets, the plan is subject to modification if required by the state’s fiscal realities and the availability of capital and other necessary funding to support this FTE growth. Each biennial budget proposal will serve as an opportunity to review the goals for that biennium, with consideration given to the continued appropriateness of the assumptions, availability of a qualified applicant pool, and assessment of opportunities and resources.

The overall strategic growth plan will be revisited as part of the next review of the campus Strategic Plan, five years from now. That will provide an opportunity to consider new benchmarks and to determine how best to extend the Strategic Growth Plan.

In developing this plan, the following assumptions were made.

1. There will be continued legislative support for expanding FTE at UWT (within the limits of available resources).
2. There will be a steady increase in demand for access to higher education.
3. New undergraduate programs will be developed that will attract freshmen and transfer students.
4. Expanded facilities, curriculum, scholarship, and co-curricular supports will be provided that are consistent with the plan.
5. Graduate enrollment will be maintained at about 18-20% overall, though the proportion may vary in any given biennium based on need and opportunity.

6. Modest increases in four, five, and six year retention rates for undergraduates will allow us some reduction in the number of “new” students required.
7. The new FTE goal for each year is inclusive of all levels: freshmen, transfer, graduate, and high demand.
8. At least two new majors will be developed in the 08/09 academic year and then three more in each subsequent biennium.
9. Expansion of graduate programs will be consistent with the rate of growth in anticipated graduate enrollment.
10. UW Tacoma will continue to closely align its admissions standards and policies with UW, while also assisting the University of Washington in fulfilling its mission of access to excellent degree programs for qualified students.

<b>Seven-Year Growth Chart: 2008/2009 - 2014/2015</b>				
<b>2007/2008 FTE 2139</b>				
<b>YEAR</b>	<b>NEW FTE</b>	<b>Total FTE</b>	<b>HEADCOUNT *</b>	<b>GROWTH RATE</b>
<b>2008/2009</b>	260	2399	2951	12%
<b>2009/2010</b>	235	2634	3240	9%
<b>2010/2011</b>	235	2869	3529	8%
<b>2011/2012</b>	280	3149	3873	9%
<b>2012/2013</b>	280	3429	4218	8%
<b>2013/2014</b>	335	3764	4630	9%
<b>2014/2015</b>	335	4099	5042	8%
			*(est @1.23 per FTE)	

## **UW Tacoma Peer Comparisons**

The Office of Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) at UW Tacoma has been tasked with generating a list of peer comparison institutions for UW Tacoma. Peer comparisons are widely utilized in higher education today and can provide benchmarks for comparing growth and establishing and justifying policy decisions and budget requests in such areas as strategic enrollment planning, facility management, academic program costs, faculty workload, and research. According to the Association of Institutional Research, peer groups can be defined as “institutions that are similar in role, scope and/or mission...similar rather than identical is the operative word.”

In order to determine what UW Tacoma values as an institution in developing peer comparisons, IRP first generated a list of possible variables (see Appendix A). These variables were distributed to the Chancellor’s Leadership Council and members were asked to rank their top ten variables. The results were collected and tabulated resulting in the top ten variables seen in Appendix A.

Based on these results, a search was conducted to find peers based on these variables. A list of peers was generated and distributed to the Chancellor’s Leadership Council, as well as the Executive Council. A few suggestions for other possible peer institutions have since been forwarded to IRP. We are currently looking at these institutions as possible additions.

IRP currently envisions creating subsets of peer institutions based on utilization. For example, we will most likely have different peer comparison institutions for facilities than we have for programs; and within programs, we will most likely have different sets as well.

The current list is an institutional peer list that contains competitor, aspirational, and predetermined peers. Competitor peers can be defined as institutions that compete for students and faculty. In our case, Seattle may be defined as a competitor. Aspirational peers are institutions worthy of emulation that we might model, such as Portland State. Predetermined peers can contain institutions based on historical relationships, geographic similarity, or national reporting. Examples of predetermined peers on the current list are WSU Vancouver and UW Bothell.

### Appendix A

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Weight (1-10)</b>	<b>Total</b>	
Urban Universities	8, 2, 10, 10, 10, 10, 7, 10, 10, 3, 8, 7, 10, 8	113	
Student Demographic Mix	1, 5, 9, 7, 4, 3, 3, 8, 8, 6, 5, 6, 10	75	
Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment	8, 8, 9, 10, 10, 10, 10	65	
Branch of Research I	9, 3, 1, 10, 10, 8, 1, 4, 10, 7	63	
Student/Faculty Ratio	4, 3, 3, 2, 6, 7, 9, 1, 1, 7, 1, 3, 7, 1, 8	63	
Fall Enrollment	9, 7, 6, 9, 9, 10, 5	55	
Average SAT/ACT Equiv	8, 1, 9, 2, 6, 3, 10, 10, 4, 2	55	
Total Operating Expenditures	5, 7, 1, 4, 5, 9, 9, 2, 1, 4, 5	52	
Program Mix	6, 4, 5, 3, 1, 7, 2, 9, 9, 3	49	
Operating Expenditures per FTE Student (FY )	7, 6, 8, 6, 3, 9, 9	48	
Percent of Applicants Admitted	3, 8, 2, 8, 8, 3, 1	33	
Average High School GPA	6, 5, 4, 9, 7	31	
Number of Full-Time Faculty	6, 7, 3, 8, 3, 6	31	
Percent of Transfer Students	9, 6, 2, 6, 4	27	
Interdisciplinarity	7, 8, 5, 7	27	
Percent of Upper Division to Lower Division	9, 2, 7, 5	23	
Percent of Revenues from Grants and Contracts	4, 5, 5, 3, 5	22	
Percent of Full-Time Faculty Tenured or Tenure Track	6, 8, 7	21	
Percent of Students Receiving Federal Grant Aid	7, 10, 2	19	

Student/Staff Ratio	<b>8, 8, 3</b>	<b>19</b>	
Research Expenditures per FT Faculty (FY )	<b>2, 5, 6, 5</b>	<b>18</b>	
Geographic Location	<b>9, 6, 2</b>	<b>17</b>	
Percent Minority Enrollment	<b>6, 3, 4, 4</b>	<b>17</b>	
Percent Full-Time Enrollment	<b>6, 5, 4</b>	<b>15</b>	
Percent of Students Receiving Institutional Grant Aid	<b>10, 5</b>	<b>15</b>	
Other:	<b>10, 4</b>	<b>14</b>	
Degree Level Mix	<b>8, 5</b>	<b>13</b>	
Percent of Faculty who are Full-Time	<b>3, 5, 2</b>	<b>10</b>	
Community Involvement	<b>5, 4, 1</b>	<b>10</b>	
Percent Freshmen Enrollment	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	
Percent State Resident	<b>2, 7</b>	<b>9</b>	
Average Federal Grant Aid Amount Among Students Receiving	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	
Percent of Admits that Enroll	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	
Ratio of Annual to Fall Headcount	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	
Three-Year Graduation Rate of Traditional Cohort (2003 Cohort)	<b>1, 1, 4</b>	<b>6</b>	
Library Holdings	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	
Top 25 Ranked Graduate Programs	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	
Percent of Expenditures on Instruction, Research, & Service (FY)	<b>4, 2</b>	<b>6</b>	
Total Ranked Graduate Programs	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	
Percent of Students who can be Housed on Campus	<b>2, 1</b>	<b>3</b>	
Research Expenditures (FY )	<b>1, 2</b>	<b>3</b>	
Percent International Students	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	
Average Institutional Grant Aid Amount Among Students Receiving	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	

One-Year Retention Rate of Traditional Cohort	1	1	
Percent Female Students			
National Merit Scholars Enrolled			
Student Fullbright Scholars			
Faculty Fullbright Scholars			
NSF Graduate Fellowship Recipients			
Staff Profile Mix			
Percent of IAS or Arts and Science Faculty			
Average Salary Full Professor			
Average Salary Asst. Professor			
Percent of Expenditures on Wages and Fringe Benefits (FY)			
Tuition & Fees as Pct of T&F plus State Appropriation (FY)			