

# Faculty Assembly Minutes

## March 10, 2004

12:55-2:10 pm, Keystone Auditorium

1. The minutes of Faculty Assembly meetings held on December 2, 2003 and January 28, 2004 were approved with some minor editorial changes.
2. Mike Kalton, Chair of Faculty Assembly introduced Steve Olswang, currently the Vice Provost, Office of the Provost, UW Seattle, and UWT's incoming interim Chancellor. Mike thought it prudent to have a dialog among faculty and Steve at this juncture of UWT's growth and change in leadership. He asked Steve to elaborate on campus growth.
3. Steve presented some basic facts about higher education in the state. He mentioned that the Senate and the House had reached some agreement on new enrollment, perhaps with a budget around \$20 million. This, he said, was to compensate for campuses for over-enrollment. UWT has about 9% over-enrollment. He anticipated about 200-500 new FTEs in the state in the 2004-05 year. Units will be able to keep the tuition portion of over-enrollment but not the state subsidy portion. These FTEs will be all allocated to four-year colleges. He felt this would be the main conversation about sharing new enrollment.
4. He then touched on the growth issue. He opined that Seattle has room to grow contrary to popular belief. He said at any one time there are roughly 40,000 students. However, the utilization of classrooms in the afternoon had a certain pattern, hence adding more students will be a problem. He thought that UWS would grow mainly in fee-paying masters programs. UWB can take in 500-600 new FTEs before the off-ramp is built. The upper limit for UWB is 2000 FTEs.
5. At Tacoma, he felt there is room to grow, with offices and the like. Much of future growth will be in Tacoma. The important thing is that we have to decide collectively about growth programmatically, over the 2005-07 biennium. We need to look at existing and new programs. The bulk of the demand is expected to materialize in 2008. He pointed out UWT did not grow to 8,000 as projected in some reports. The bricks and mortar portion of the facilities may have to be on hold. But the foundation of this campus will continue to be interdisciplinary.
6. At this point questions were raised and discussion ensued. Jim Gawel asked if it was possible to change from 2 to 4-year institution within the next four years. Steve responded by pointing out that the state does not benefit much from the addition of lower division courses. He felt that it would be best to selectively add lower division courses rather move toward a full-fledged 4-year campus in the immediate future.

George Mobus argued that the quality of student output would vastly improve with lower division courses. He cited examples of students joining the Tech Institute to work with computers but not to learn programming. Some students left the Institute to join the IAS program. Students like to do science but not network administration. There appears to be a

different kind of an education need, which is not being met here. Steve said at this time we would not be getting into applied technology degree. However, such new directions could be looked at in the future.

7. Mike said that a 4-year campus would be very effective in making interdisciplinarity operational across campus. Two years is not long enough to do this well. In this connection, Sam Parker pointed out that there was a mismatch between the relative strengths of community colleges and UWT, thus making UWT's teaching and programmatic development more challenging.

Steve, while agreeing with the gist of the arguments in favor of a 4-year campus, cautioned about the political realities. He felt that the state would not benefit from this move and hence would not support it. At this time there are no common graduation requirements across the six programs. So the question is whether there is a common core of interdisciplinary knowledge. It is a curriculum issue. To what extent can existing programs/concentrations be reworked? For example, if Business could be integrated with Technology and MIS or the IAS concentrations could be linked to some aspects of the Business program.

Zoe Barsness suggested that the interdisciplinarity discussion really boiled down to institutional obstacles such as budgets, FTEs, and programs. Steve agreed that budgets are based on FTE-based enrollment. However, he did not think that they should be impediments. He felt that we needed to think like a campus and tackle these issues by being student focused. He is working with Sandy Boyle on these budget matters.

Steve said that UWT can become like UWS but that is not the mission of this campus. We can have psychology or communications studies but there ought to be some interdisciplinary core. Jim Gawel reiterated that a two-year program limits the breadth of studies for students, especially in programs that have to meet certain accreditation requirements. He used an example of an IAS student wanting to have some grounding in business management. Steve agreed with Jim's observation but asked if some course on business practice could not be offered for such students.

George Mobus suggested that team teaching and working with specific projects that are amenable to interdisciplinary approaches could be one avenue for pursuing interdisciplinarity. For example, faculty and students could work together on distributed computing for solving a global problem.

Steve felt that this was not a budget issue. For example, two faculty members can get together and teach 120 students. However, Janet Mobus felt it would be better to create more value with a 4-year program rather do the best creatively with a 2-year program.

Steve did not disagree with the basic relationship between a 4-year campus and interdisciplinarity and the ways to meet such a goal. He agreed that UWT would become a 4-year college but he felt this kind of development is not possible at this time. He speculated that in 10 years that might be possible. Basically we need a critical mass and the associated scale economies.

Rachel May pointed out that creativity is a great idea to tackle some of these challenges but in the end she felt that it boiled down to pressure on faculty to fulfill their quotas.

8. Steve said that he was entering UWT with a different perspective. He has a lot of learning to do. He agreed that the budget is small, tight, with a lot of restrictions. But he said he was going to something with these issues. He was aware of the pressure of workload: publishing, teaching, service, and student quotas. However, he insisted that this campus will have to be creative. He will work with Jack, Sandy, and the Program Directors. He needs to understand the problems first.

Sam, alluding to Rachel's point about creativity and related pressure, said that a 4-year program would provide the cushion to dealing with such pressure. In the end we are all concerned with the quality issue. Steve said that the problem is that we have to get bigger to relieve that pressure. For example, we need to have about 120 students before we can have TAs.

9. Marjorie Dobratz pointed out that there were limits to research in publicly funded institutions such as ours. Steve promised to work hard to get more money. He said over the long haul such efforts are likely to pay off.
10. Cathy Tashiro wondered if a hybrid model could not be identified rather than the standard 2 or 4-year models. Steve proceeded to draw a diagram, depicting the "Lee Huntsman Model," in which some programs could be at the lower division as well plus you would also have some masters programs. Marjorie said that nursing could move down to lower division but in community colleges. The problem with this, as Lisa Hoffman pointed out, are some basic issues such as writing abilities of community college students. Steve felt that some of this could be taken care of during orientation. Myrth Ogilvie said law schools typically screen students and provide remedial instruction in these areas. Using Steve's diagram Janet Mobus suggested that an interdisciplinary program outside of IAS be developed.
11. Moshe Rosenfeld asked if it would become a residential campus if we were to grow to 4,000 students. Steve said that we would be looking at the possibility but with the private housing market. Private subcontractors could provide residences.
12. Steve concluded the discussion by cautioning the faculty that it would be a mistake for UWT to delink from the UW system. We do not become a Tacoma State College. So we need to be creative. He said he will initiate various decisions to reinforce UWT's unique strengths.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 pm.

Submitted by:

Anthony P. D'Costa  
Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly