

Faculty Assembly Minutes

19 October 2005

Attending: Robert Jackson, Josh Tenenberg, Patricia Spakes, Jack Nelson, Orlando Baiocchi, Stern Neill, Katie Baird, April Boutillette-Brinkman, Donald Chinn, Sam Chung, Stephen Detray, Marjorie Dobratz, Denise Drevdahl, Charles Emlet, Ehsan Feroz, Jerry Finn, Edwin Hong, Michael Kalton, Diane Kinder, Annette Henry, Janice Laakso, Karen Landenburger, Marcie Lazzari, Ginger McDonald, Don McLane, George Mobus, Janet Primomo, Bill Richardson, Eugene Sivadas, Christine Stevens.

- The meeting came to order at 12:52pm.
- Bob Jackson asked members of host departments to introduce new faculty members: Jerry Finn, Orlando Baiocchi, Ehsan Feroz, Marinilka Kimbro, Emily Ignacio, Linda Ishem and April Brinkman.
- VCAA Jack Nelson provided a report.

The university reached 106.7% of enrollment on census day. However, UWT is graduating students at the end of this quarter and will need to replace them. We have a major recruitment push, which will require help from each unit.

We have a funding commitment from the state for 125 FTE freshmen (around 160 people) for fall 2006. We currently have no commitment for freshmen in fall 2007, which will be forthcoming in January from the state legislature.

There are 14 faculty searches this year, in Education, Business, and IAS, including a Port of Tacoma endowed research chair in IAS.

Carolyn West has been named to the Bartley Dobb Professorship for the Prevention of Violence. This is a 3 year, renewable appointment.

In addition to the efforts to prepare for freshman, there is a larger agenda. This includes how do we build out our program offerings in majors, minors, and graduate programs so that we have the appropriate breadth for a larger institution.

Crum asked what the implications are of having a research-oriented chair (i.e. the Port of Tacoma chair in IAS). Nelson responded that this will entail lighter a teaching load (but teaching responsibilities) and a heavier emphasis on research.

- Jackson provided a summary of the planning efforts for "Charting the Future" since last spring. He reviewed the set of milestones that occurred since last spring, including committee formation, townhall meetings, key task force meetings, and appointments to head the implementation effort.
- Jackson then opened the floor for discussion on the "Charting the Future" Interim Report Draft.

Kalikoff indicated that revision will be part of the process. For example, p13 of the report refers to matters of scheduling. But there is no general evidence that any particular schedule is preferred

over any other, given the number of factors that influence student success. How students get through the core without delaying their graduation and without declaring their majors right when they arrive will be a challenge to accommodate.

Primomo stated the importance of maintaining consistency between the report and existing legislation in the Faculty Code. For instance, on p1, under "cross campus enrollment", this needs to be consistent with existing policy on what is allowed. Another area is in "Recommendations for admissions" in the Student Services part of the report. A third area concerns a proposed "conduct code".

Primomo added that the goals of undergraduate education at UWT stated in the report are new and have not been discussed as a campus, and it impacts everyone.

Kimbrow asked what our market is for new undergraduate students? Is it possible that a student not admitted in Seattle would come to UWT? If so, then the market might be quite different than what is expected in the Interim report.

Nelson responded that in an agreement with Seattle, there will be an electronic application that covers all three campuses. There will be a questions that asks "which branch?" and then asks "will you also want your application to go to another branch?". It *is* possible to be rejected at Seattle and accepted at Tacoma (and the other way around). We don't know yet, however, whether we will give a geographic preference to students in the South Puget Sound, though we are legally permitted to do this.

Students are not guaranteed transfer from UWT to UWS. But, Seattle has agreed that 30% of its transfer students will be from Washington state CTC's, and so they have to reserve spots for those students.

Kimbrow stated that Emmert indicated in a recent discussion that many students in Washington are not being served for 4 year degrees, and many leave the state (e.g. go to the California state system). Tacoma thus provides an opportunity for many of these students that previously had left the state. The Interim Report seems to ignore this pool of students (non-commuter, place-bound students from the South Puget Sound); not ignoring them provides UWT with a great opportunity.

Spakes responded that this is a well-taken point. We will know what students look like when they arrive. But we still need to develop a curriculum, even realizing that that there is a large degree of uncertainty. We will study the incoming freshmen quite seriously, and our student body will undoubtedly change over time.

Nelson responded that we are not assuming that the incoming freshmen will look like what we've already seen. We think they will be younger, right out of high school. We are targeting people who want a four year experience but cannot relocate to another campus.

Ishem commented on the modified cohort model. The model might not maximize our advantage over Seattle, and asked how this model was chosen.

Jackson stated that the model was selected partly by resource constraints. An advantage is the engagement provided by learning communities.

Kalikoff added that collaboration and innovation with team teaching is also possible under the

proposed model. This allows experiments with small group work in subsets of the larger cohort (versus the size of our upper division courses that are capped at 35).

Ishem asked, how is team teaching envisioned? The rest of the report implies that this group of students will be viewed as "needy" in terms of support, but pedagogically, the larger classes don't seem consistent with this model for student need. Having more elaboration of the teaching model for the core would help.

Chio responded that the cohort model was chosen for primarily pedagogical reasons. The cohort offers the opportunity to reintegrate knowledge from the standpoint of interdisciplinarity. It is trying to address the fragmentation that often occurs with a rigid discipline-based university organization. Coupled with a focus on learning communities, it offers the possibility for integration.

Feroz noted that problems are often in the details of the implementation (i.e. the devil is in the details). He asked if there is a pedagogical basis that privileges a 5-credit model for freshman over a 3-credit or 4-credit model. There might be administrative reasons, but are there pedagogical reasons?

Richardson responded that if one were starting next year from scratch, we would do it in a different way. But we have to mesh the freshmen with the existing 5-credit upper level programs.

Feroz replied that we might be missing a great opportunity by looking at the past rather than the future. We need to think about 20 years ahead rather than 15 years past. He suggested that we do more research on what is the most appropriate credit hour system for a graduating high school student and what is the optimal mode of delivery for freshmen.

Richardson stated that we are looking at a program that will work for the next several years. It is a compromise of a number of issues. We recognize things will change, building on other models and institutions but sensitive to the given context and constraints. In 5 years this will be different.

Feroz stated that institutions have long memories and so what we do now may be with us for a considerably longer period of time.

Kimbrow inquired if there are other institutions that use the proposed model?

Kalikoff commented that the learning community movement has certainly been around for 25 years. But best-practices are never independent of context and constraints. Kalikoff can send bibliography references to anyone interested in learning communities.

Chio added that curriculum planning did not start with a blank slate; it started with research, looking at different models. The committee also examined experiments-in-the-making of people and institutions at the forefront of rethinking undergraduate education across the country. The committee started from this base, and adapted it to the contextual constraints. One of the overriding design stipulations of 5/10/15 credits concerned transferability between CC's and UWT, as well as accreditation.

Feroz indicated that we might need to do lots of remedial action as a result of these choices.

Mobus stated that discussion needed to start with content and organization of content, and then the

way people learn. That conversation hasn't happened, and we jumped immediately to details of implementation. Looking at how people learn is quite important. But we need to look at the content, and what people will need 20 years from now. We need those kinds of discussions, before we determine the implementation details.

Jackson commented that as chair of the Steering Committee, he is happy to receive email with suggestions for language that will go forward.

Dierwechter commented that we are underutilizing lost time/space on this campus. We focus on the classroom, but there are other things that we can do with the "dead times/ dead spaces". He cited the September project as an example, which focused on broad themes of extraordinary interest, but was poorly attended. Can we provide incentives for people to participate in this kind of activity? These non-classroom experiences can provide us with a way to get exposed to colleagues' research to take back into one's classroom. Is there a way we can do this?

Spakes stated that the student services group is working on this. We haven't done as much as we need to do to integrate co-curricular with curricular. Glenna Chang and Beth Kalikoff are working together on this. For example, we have museums right across the street, and we know that students will be here all day long and there will be "dead spaces." They are expecting a full range of student services, lecturers, cultural things. We need to see that the curriculum means the university experience.

- The meeting adjourned at 1:55PM.