

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Academic Standards**

October 30th, 2015

1:30pm – 3:00pm

Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Approval of minutes from October 16th, 2015
 3. Chair's report
 4. ABB brainstorm (Exhibit 1) (Exhibit 2) (Exhibit 3)
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Kramer at 1:30 p.m.

2) Approval of minutes from October 16th, 2015

The minutes from October 16th, 2015 were approved as amended.

3) Chair's report

Chair's meeting with the Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL)

Kramer met with CTL as was discussed in a previous meeting. She noted that the CTL is interested in using council-drafted guidelines to aid instructors in developing future course syllabi and recommended that the guidelines include information regarding all aspects of syllabus creation. CTL will provide the how-to portion and FCAS will provide the guidelines which refer to the CTL website for examples, it was noted. Kramer explained CTL plans to include links to the faculty senate website FCAS page on their own website to better broadcast the many council guidelines available there.

Chair's meeting with FCTCP chair Bill Erdly

Kramer explained she recently held a meeting with the current chair of the Faculty Council on Tri-campus Policy (FCTCP) Bill Erdly.

Kramer explained Erdly did not have knowledge that the UW College of Engineering plans to alter the way in which it admits and enrolls undergraduate students, a previously discussed topic in FCAS this year (2015-2016). She explained that the FCTCP plans to discuss the topic as in preparation for the anticipated tri-campus review portion of the review process.

Kramer explained she and Erdly also discussed Activity-Based Budgeting (ABB). She noted Erdly believes ABB dollars go to the UW Tacoma and UW Bothell campuses, where the campus chancellors decide on the uses of those revenue streams. She explained that because of this, speaking to department heads

about ABB at UWT and UWB is unlikely to provide the same kind of information as that obtained from UWS department chairs (a previously posed idea within the council). Kramer noted Erdly was clear that the branch campuses have felt the stresses of ABB, even if understood via a different name. She clarified that FCAS's ABB surveys will be adjusted and sent to UWT and UWB, and that this will occur later in the academic year.

A member noted UWT and UWB have different ABB models that possibly do not rely on student credit hours. The member explained if there are different constraints at those campuses, it is an opportunity to see different outcomes.

Meeting with Bob Stacey (Dean of College of Arts & Sciences)

Kramer noted that after a meeting with College of Arts & Sciences Dean Bob Stacey, she has learned that the Integrated Sciences degree program will go through the RCEP process (Reorganization, consolidation, elimination process).

4) ABB brainstorm (Exhibit 1) (Exhibit 2) (Exhibit 3)

Way (chair, FCAS ABB Subcommittee) explained that the subcommittee has completed preliminary drafts of ABB surveys to be broadcasted to varying populations around the university. She explained that the ABB subcommittee is advantaged in its work because of its diversified membership, which represents a wide range of units and academic perspectives. She noted the subcommittee's current plan is to survey UWS college deans, department chairs, and departmental advisors, though the body is open to recommendations. Way explained a few overarching questions that the surveys seek to answer are:

- i. How much do people understand about ABB (i.e., there are varying understandings)?
- ii. What decisions have been made based on assumptions about ABB?

She explained the subcommittee is hoping to broadcast the surveys as soon as possible. The council then looked at the questions of the three surveys and provided feedback.

Departmental advisor survey (Exhibit 1)

Way noted this survey is designed to gather information on the changes made in departments' curriculums after the implementation of ABB.

The council gave some general feedback:

- Ballinger noted it is likely that curriculum changes and other changes at the departmental-level are not all motivated by ABB; he explained curriculum could be impacted by enrollment numbers or other factors
- Taylor noted the ASUW could potentially conduct a student survey which seeks to find how students get information from their advisors, and if that has changed over the years since ABB has been implemented.
- Stroup expressed an interest in finding out if course "poaching" is occurring between departments, and noted that questions should be drafted more explicitly to gain this information

- It was noted some deans implement ABB down to the department, and some keep it up at the college-level
- A member noted his own advisor would not know the answers to many of these questions. There was some discussion of altering the questions to make them easier to answer
- Ratner noted one question is missing: “how has ABB been communicated to you in your respective position?” Also: “where would you go to find this information, if you did not know?” Janssen added: “has there been any push to alter your department under ABB?”

The council also gave question-specific feedback:

Question #3 – It was noted the question should be made into a statement, as the adjoining answers don’t make sense with the text in question-form

Question #4 – There was a recommendation to include the date when ABB was implemented at the UW

Question #6 –Janssen recommended adding the phrase “over the last five years” to the question. This was agreed upon. Also: “do you think this has anything to do with ABB as a factor?”

Department chair survey (Exhibit 2)

The included questions were found to be good by council members. There was some discussion that questions #3, #4, and #5 may be better directed towards department advisors. It was also noted that “temporary appointed faculty” should be included in some of the questions.

College dean survey (Exhibit 3)

The council gave some question-specific feedback:

Question #3 - Ballinger made the point that the answers to the adjoining questions may have nothing to do with ABB, including inconsistencies in budget allotments. He explained it may be helpful to see enrollments in a responder’s college, to pair with the answers given

Question #4 – Kramer noted this question is key to the council’s ABB investigation

Question #6 – It was noted the question might be changed to “what percentage from the provost is used to support student services, such as advising?”

Questions #7 / #8 – These questions were noted to be inappropriate for this survey

Question #9 – Kramer noted the dean survey should be cut down to a couple of questions

*Another potential question was recommended to the effect of asking how deans are advising chairs on curriculum-related decisions. There was a recommendation to flip that question, and ask chairs what they are hearing from their deans. The council felt this question to be very important.

General discussion on the three surveys

The council discussed more potential questions to be included in all or some of the surveys. These included:

- “What would you most like to know about the ABB process?”
- “What would you most like to know about ABB that might impact your decision-making?”
- “How is ABB allocated in your college or division?”
- “What would you like percentages to be?”
- “How would you account for any significant changes from the last five years”

The council held more general discussion. It was noted “SCH” means “Student Credit Hours” within the surveys. Kramer noted a description of ABB needs to be at the top of each survey. It was noted there are too many questions included on the surveys; 20 questions will likely render many surveys unfinished.

There was additional discussion concerning how some majors and enrollment areas are experiencing diminishing enrollments nationwide and have been long before the implementation of ABB at the UW. Although it was agreed that these problems should not be attributed to ABB - a member clarified that under the conditions exacerbated *by* ABB, these areas, which despite their diminishing demand have not been historically cut out of universities completely, are much more likely to be cut out now, which is the concern.

Conclusion of business

Kramer asked Way and other members of the ABB Subcommittee if they have enough information to go forward with finalizing the surveys. Way noted they do have enough feedback from the council. It was noted the surveys will be finalized, sent to Kramer, and then sent out.

5) Good of the order

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Kramer at 3:00 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Phil Brock, John Deehr, Peter Hoff, Don Janssen, Patricia Kramer (chair), Dan Ratner, D. Shores, Sarah Stroup, Thaisa Way
Ex-officio reps: LeAnne Jones Wiles, Roy Taylor
President’s designee: Phil Ballinger
Guests: Janice DeCosmo, Robert Corbett, Matt Winslow, Tina Miller, Emily Leggio

Absent: **Faculty:** Robert Harrison, Daniel Enquobahrie, Champak Chatterjee
Ex-officio reps: Robin Chin Roemer, Mel Wensel

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – FCAS ABB Departmental Advisor Survey

Exhibit 2 – FCAS ABB Chair Survey

Exhibit 3 – FCAS ABB Dean Survey

Survey Questions for Department Advisors

From the Office of Planning & Budgeting: "The University of Washington fully implemented an activity based budgeting (ABB) system at the beginning of the 2013 fiscal year with initial budgeting starting in 2010. ABB is a method of budgeting in which the activities that incur costs in every functional area are accounted for, analyzed, and then linked to the mission and strategic goals of the institution. The full costs of programs and services are then more transparent and available to help with planning, budgeting and decision making."

In July 2015, Faculty Council subcommittees were charged with investigating four areas of academic life that are imperfectly addressed by the current budget model. We are writing you on behalf of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards ad hoc group responsible for reviewing educational collaboration, with a focus on joint courses/degrees and new academic initiatives. Each of these committees is expected to provide recommendations to the ABB committee by the end of Autumn Quarter 2015. The ABB committee will work with faculty and the Board of Deans and Chancellors to contemplate, where necessary, recommendations from these committees during the upcoming ABB Phase II process.

The following questions are intended to enable the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to better assess the influence of ABB on Academic and Curricular issues. All responses will be kept confidential.

Please answer the following questions about your department and your work with students from your perspective as a department adviser and/or student services administrator.

1. Please specify your department or unit. [text box];
2. Please provide some information about your role in your department. Check all that apply.
 - a. Academic advising for undergraduate pre-majors and majors;
 - b. Academic advising for prospective and current graduate students;
 - c. Career-related advising for undergraduate majors;
 - d. Student support services including administration of department support such as scholarships, fellowships, TAs, project support, or student activities;
 - e. Scheduling, or assisting with scheduling, of department courses and classrooms;
 - f. Supporting department faculty in their teaching responsibilities including submitting requests for new course approvals, assisting with instructor course descriptions, advertising new or special topics courses, other related responsibilities.
3. How many undergraduate majors does your department offer? Please indicate the average number of students in each major. Major #1: [text box]; average number of enrolled majors: [##]
4. How many undergraduate minors does your department offer? Please indicate the average number of students in each minor. Minor #1: [text box]; average number of students enrolled in minor: [##]
5. Over the past 5 years, has your department been able to adjust course offerings and teaching loads with appropriate flexibility in response to student demand and enrollment, such as (check all that apply):
 - a. Adding or eliminating course sections
 - b. Changing course enrollment limits
 - c. Changing frequency of course offerings
 - d. Adjusting faculty teaching responsibilities
 Briefly explain. [text box]

6. What increases in student services have occurred over the past 5 years? Check all that apply. [___ advising; ___ teaching assistants; ___ study or tutoring services; ___ other [specify]]
7. What decreases in student services in your department or college have occurred? Check all that apply. [___ advising; ___ teaching assistants; ___ study or tutoring services; ___ other [specify]]
8. In general, to what do you attribute the changes noted in 5 and 6 above (please be as specific as you are able to be) ? [text box]
9. Have any classes or programs been eliminated or made smaller/ decreased over the past 5 years? [Y / N / ?] Briefly explain. [text]
10. Have any classes or programs been added or increased over the past 5 years? [Y / N / ?] Briefly explain.[text]
11. Have any courses in your department that are jointly offered with another unit been changed or eliminated? [Y/N/?] Briefly explain [text]
12. Over the past 5 years, has your department experienced changes in the number of students enrolled in your major or minor programs:
 - a. Majors [increased number of majors; no change; decreased number of majors]
 - b. Minors [increased number of minors; no change; decreased number of minors]
 - c. Other undergraduate and graduate programs [increased number of participants; no change; decreased number of participants]
13. Do students face difficulties in enrolling in required courses? [Y / N / ?] If so, why? [text]
14. How many degree programs in your department have become self-sustaining over the past ten years? [#] To what do you attribute that change?[text]
15. In the future, do you anticipate further changes in your department's academic program offerings including (check all that apply):
 - a. Increasing course offerings
 - b. Decreasing course offerings
 - c. Increasing number of students admitted to the major
 - d. Decreasing number of students admitted to the major
 - e. Increasing number of TAs in your department
 - f. Decreasing number of TAs in your department
 - g. Increasing number of large lecture courses
 - h. Decreasing number of seminar courses or other smaller courses
 - i. No anticipated changes
 - j. Don't know
 - k. Other [specify].
16. In general what do you attribute any anticipated changes? [text]

ABB Survey for Chairs

"The University of Washington fully implemented an activity based budgeting (ABB) system at the beginning of the 2013 fiscal year with initial budgeting starting in 2010. ABB is a method of budgeting in which the activities that incur costs in every functional area are accounted for, analyzed, and then linked to the mission and strategic goals of the institution. The full costs of programs and services are then more transparent and available to help with planning, budgeting and decision making."

ABB funds are determined by a formula that is based on the average of the number of degrees awarded and of student credit hours (SCH's) taught by each unit. The relative importance to the activity of the unit of each of these two components is reflected in the percentage associated with it. In other words, if awarding degrees are valued equally with teaching courses, the percentages would both be 50%. Separate formulas are created for the undergraduate and graduate allocations.

In July 2015, faculty subcommittees were charged with investigating four areas of academic life that are imperfectly addressed by the current budget model. We are writing you on behalf of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards ad hoc group responsible for **reviewing educational collaboration**, with a focus on joint courses/degrees and new academic initiatives. Each of these committees is expected to provide recommendations to the ABB committee by the end of Autumn Quarter 2015. The ABB committee will work with faculty and the Board of Deans and Chancellors to contemplate, where necessary, recommendations from these committees during the upcoming ABB Phase II process. The following questions are intended to enable the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to better assess the influence of ABB on Academic and Curricular issues. All responses will be kept confidential.

1. College or School? [text box]
2. Department Name? [text box]
3. How long have you served as Department Chair - please check the appropriate box:
 - Two years or fewer. (We may survey the previous Chair)
 - Three years.
 - Four years.
 - Five or more years.
4. A. To what extent does your College/ School use ABB assessments to allocate budget funds at the departmental level? [text box]
 - B. What percentage of department funding is based on your Department's ABB assessment{##}
5. What percentage of funding from the College to your department do you think is appropriate to be based on the Department's ABB numbers? [text box]
6. A. How many full-time teaching faculty are in your department (tenure-track plus full-time multi-year/ permanent lecturers)? [text box]

7. B. Has this number increased, decreased or stayed the same over the past five years? Y / N / ?
C. Has ABB played a role in any of these changes? If so, please explain. [text box]
8. A. How many full-time, single-year / part-time/ temporary lecturers do you typically employ in an academic year? [text box]
B. Has this number increased, decreased or stayed the same over the past five years?
C. Has ABB played a role in any of these changes? If so, please explain. [text box]
9. A. Has the number of Teaching Assistants in your department increased, decreased or stayed the same over the past five years? [text box]
B. Has ABB played a role in any of these changes? If so, please explain. [text box]
10. The ABB formula includes a percentage for the two components (degrees awarded and student credit hours taught by units) which adds to 100%. At the undergraduate level, what would you believe is the appropriate percentage for degrees awarded? (enter a number between 0 and 100) [##]
11. For the ABB formula at the graduate level, what would you believe is the appropriate percentage for degrees awarded? (enter a number between 0 and 100) [##]
12. Has ABB provided you flexibility to respond to changes in student demand for classes? Y / N / ?
Please explain [text box]
13. Has ABB affected the number of Joint Courses (course numbers taught by more than one department) that your Department participates in? Y / N / ?
Joint courses have increased: Y / N / ?
Joint courses have decreased Y / N / ?
14. A. Have the types of courses and balance of those courses in your Department (e.g., seminar vs. lecture, lab or field based courses, etc.) changed over the past five years? Y / N / ?
If Yes, then please provide some details [text box]
B. Has ABB played a role in any of these changes? If so, please explain. [text box]
15. Have you noticed other Departments offering courses or programs (e.g. options, minors) with content that you or others in your department think have substantial overlap with your department or program? [text box]
16. Other Comments [text box]

ABB Survey for Deans

From the Office of Planning & Budgeting: "The University of Washington fully implemented an activity based budgeting (ABB) system at the beginning of the 2013 fiscal year with initial budgeting starting in 2010. ABB is a method of budgeting in which the activities that incur costs in every functional area are accounted for, analyzed, and then linked to the mission and strategic goals of the institution. The full costs of programs and services are then more transparent and available to help with planning, budgeting and decision making."

In July 2015, faculty subcommittees were charged with investigating four areas of academic life that are imperfectly addressed by the current budget model. We are writing you on behalf of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards ad hoc group responsible for reviewing educational collaboration, with a focus on joint courses/degrees and new academic initiatives. Each of these committees is expected to provide recommendations to the ABB committee by the end of Autumn Quarter 2015. The ABB committee will work with faculty and the Board of Deans and Chancellors to contemplate, where necessary, recommendations from these committees during the upcoming ABB Phase II process.

The following questions are intended to enable the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to better assess the influence of ABB on Academic and Curricular issues. All responses will be kept confidential.

1. College or School? [text box]

2. What is your understanding of how ABB funds are allocated to the Colleges/Schools? Has ABB impacted your College/ School budget since it was fully implemented in 2013? (feel free to explain with as much specificity as you can muster) [text box]

3. Has ABB offered the flexibility to respond to changes in demand and enrollment across the college or school?

Please explain. [text box]

4. How does the Dean allocate the ABB funds within your college / school? Please be as clear and detailed as possible.

[text box]

5. What is your advice to departmental chairs regarding budgets as they impact curriculum decisions and what role does ABB have? [text box]

6. Has ABB had a role in decisions regarding: (please add details when possible)

- Number or type of degree programs or majors?
- Professional and Continuing Education (PCE) courses/ programs?
- Joint or collaborative degrees, majors, or courses with other colleges/ schools?
- Graduate student enrollment and/or funding?

Please give details as best you can:

[text box]

7. Are there other impacts of ABB on the curriculum or related issues that you think are important to understand and consider? If so, please explain as best you can. [text box]