

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., April 19, 2012
26 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
 - 2) Approval of February 2, 2012 and February 23, 2012 FCTCP meetings
 - 3) Presentations on Admissions data and processes from the three campuses:
 - a) Seattle Campus: Paul Seegert, Associate Director for Operations, UW Seattle
 - b) Bothell Campus: Jill Orcutt, Director of Admissions, UW Bothell
 - c) Tacoma Campus: Derek Levy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services, UW Tacoma
 - 4) Tri-campus review subcommittee discussion
 - 5) Good of the Order / Discussion of additional topics this year -- and in preparation for next year
 - 6) Adjournment
-

1. Call to Order

Council Chair Bill Erdly called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Approval of February 3, 2012 and February 23, 2012 FCTCP

Minutes from February 2 and February 23rd were approved with changes.

3. Presentations on Admissions data and processes from the three campuses:

Admissions Data

Erdly described the discussion on admissions data and processes from the three University of Washington campuses as the beginning of FCTCP's investigations into cross campus topics. He informed that the next session would serve to explore and clarify the intersection on course / curriculum approval processes across various bodies, such as FCTCP, FCAS, and the Curriculum Committee. Topics can also be generated by the General Faculty Organization or the Faculty Assembly, as well. These presentations will be open discussions, to learn about processes across the campuses.

Paul Seegert, Associate Director for Operations at UW Seattle highlighted a few of the statistics on enrollment and class demographics within the Seattle campus. The average grade point average (GPA) and test scores of applying students has increased to 10,000 freshman applications from Washington state, and 10,500 US non-Washington residents. Non-residents applicants are increasing continuously, of which a growing number are international applicants. These increased GPA scores were potentially attributed to increased quality of students, as both GPAs and SAT scores are increasing simultaneously. 4 year transfer applicants were highly competitive, reserved for Washington State community colleges.

The question was posed whether the proportionality agreement of attempting to ensure that transfer students make up 30% of the freshman student body was a system-wide or campus agreement. This was noted to be a campus agreement, although the proportionality agreement expired last September. The Bothell and Tacoma campuses had different ratios; Bothell is 52%, and UW Tacoma was 72%. Such high rates were considered difficult to accomplish without broadening the definition of "transfer student" to

include running start students. Viability of reaching these ratios was noted to be decreased with the greater number of “lower division” courses. Further questions followed whether such proportionality agreements would be extended after the Higher Education Coordinating (HEC) Board, however a State-level strategy on proportionality has not been defined. Discussion continued regarding accessibility of a pathway from 2 year to four year degree, emphasizing the importance of building a process to best assure student transitions, and the challenges of proportionality due to increasing freshman enrollment to balance between transfer and freshman growth. Additional questions were raised about once transfer students reach the credit ceiling for admissions, and such students were counseled to apply to other campuses should they reach such a ceiling.

Data on origin of students was presented, as well as the top 20 competing institutions receiving SAT scores from UW applicants. There was noted to be a decrease in cross-applicants between UW and WSU or WWU, however increases in the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign and Penn State University Park.

Derek Levy, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services at UW Tacoma presented Autumn 2011 information for UW Tacoma. The campus strategy was noted to emphasize growth in non-resident students, noting a small number of international students. Trends on the Tacoma campus for admissions also demonstrate a gradual upward trend for SAT scores, and GPA. Of students applying for the UW Seattle campus choosing to attend UW Tacoma, these numbers are decreasing, down from 60% to 50% over six years. Application yield trends, for freshman, transfer and graduate students. Freshmen numbered 252 in the past year, and 1,200 applications are expected in autumn 2012, increasing to around 300 freshmen admitted. Transfers have steady growth as well in both applications and admissions. During autumn 2011, there was actually over-enrollment in continuing students. Levy briefly described self-sustaining degrees, mentioning accounting and education, the latter which was transitioned to the State. The Key Bank Professional Development serves like UW Educational Outreach (EO) but the accounting model was noted to be different as it will be operated by the Milgard Business School, though some services and fees from UW EO will be utilized by UW Tacoma.

Jill Orcutt, Director of Admissions of UW Bothell was introduced to the group. She informed of rapid growth on the UW Bothell campus, which should follow for the next 10 years. Currently, Bothell shares 52% of common applications with Seattle campus. The campus has seen a huge jump in international students, increasing to over 200 from 80 during the previous year. Recruiting efforts were noted to have broadened rather than serving the small geographic radius of the Bothell area. Diversity within students has increased. As with both the Seattle and Tacoma campuses, Bothell has also experienced an increase in SAT scores within freshman. Retention rates of freshmen have increased to nearly 75%.

Common Application

The question was posed whether there were particular policies or procedures which could be used to facilitate further support of student enrollment growth. In response to the question of why the University of Washington does not have a common application as the University of California system does. Part of this was due to having different deadlines, but reviews exist at both a central and campus level. Though some commonalities exist within the applications for the three campuses and all similar fields will populate, these applications are different. A common application could be viable, however issues are present such as deadlines and differences within the degree programs and requirements. Also, different applications exist for freshmen, transfer and international transfer applications, which may create more challenges for a common application.

ASWU representative Maxine Sugarman requested to know if the University of Washington is moving forward with pursuing the Common Application.¹ ASUW had decided that it preferred that the University of Washington pursue the Common Application rather than having a separate application. Sugarman suggested adding supplemental questions to distinguish UW's application within the Common Application. The three campuses are considering using the Common Application however two important items would cause difficulty in adopting it. Firstly, letters of recommendation are not required by UW but are required by the Common Application, and requiring these in Washington State would add a heavy burden to high school counselors. Also, the Common Application does not allow use of the high school grid, which UW utilizes for GPA and other statistics for students without sending transcripts. UW Admissions has suffered temporary staff reductions of 50%, has only been able to keep up with increased student volume due to the efficiencies of using the "grid." Other disincentives to adopt the Common Application were noted such as incurring additional fees due to changes in content, and the inclusions of mandatory questions such as religious affiliation which UW doesn't allow. If the University of California system adopted the Common Application, the UW would be pressured to adopt it as well. The Common Application would still require application fees to for each institution applied.

Recruitment of non-residents was noted to be a target for growth across all schools, and questions arose on the tradeoffs of this strategy. Seegert is investigating the benefits and costs from switching to using the Common Application, and compare the gains and the losses, noting that admissions operations would need to gain access to higher funding, staff, and space. Adopting the Common Application was noted to be positive for visibility and applications for non-residents but may complicate the application for transfer students. If setting up two different systems, it will cost more. The question was raised whether students would have input on this decision, and Seegert informed that decision would fall first to the admissions offices in all three campuses, and then would fall to the Provost, President or Chancellors.

Naming of Concentrations / Majors

Concern was expressed on the confusion of parents and students regarding "concentrations," which were shifted to "majors" for clarification. It was suggested that the University establish a matrix comparing naming in similar programs. Having clear names for degrees was attributed to be even more necessary due to the growing number of new degrees and is important to the application process, in both marketing and student expectations. Each campus proposes such names, however interdisciplinary programs such as Arts & Sciences in Tacoma may be unlikely to have one discipline's name, or be offered as options and not majors. Concerns were expressed that allowing for customization in grouping similar degrees across the three campuses which may not be available through other application processes. The balance between support and competition for the three campuses is important to consider when naming such degrees or programs in either a "traditional" or "non-traditional" manner.

Discussion followed on retention rates, whether the amount of first generation students has an impact on these rates. Over one year ago, Seattle had a 17.8% rate of first generation students, where Bothell and Tacoma had respectively 22.5% and 33.2%, respectively. Methodology on calculating these numbers is currently being updated, more recent freshmen data forthcoming from the Office of Planning and Budgeting. Levy attributed increased need of student support due to having a larger population of vulnerable students. Erdly noted that budgeting narratives are visible from the Special Committee on Planning and Budgeting, and that one major topic has been additional funding in student support.

¹ An undergraduate college admission application that applicants may use to apply to any of 456 member colleges and universities in the United States. Online at: <https://www.commonapp.org/CommonApp/default.aspx>

Barsness added that another factor to take into account is financial need, which may account for UW Tacoma's lower retention rates as Tacoma has a higher percentage of students with financial need. Some students put their studies on hold in order to work and gain funding for completion of remaining years in school.

Cross Campus Degrees

Barbara Endicott Popovsky discussed the three campus program which she is working on currently. She is working on making cybersecurity a full degree, and creating this cross-campus program is important for three reasons. 1) The broad expertise in the field shared between the three campuses, 2) savings in costs by leveraging professors across the three campuses, with no further funding needed to hire additional professors and 3) high demand for such workers, continuing to increase. Security courses are offered in each of the three campuses, and each campus offers a different specialty. By offering the program across the three campuses, students have the choice to pick the courses/specializations that they want to take.

All three campuses informed that they would be interested in the creation of such a program. She indicated that the next step is administrative specifics of such a program to create a Tri-Campus model. She continued that the biggest barrier is within the administrative processes, and she would like to document this process to determine if it can be used for other programs. The degree will come from the campus in which the student is enrolled, but the transcriptable option would allow taking courses on all three campuses. Academic Dean of the iSchool was willing to present to the council. This conversation would be interesting to discuss in terms of recruitment and admissions, and the branding of such particular programs.

Erdly thanked the guests for presenting to the Council.

4. Good of the Order / Discussion of additional topics this year -- and in preparation for next year

Next meeting will invite FCAS to discuss the curricula review questions and requested for council members to submit any topics or questions that they may have.

5. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:18 a.m. by Chair Bill Erdly.

Minutes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. jayf@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Erdly (Chair), Michael Kucher (representing Julie Nicoletta), Endicott Popovsky
President's Designee: Wadden, Jeffords, Harrington
Ex-Officio Reps: Deardorff, Sugarman, Joseph, Leadley
Guests: Pamela Lundquist, Lisa Garcia Hanson, Derek Levy, Paul Seegert, Jill Orcutt, Zoe Barsness

Absent: **Faculty:** Collins, Roesch
Ex Officio Rep: Fridley