To: Ken Yocom (BE Commons/Chair of Landscape Architecture) and Vikram Prakash (Associate Dean of Academic Affairs)
From: Jeff Hou (on behalf of the College Council)
Re: Comments on BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure, and associated documents
Date: March 27, 2023

This memo presents the feedback from the College Council and faculty from different CBE Departments on the draft BE Commons, Oversights + Infrastructure shared with the College Council on February 17, 2023. As agreed at our meeting with the CBE Curriculum Committee and Prof. Ken Yocom on February 1, 2023, the draft document was shared with all CBE departments, and each College Council representative collected the feedback presented here in Part II. In the interest of clarifying the issues concerning the establishment and oversight of a college-wide curriculum, the College Council prepared an additional overview of the State Law and Faculty Code as presented in Part I.

Part I. Overview of the pertinent sections from RCW and the Faculty Code that apply to the governance of curriculum:

The idea of creating college-wide courses to be offered or cross-listed with a BE course designation is not inherently problematic, but there are changes to criteria and protocol needed to bring curriculum review in compliance with the faculty code. This **BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure** proposal and associated documents raise the additional question of governance for BE offerings, perhaps including though possibly separate from the existing BE PhD program.

The course designation for Built Environments (BE) was instantiated in the Dean's Office with the Graduate School's approval of the BE PhD program. Processes for approval of graduate offerings are supported by the Graduate School, though they do, according to the faculty code (see below) require the participation of any and all affected units (e.g., our departments and programs within the college) as well as governance by the CBE College Council through our standing Curriculum Committee. Though courses have been previously approved by the CBE Curriculum Committee, the review process has not, to date, been adequate to address the requirements of the faculty code. An update led by the CBE College Council is underway. Yet it may be helpful to everyone involved to have a shared understanding of the powers and duties of the faculty concerning curriculum, as provided by the Revised Code of Washington and the Faculty Code and Governance of UW, and to see prospects and problems regarding BE offerings in this light.

The proposal regarding BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure (dated February 14, 2023, for College Council Review) contains more ambitious aims for authority over curriculum than previously contemplated in the College (CBE), in part because its title does not match the vast scope of its contents, but also because BE Commons and the CBE Office of the Dean do not have the authority to undertake this scope of activities; that authority rests with the voting faculty of the College.

Taken collectively, the contents of BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure (dated February 14, 2023 for College Council Review) resemble the proposal used in the recent past to form a new department in the College and, with respect to the associated Memorandum of Understanding Between the Office of the Dean CBE and CBE Academic Units (dated November 8, 2021) suggest that the Dean's office would have the authority to develop the curriculum. It is important for the voting faculty of the College to know that

the BE Commons committee and Dean's office currently do not have the authority to govern the curriculum.

Authority to govern undergraduate curriculum in the College is vested in the voting faculty with appointments in the College. This authority traces back to the original delegation of the general powers of the faculty by the State of Washington, under rules prescribed by the Board of Regents.
The faculty derives its authority from statutes of the state, from resolutions of the Board of Regents, and from executive orders of the President. The faculty, including the President, are in "charge of the immediate government of the institution" under rules prescribed by the Board of Regents (**RCW 28B.20.200**). Among these are the authority for "educational policy" and "scholastic policy," and "[f]ormulation of procedures to carry out the policies and regulation thus established," pursuant to **Executive Order No. IV, Legislative Authority of the Faculty.**

In exercising its authority, the faculty establishes its own organization, including its own legislative (Senate) and executive agency (Senate Executive Committee) and, at the college, school, and department level, "authorizes the faculty in each of these to effect its own organization and to delegate to committees, councils, or departments such of its powers and duties as it deems appropriate" (**Faculty Code, Section 13-31)**.

The powers of the faculties of colleges and schools, and the deans and departments within them, are further described in Chapter 23 of the Faculty Code. Chapter 23 specifies that the governing body of a college or school is comprised of "voting members of the University faculty" whose "official appointments are to positions within it" (**Faculty Code, Section 23-42**), and that the faculty "may exercise direct control of its affairs or may delegate such control as it deems appropriate to an executive committee, council, or other committee or committees" (**Faculty Code, Section 23-41**).
In an example of this delegation of powers, the voting faculty of the College of Built Environments has, in our case, delegated powers to its Elected Faculty Council, also known as our College Council. The powers granted to the faculty of the College are broader than those we typically discuss, however.
The powers and duties granted to the faculty of each college and school, with the exception of the graduate faculty (with regard to graduate programs, for example), as stated in Chapter 23 are to, with respect to academic matters:

- "Determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
- Determine its curriculum and academic programs;
- Determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
- Recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
- Exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students;" (**Faculty Code 23-43**)

Note the authority to determine curriculum and academic programs. In all of these respects, the faculty of each college or school (other than the graduate school) has the authority to "determine its own organization and rules of procedure" (**Faculty Code, Section 23-45)**. This distinction between the Graduate School and the faculty of the college explains why the governing processes and procedures of the BE PhD program exist separately from the current proposal for BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure. It also explains why the contents of the proposal fall under the authority of the voting faculty of the College, which is served by our Elected Faculty Council (College Council).

To emphasize the point, Chapter 23 explains that the "faculty of each school or college shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected", with election by the "voting faculty" of their respective units, and a chair setting the agendas and presiding over meetings (note also that "deans, associate deans, and directors or chairs of departments" are not allowed to appoint, propose membership, or vote on elected faculty councils). (**Faculty Code, Section 23-45**).

Considering the Dean, the voting faculty of the college or school are granted the powers and duties to, "with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its chancellor or dean in accord with the provisions of Chapter 24 and of Chapter 25, Section 25-41." (**Faculty Code 23-43**). Note that, in this respect, Chapter 23 of the Faculty Code requires the elected faculty council or councils to "advise the dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and advise the dean on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets." (**Faculty Code, Section 23-45**) Considering the departments, the faculty of a college or school "[m]ay, if it is departmentalized, delegate to the faculties of its several departments any of the powers and duties" specified above (**Faculty Code 23-43**). Still, although the "organization and rules of procedure of a department may be determined by the department faculty," departmental organization and rules "shall be subject to review by the appropriate campus, school, or college faculty." (**Faculty Code, Section 23-45**).

Another key component of the Faculty Code that pertains to matters of curriculum (among other things) requires that the faculty, "[i]n exercising its authority," "shall carefully consider the effect of its actions upon other campuses, colleges, schools, and departments" (**Faculty Code 23-47**). Such "effects" that flow from curriculum decisions are broad, including but not limited to budgets, resources (faculty, departmental, and program), and impacts on the student body served by departments.

How does this apply to BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure, and its associated Memorandum of Understanding Between the Office of the Dean CBE and CBE Academic Units and Proposed Guidelines for BE Studio and Seminar Processes?

Overall and irrespective of the contents of the documents, the power, and authority to govern BE curriculum rests with the voting faculty of the College, not with the BE Commons, nor with the Dean's Office.

It is in the best interest of the College (CBE) and its collective units for the College Council to engage the voting faculty to determine the interests of the voting faculty in expanding the BE curriculum. The voting faculty of the College would benefit from an analysis of the income, expenditures, and participation in BE courses to date, to be able to assess their current value and viability, and to obtain from the Dean's office a projection of the income and costs (by source) projected in association with the BE proposal. Such data only serves its purpose under the Faculty Code if the voting faculty can see the effects that such choices would have on the departments and our various existing programs, as noted above.
It may be in the best interest of the voting faculty to prepare an alternative roadmap to BE curricular expansion than what is suggested by the BE Commons, Oversight + Infrastructure, and its associated Memorandum of Understanding Between the Office of the Dean CBE and CBE Academic Units and Proposed Guidelines for BE Studio and Seminar Processes. Any such roadmap would have to be inclusive of many interests within the College and establish, through the voting faculty, a representative governance structure.

II. Comments from the Faculty by Departments

The following includes comments from individual faculty members as collected and documented by the elected representatives of the College Council from each department.

Architecture

1. In my opinion, the most sensitive point for our department is the financial impacts/risks and how these are to be managed. Perhaps the most direct language addressing this issue is on the Appendix A DRAFT "Memorandum of Understanding Between the Office of the Dean CBE and CBE Academic Units". It states:

   "Changes (including creation of new large courses, changing course designation, or consolidation of current courses) will not have an overall negative impact on any one individual department. If there is negative financial impact, the Dean will use college funds to make up the difference."

   I think in order to appease the concerns raised by our faculty in the last faculty meeting would be to provide clarifications on this point. Especially on HOW this will be done. The first point talks about the "overall" financial impact. What does this mean? How would the impact be calculated? Based on what enrollment to what classes? Based on past year ABB? There is also little clarity on how the revenues will be distributed but seem more likely to have to do with who participates in the classes and less on who's classes are being displaced/affected.

2. The CBE-CC also contains a significant additional load for faculty and staff serving on the various committees. This includes a (presumably new) 0.5 FTE staff position. It would also help to get specifics on the financial implications of the added load to staff and faculty.

3. **Increasing student enrollment in CBE courses:**
   Before moving forward, it would be helpful to identify the specific CBE courses that are under-enrolled and how their enrollment would benefit from the development of more CBE courses.

4. **Increasing student enrollment in and improving access to CBE minors, majors, certificate, and graduate programs**:

   Existing course scheduling issues should be addressed/resolved before the attempt to increase enrollment is pursued.

   - Existing certificate courses need to be coordinated across the departments to avoid conflicts with required courses.
   - Are we currently able to meet current demand? Example: In winter 2023, Architecture was asked (rather last minute) to place 9 MUP students who needed to take an Urban Design Certificate studio.
   - Which certificates desire increased enrollment? Real Estate Certificate is already very popular – can its courses support an increased enrollment? Does RE want to increase enrollment?
   - Design Studio-centered programs want to grow but are limited in how big they can expand due to physical constraints (available studios, number of desks).

5. **Increasing revenue for the College and all its Departments:** Assuming that the new CBE courses will pay for the new Director and Staff positions and the faculty to teach them….has BE Commons asked Rachel to run a cost-benefit analysis for offering additional courses and the minimum enrollment #s needed to make each one financially viable?

6. **Improve teaching and funding opportunities for graduate students in particular our Ph.D. cohorts?**

   - Are currently offered BE courses filling or meeting minimum enrollment targets? If they are not filling, how does expanding course offerings address this issue?
   - Since the CBE (college) does not award Bachelor's or Master's degrees, this may pose as an initial challenge in attracting students outside CBE to take these courses.

7. **Resolving existing conflicts in course scheduling and teaching to improve accessibility and expand participation by both students and faculty:**

   - Finding classrooms is a primary course scheduling challenge. How does the creation of more BE courses offering improve course scheduling and accessibility to currently offered courses?

Construction Management

1. How will the resource be allocated assuming BE class involves more than one department? (page 5) The description in the proposal (page 7) ['equitable manner'] is still not clear.
2. A non-competing clause is missing: i.e. BE cannot offer a course that competes for ABB revenue with any existing department courses. Therefore, each course proposal should be reviewed by departments and deemed as non-competitive. The initial goal was to provide offerings that were either interstitial between disciplines or overarching.
3. It needs to state more clearly that one of the goals is for the BE to be self-sustaining and if generating positive revenue, this "profit" should be used to reduce the 34% CBE overhead and commonwealth charge.
4. The proposal mentions (page 1) that "the proposal provides a directive for the CBE Curriculum Council to begin developing evaluation protocols and criteria for BE-related courses". I understand that College Council develops the evaluation protocol, not Curriculum Committee.
5. Regarding the credits that would be offered for taking the BE courses. For a graduate program, we have a limited number of 9 credits to be taken as non-cm credits. If the BE proposal credits are offered such that each graduate student must take a particular number of BE credits as part of our degree (or other units' degree), then students would be at a disadvantage. Since if they have no particular interest in the topics offered in the BE courses, but still required to take BE courses, they won't be able to take other credits suitable for their career or interest from other units and if they do, it might come at increased tuition to the students. Generally, students are allowed to take the 9 non-cm credits from any UW unit with the approval of the GPC or the immediate advisor subject to such credits are related credits to the degree. We require no prior approval for the credits taken in our college and CEE, but we do not force them to take such credits.
6. For the 300-400 level courses, the two guidelines seem contradictory to each other - the topics covered in the courses should be a disciplinary priority (i.e., they are likely in the existing curricula already) AND complement/supplement existing curricula (i.e. they should be something new). This might just be a wording issue.
7. One of the guiding principles (on page 2) has a very different flavor from the other two principles as it contains keywords strongly tied to certain disciplines in CBE. The principle says: "Focusing on the

potential for interdisciplinary collaboration and learning to help educate students about past, current, and future urban issues related to equity and justice from the current housing crisis to climate impacts.

Landscape Architecture

1. How will the courses be determined? And how will Departments be supported when some faculty are teaching BE courses?

2. Under the "Faculty Director" position, I raised a question about how pedagogical priorities are determined. Who would be determining these priorities and how will they be determined?

   Another thought that I didn't raise is whether this process begins as a pilot. The CBE Commons Curriculum could start with a series of shared, commonly required courses that are driven by, for example, accreditation requirements. Ken mentioned a Professional Practice course. Maybe there are a series of topics/categories that provide an organizational structure for courses that are common across multiple departments (digital representation and analysis; design thinking; history/theory; professional practice; etc.). One way this might start is to do a cross-department analysis of where there is currently duplication in course type/content. I recognize this would take some time, but might also help set up a structure for establishing this infrastructure, and get more buy-in from other departments if that teaching load becomes more distributed across the college and increases efficiencies.

3. I am very supportive of the CBE Commons idea. I think it is important that CBE finds ways to reach broader student audiences. I think there is a lot of untapped impacts we could have on students across the university as I suspect there are a lot of students looking for the types of perspectives we offer but we are not a big enough presence on their radar. I am particularly excited about the interdisciplinary emphasis. I think a common curriculum that emphasizes interdisciplinarity will give us the flexibility to deliver cutting-edge courses that might be more difficult to fit into departmental curricula. From my perspective as someone who works on climate change, I think our society is going to undergo rapid shifts in the next few years and decades and we will need to respond pedagogically quickly. In that sense, I think the CBE Commons could give us the flexibility to keep up with those shifts and stay relevant and timely in the future.

4. I believe this proposal has promise and can potentially move the college in a positive new and more interdisciplinary direction.

   However, there are a few aspects of the proposal that warrant further consideration:

   - The proposal calls for a great deal of vetting & review of course proposals by a faculty director and steering committee. While this makes sense on one level, it does introduce an unprecedented power structure and review process for course proposals. We need to be vigilant to be sure that course proposals are reviewed in a fair and equitable manner. One way to help ensure that would be to develop clear, explicit (written) criteria that will be the basis for reviewing and accepting course proposals. It will be important for the Faculty Director and Steering Committee (if that proposed structure is to be kept in place) to be transparent about these criteria and the rationale behind their selections.

- The reality is that this new structure and process is being proposed in the context of ABB where individual departments are constantly scrambling for dollars. How can he have a truly, fundamentally interdisciplinary model that breaks disciplinary silos within this budget structure? Are there mechanisms that can be put in place to help ensure that we can really pursue a new level of inter-departmental cooperation and fresh teaching opportunities without this spiraling into departmental competitions?

I would like to have faith that we can find a way to spearhead a new initiative like this that is not business as usual but provides a genuine opportunity for interdisciplinary teaching and learning that goes beyond our current model - even of BE studios as they exist now. I'd like to see this as an opportunity to offer fresh, new courses that are shared across disciplines with faculty across departments co-teaching (or teaching in sequence) to provide students with different disciplinary takes on issues that demand we think outside the box. There are many possibilities if we can find an equitable and transparent vetting process and administrative/budgetary support to help circumvent conventional territorial approaches to teaching and course content.

Real Estate

1. The entire proposal is based on BE courses attracting new students and generating additional revenue. However, there are BE courses that already exist and from a preliminary analysis the existing courses are not achieving these two goals but rather doing the exact opposite - costing CBE money and pulling existing CBE students from classes offered by the departments. Before moving forward with creating any more courses, the existing BE courses should be fully evaluated to determine if the goals are being met.

2. It is unclear if the proposal is asking us to approve further work to identify whether the college needs to allocate additional resources to the BE curriculum or agreement to do so?

3. The proposal and appendices largely read like CBE doesn't already have 16 courses at undergrad and grad levels, including 5 at 200 level that are offered regularly with a large number of seats with a total of 600-700 students a year taking BE courses. In the last couple years, the 200 courses have had about 2/3 of their seats filled up (current registration at the end of Period I for BE 211 is at 20/160). There are references to the 400 and 500 level seminars and studios but without really explaining what more is needed in developing those. The CBE Commons Committee may have done work to review these courses, spoken with the students on what they see as the gaps or needs in BE offerings but no reference to these findings is made and the efforts largely read disconnected from the existing offering and potential needs to adjust it. Sharing the findings of an analysis of the current offering, and if not doing one, seems like it would be helpful before discussing potential changes.

4. The College Curriculum Committee last year raised issues with the approval process for temporary and new courses offered through BE and offered a proposal to be the entity in charge of reviewing these. Given that this committee is involved in reviewing all course proposals for the college, it seems they could have the best view to review BE proposals as well rather than creating another committee. So there seems to be a need for a governance change but not clear if there is a demonstrated need for additional resources given existing staffing in the Dean's office and student services in particular.

5. Comments on page 2:

   "The Commons Committee is not a decision-making entity within CBE, but composed of volunteers from the representative departments…..": How are they then empowered to make curriculum decisions which affect all departments? The CBE has a curriculum committee voted by each department coordinating across departments, why wasn't a similar vote requested to form this ad hock BE commons committee? Did participants truly volunteer or were asked to serve/selected by the Dean's office? The proposal on page 4 indicates that the department curriculum committee faculty will serve on the Steering committee why was this not followed before?

   - "*expanding students' knowledge by tapping into professional expertise to ground in disciplinary strength while confidently crossing boundaries to tackle broad social and personal concerns*." This suggests that there isn't a balanced academic and professional approach and only the professionals are valued for their contributions. Is this accurate?

   Principle bullet points:

   - "Providing equitable access" -- this suggests that the current CBE courses do not, which is not true in the majority of courses
   - "Focusing on the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration" -- this is taking place already with courses which are cross-listed across departments/colleges etc.
   - "Providing students with the highest quality of education". Don't the other CBE courses offer the same standard? If only professionals are valued as stated above then do they represent the highest quality?

6. Comments on Page 3

   - *"*this proposal is to provide a general approach and structure that directly serves to benefit the CBE and each of the departments pedagogically, financially, and administratively". How does an ad hoc committee affecting the CBE curriculum with no coordination with the department curriculum committees make such a statement? An analysis needs to be provided based on the BE 200 level courses offered through time, the number of students they brought vs. cannibalized from CBE departments as well as the cost per course and benefits, especially among departments offering similar courses (e.g. Arch and UDP). How have enrollments of the BE 200 fluctuate through time and do they justify an inclusion of 100 level or even higher as the higher will infringe in department courses?
   - There are efforts to create a BE curriculum for a while with dedicated administrator time (faculty director etc.) this report is still very preliminary even though an investment was made in money and effort. It seems that the administration and the ad hoc committee wants to hide the impact by NOT including in the report the financial information as outlined above and in contrast making unsubstantiated statements regarding the benefit to the college.
   - Faculty director: Based on the appointment and reporting relationship this seems to purely be a curriculum serving the Dean's office objectives rather than the college and it looks like a "shadow department" with the faculty director as the chair with all the additional support required for the department (e.g. staff, steering and advisory committees).

   Two concerns are:

- Faculty should determine by vote the director rather than the CBE administration after a nomination process (similar to the program directors)
- The BE commons had a faculty director and support, why are they not providing the budget info before any decision is made to proceed further? Even if data were not collected the Dean's office should provide all the financial data on income and expenses on the current BE curriculum

7. Comments on *Page 4*

   "These course offerings should build upon and/or modify existing CBE curriculum". The Dean and Director of the BE curriculum should not be able to affect department courses. Faculty and not administrators determine the course offerings

Urban Design & Planning

In addition to the comments shown below, UDP faculty raised several of the same concerns as listed above from the Real Estate department.

1. It is my understanding that this is something many in the college have wanted to do for a long time (e.g., generate BE courses). Advisors have been involved for some time. This is helpful. One question I have about this is, where is this coming out of organizationally? This feels like it might be coming out of the Dean's office, my sense is it is somewhat problematic to have the Dean weighing into that.

   For example, if this document were approved as written, the Dean would select the "Faculty Director" and that this person would "report" to the "Associate Dean of Academic Affairs" for CBE.

   > *Faculty Director: Administrative appointment (partial %-FTE) by the Dean for a faculty member (Tenure or Teaching track) for a renewable 3-year term that reports to the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs for CBE.*

   Giving a Dean the authority to make such an appointment, and then having this person "report to" an Associate Dean does not fit with the delegation of this role to the voting faculty of the College. It would be more fitting and suitable for the College Council to hold nominations and an election for the position, much as it already does for the representatives to the Faculty Senate, for example. Much like the Bylaws of the Urban Design and Planning PhD program, the re-appointment could be handled by the core faculty of the program, which in this case is the voting faculty of the College.

2. The Dean is also very involved if, as noted in the documentation and attached MOU, their office is providing payment for the program. If the Dean's office is providing payment, then the Dean would have the ability through the budget to control decisions about expenditures for the program. While the documentation makes payment by the Dean's Office sound favorable to departments, it is not actually favorable to departments. The Dean's office does not have its own revenue adequate to pay for the start-up or continuation of this program over time. The Dean's office would have to be pulling funds from the ABB revenues of departments in order to pay for this program, unless and until BE courses were able to pay for themselves. The language and its intent is disingenuous in this matter. If the financial matters of BE are actually – on balance with all other expenditures and revenues over time – favorable or at least risk-free to the departments, then show us the data that proves that point.

3. There are many statements in this document that are either too ambiguous to be understood or are requests for powers that should not be granted. For example, throughout the document the acronym CBE is being used. CBE refers to the College and the collection of departments and programs within the college, altogether. And the term CBE-CC is being used to refer to the group of 'volunteers' who are not a decision-making body within the College. On this point, for example: Is this document limited in its scope to BE courses and their administration, as if in the form of a program (and if so, are you including or keeping separate the BE PhD program)? If so, then the language in this document and the attached MOU needs to be changed.

   For example, see this language: *The Faculty Director position would be responsible for overseeing all aspects of the program oversight and management including, but not limited to:*
   - *Curriculum establishment and adjustment to meet pedagogical priorities;*
   - *Budget evaluation and management;*
   - *Curriculum management (CBE and UW) through Kuali for new courses and course revisions;*

   Any faculty director asked to 'oversee all aspects of program oversight and management' would surely not be responsible for the management of the CBE curriculum. Would this person's charge actually be to facilitate the decisions of the Steering Committee with regard to BE course offerings? Carrying out administrative tasks as required by the College Council's Curriculum Committee and the University of Washington Curriculum Committee?

4. This is not a proposal to form a department — or if it is, then make that clear. Currently, it has all of the makings of misinformation to say that this is about BE Commons' goals while actually intending to form a department. We note the following language under the 'responsibilities' of the 'Faculty Director':

   > *Interdepartmental coordination working directly with department Chairs, department and PhD Program Leads, and department staff for identifying faculty and student teaching assignments;*

   Faculty currently create courses and navigate their own course assignments in an iterative way with program directors and department chairs. This language gives the impression that the person in this position would be given the authority to select and/or seek out assignments of faculty members to courses, instead of faculty creating the opportunities for themselves. Coordination is too ambiguous a term to describe your vision for how faculty and student teaching assignments would happen. This choice of language sounds top-down, with a 'faculty director' operating like a department chair or program director, which it is not, if we are to take the title of this document as it is now. What is the assumption about HOW courses would be developed and instructors assigned, if this person is the 'faculty director' of non-PhD BE courses?

5. Our faculty are teaching within our departments. So how, within this framework, are new courses expected to be created? How are they going to be created? Is it something out of the departments and then into the BE? What is the expectation?

6. Departments differ in the ways that they are organized internally to administer curriculum for their various programs. UDP for example has a Curriculum Committee for its Master of Urban Planning program, but this department also offers degrees in CEP, MIPM, PhD, and a UDP minor. What is meant by this description for the members of the "Steering Committee"?

The representative for each department should be a member of the department's curriculum committee.

Is this a reference to the College Council's standing Curriculum Committee, which is comprised of representatives from the five departments, or something else?

7. It seems like it would be better to have a model of nominees and College-wide elections for the Steering Committee, administered by the College Council, where 2 seats would be available from each of the Departments' voting faculty, for a total Steering Committee membership of ten. It can be helpful to have a broad base of faculty members to steer any intentionally interdisciplinary offerings, even if (or perhaps especially if) they are not organized into a degree-offering program. Better to allow broad participation from people who can nominate themselves, who can make the case to their colleagues for participating in this way.

8. The faculty are the source of vision in R1 institutions. Process matters, because the administrative assignment of people to teaching roles does not result in the creation of a vision to attract people and elevate our discourse. The kinds of hierarchical administrative arrangements shown here could be easily interpreted as creating the kind of arrangements for teaching that we see in community colleges, or in the online teaching arrangements that lead us to question the quality of the course offerings. The Dean and Associate Dean should not be selecting and overseeing or receiving reports. The 'Faculty Director' should be facilitating the will of the Steering Committee, all of whom should be elected by the voting faculty of the College. They would be much more than "communication conduits" and "offering professional advice and perspective". If they are actually Steering, then they are making decisions by majority vote with rules of quorum like any committee or council formed as a result of decision-making by the voting faculty of the College (according to the authority in the Faculty Code). This also means that the various lists of course types and goals is premature, as it would fall upon the Steering Committee to solicit proposals or suggestions for new courses. What matters is not a "Strategic Approach." What matters are the Bylaws that any such committee would generate about how they govern themselves and are, in turn, overseen by the voting faculty of the College.

9. Ambiguous language could lead one to believe that "*The following is an initial, not exhaustive, list of proposed criteria for course approval*" could be meant to supersede the course approval process and authority that currently exists within the College Council's Curriculum Committee. What is the intent?

10. This whole document appears to be asking for authority while lacking the kinds of information that the faculty would want to see in order to know whether to grant such authority. There have already been several years of offering BE courses. What do the revenues, expenditures, SCH, and faculty and staff resources look like for those courses over these years? What evidence or studies do we have that show a market for SCH coming from OUTSIDE our existing departments? What evidence do we have of faculty proposals to generate and then provide their own talent and resources to BE offerings? What evidence do we have of cost-sharing agreements for the ABB that would be generated from these courses?

11. If we think about the Ph.D. programs, where we have a set of a few courses but most of the courses that students take for credit from the Ph.D. program are already offered through other departments and programs. It seems that in this framework you propose you have BE and CBE (from across the

College's other programs) courses and different dimensions. The way I read this document, the primary purpose is so that students will take BE courses and enormous revenues will flow into the Dean's office.

12. The Dean envisions these BE courses to gain revenue, but will there be revenue sharing between the Dean's office and the department? In what amounts or proportions? Net of what expenses? If the Dean receives the surplus, then are we really making pie bigger, or just delivering revenue from the departments to the Dean's office? I have no clear outlook or clear idea of how this is going to be handled. It is NOT in this document.

13. Under what expectation is the executive committee in the Dean's office rolling this out to the entire faculty? You must have some ex-ante analysis showing how revenue would grow... 10% 20% above current levels from some baseline of current programs or ABB. [*Ken Yocom says a market analysis was done last year but is not presented here*].
    - We would need to see the market analysis. Why wasn't this market analysis shared with the voting faculty? That is the first document we should all see and discuss – that should happen long before we even begin to take up the idea of changing the powers and duties for curriculum.
    - [*Ken says that Vikram says that other colleges have needs that our curriculum could fulfill*] We are in an ABB financial structure,... so other colleges will send their students to our college? There are no specifics offered in this claim, and the idea that other Colleges, under an ABB model, would be eager to send their student SCH to our College runs against the financial incentive structure of the ABB model for the University. It also runs against what we have seen anecdotally between Colleges: when ABB started the enrollments of students from other colleges in our courses DECLINED.

14. I have a comment and question. When I saw this I was excited about building a bridge between department curriculums because I think it is a problem for us to integrate the curriculum and establish synergy among curriculums, or a more flowing curriculum among departments. So I was very excited about this. So the idea that this just belongs to BE... was discouraging.

    Thinking about this as a bridge, I would like to see more of the vision. It is clearly here built on an administrative perspective, but I do imagine that a vision of what this college should be and what the needs are of renovating the curriculum could expand beyond the administrative structure into what administrative structure we SHOULD have.

    During the development of the collegewide strategic plan, we all tried to be supportive. There are two important things that are problems with this proposal. Organizationally what are the power and resources of this committee? If that director is like a PhD program director, it does not have resources, tenure, or a home, no one has obligations. [*Speaking to Ken Yocom*] You mentioned that if it was an LA course [*a good performing course being taken over to BE*] you would not be happy about it. Who is giving up opportunity - budget-wise - and who is capitalizing? Just think about the possibility that you have curriculum and individual trips into that curriculum.

    It is not clear who is developing the courses or the curriculum.

15. Why wasn't the market analysis included in this documentation? There has been a director for a while now, but Ken Yocom mentioned that there has been a market study. Why didn't we receive the most critical element, the market study? We know that the studio classes run in deficit and we

know that the 100-200 level SCH numbers are no longer strong. You need to prove that this thing is going to make money, or at least pay for itself.

16. Our intention is understanding. This document does not mention the strategic plan and doesn't have a shared vision illustrated there. The structure has an MOU, and THAT is the structure presented to us.

17. We may be more constructive if we [*the faculty*] reverse the problem and say take leadership.