

**College of the Built Environments  
Minutes for the All-Faculty Meeting  
May 3, 2023**

**Attendees:**

Jeff Hou (LA) (Chair), Kimo Griggs (Arch) (Past Chair), Yong-Woo Kim (CM), Rebecca Walter (RE), Jan Whittington (UDP) (Chair-elect), Louisa Iarocci (Arch) (Note-taker) and members of the CBE Faculty and Staff

Zoom link:

<https://washington.zoom.us/j/92236750867?pwd=SGxNYIVHWnhSc0JjWVl6Zm9DOG5aQT09>

**1. Call to order**

At the conclusion of the CBE all-college meeting, Chair Jeff Hou called the Annual Faculty Meeting of the 2022-23 academic year to order and confirmed (with the assistance of Kimo Griggs) that 43 faculty were present, representing a quorum, and all the departments were represented.

**2. (Beyond) Land acknowledgment**

Jeff Hou reminded everyone that May is the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month and began with an acknowledgment of the diverse cultural heritage of this land, along with resources to think of what each of us can do in terms of taking meaningful and concrete action to benefit our community.

**3. Annual retention report**

Jeff Hou invited Dean Renee Cheng to make a brief report on faculty retention this year. Dean Cheng reported that there was one case this year that was resolved successfully.

**4. Chair's update: Recap of College Council business AY22-23**

Jeff Hou then proceeded to briefly recap the College Council (CC) Business of AY 22-23, thanking the Council members, Vikram Prakash, the Dean of Academic Affairs, the College Staff, and the Department Chairs for all their coordination. CC spent a significant amount of time reviewing a number of documents related to Tenure & promotion cases, Unit adjustment proposal, and non-competitive hiring policy, and the CBE Budget narrative/proposal. On the latter specifically, the CC will be sharing a list of things that they would like to receive for next year to make the process more meaningful and productive in the future.

BE Curriculum has been the focus of a great deal of discussion. The College Council has collected feedback from the faculty on the BE Curriculum proposal and has forwarded this to the working group- as well as being in touch with Vikram Prakash and Ken Yocum, members of the

BE Curriculum Working Group about developing criteria and protocols for reviewing courses and programs to include courses at the college level.

Reminder on the survey for the preferred options for the Faculty Salary Increase will close tomorrow May 4th, 2023 and the CC will forward the results to Dean Chang for a decision- as well as sharing the results with everyone. Thanks to everyone who has already responded.

#### **4. Faculty Senate update**

Jan Whittington, College Council representative from the Department of Urban Design and Planning and chair-elect of the College Council provided an update from the Faculty Senate. She co-chairs (with Gundual Proksch) Faculty Council on Campus Planning and Research and is a member of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB). The Washington State Legislative results this year have the state providing 60% of the Merit Increases which is less than the 2/3rds requested by the University. A demographic dip is leading to a fairly dramatic decline in admissions in universities across the state of Washington- the UW is starting to see that impact now. She stated that we will have some challenging budgeting conversations in the coming years with some units still recovering from the financial impact of COVID. Faculty Senate members are aware of the fact that even a 4% increase across the board would only allow a partial recovery from the rate of inflation occurring in the State. She noted that the poll sent out to faculty on the faculty salary increase is in response to concerns about how decisions on merit are being made- the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting reached out to Faculty Councils across the UW to request more proactive participation by faculty as to how merit increases should be distributed.

The business of the faculty in terms of changes to legislation has this year -rather than a complete adoption of grievance and adjudication, focused on a soft phase one launch with the adoption of a program with faculty liaisons that have to go through an adjudication process of some kind on campus.

The Faculty Senate has adopted gender-neutral language across all the chapters in the faculty code, language is also being proposed to include community-engaged scholarship in consideration of all the ways that we acknowledge the variations in scholarship on our campus. Faculty should be aware to look for forthcoming proposed legislation about a proposed campus-wide decarbonization strategy focused on the Central Plant, which will be a long-running program of around 10-15 years, with a partially estimated cost of around 800 million dollars.

#### **5. Discussion items:**

##### a. Proposed amendments to the CBE Bylaws

The following transcribes Jeff Hou's presentation on the proposed amendments to the CBE Bylaws. He first provided a brief timeline of the proposed amendments to our Bylaw, providing some background and history- the timeline beginning with a request from Vikram Prakash,

ADAA on November 16, 2022, then discussed by College Council in meetings on 1/3/23 and 2/7/23. A draft of the amendments was produced on 3/7/23, then shared with CBE Leadership and Department Chairs for feedback on 3/21/23, discussed at the Chairs + meeting on 4/6/23, and the draft shared with the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee on Codes & Regulations on 4/13/23 that provided feedback on 5/2/23. The next steps are to gather more feedback and decide whether to have a vote at the All-College Meeting on May 31st or online to complete the process at the end of the academic year.

There are a few things on the table that have not been addressed in this round because they require more time- these include the oversight of the research centers, how and if the Dean's Office Policy and Procedures need to be referenced in the Bylaws in some way and how the Diversity Council fits into the government structure of the College.

Jeff Hou stated that this Proposed Amendments Document is a finished draft but is still subject to change so faculty feedback is welcome, reminding everyone that this is a living document, that will require revisions in the future.

The current proposed amendments to the CBE Bylaws include:

- Updates to the language of the CBE Bylaws to be more Gender Inclusive  
Gender references were removed and replaced with job titles as recently done in the Faculty Code. Highlighted texts in yellow are new language with crossed-out text, being removed.
- Updates to include Teaching Track Faculty  
Make sure we use the term "voting faculty" to be consistent with the Faculty Code.
- Clarifying and aligning College Council responsibilities roles with the language in the Faculty Code. Make the roles and responsibilities of the College Council align more closely with the Faculty Code (23-43) and clarify the role CC plays in advising implementation of the existing curriculum and proposed. Item J has received feedback from the Senate Advisory Committee on Codes and Regulation and has been revised based on their feedback.
- Clarifying language on the meeting quorum, clarifying the process for proposing amendments to the Bylaws  
The College Council has proposed deleting a paragraph it considers counter to the purpose of the quorum in considering and amending a proposed action.
- Another proposed amendment lowers the threshold required for the number of non-voting faculty to make motions to ensure non-voting faculty have a voice. The language for approving amendments is also proposed to be changed to be more consistent with the faculty code.

Jeff Hou concluded his summary of the proposed changes. He outlined the next steps to be taken as hearing questions and comments from the faculty- the plan being for CC to share a finalized proposal that will be sent 2 weeks prior to voting, and decide whether to vote online or in the final meeting of the academic year on 5/31.

Discussion:

Dean Cheng raised the issue about the wording of “sets policies” in Item J of the proposed changes to the Bylaws, recommending that this be changed to “advise on policies.” She observed that “if for example, the faculty sets a policy that unintentionally creates a problem, that it is ultimately her responsibility to manage and hopefully anticipate.” Jan Whittington noted that the policy would need to be approved by the Dean.

Carrie Sturts Dossick (chat) noted that the faculty code suggests the faculty/college council “advises on” policy, not “setting policy.” She stated that the college council is not elected to oversee or set policy for curriculum or academic matters in the college- since we have other curriculum committees for this purpose- like the College Curriculum Committee and the BE Curriculum Committee. The College Council is elected to advise the dean on matters involving academic policy. “Section 23-45 of the faculty code "The governing body of a campus, college or school is its elected faculty council. According to Section 23-45 of the Faculty Code, these elected bodies shall advise their respective deans or chancellors on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets."

Jan Whittington (chat) responded with the following excerpt from the Code: “Section 23-43 Campus, College, and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties In accord with Executive Orders No. IV and No. V, and Chapter 13, Section 13-31, Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty grant to the faculty of each campus, college, and school, with the exception of the graduate faculty, the powers and duties enumerated below. This authority is subject, however, to the power of the Senate to determine policies which affect the general welfare of the University (Chapter 22, Section 22-32, Subsection B) and to the procedures set forth in Sections 23-47 and 23-48 for the coordination of campuses, colleges, and schools.”

Carrie Sturts Dossick (chat) stated that she believes that the College Council members are not “senators” but rather refer to the Faculty Senate. Jan Whittington responded that the excerpt is not about the Faculty Senate- but refers to the “faculty of Colleges and Schools and outlines a more extensive list of power and duties than people have previously thought of as limited to 23-45c.”

Christopher Campbell (chat) provided the following excerpt: “23-45 C. Each school or college shall have an elected faculty council or councils which shall 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.”

Dan Abramson (chat) stated that “it would be helpful to include notes to specific sections of the Faculty Code where revised Bylaws language is based on that eg. distinction between ‘set’ and ‘advise.’” He asked if there was a way to post both the draft ByLaws Revision and the chat contents (transcribed here) on the CC’s internet site for future reference.

Jan Whittington stated (chat) that “it might be helpful to keep in mind that the amendments to the Bylaws have already been reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations, an advisory group informally known as the ‘code cops.’ advising on interpretation of the faculty code by the Senate Executive Committee.”

Vikram Prakash noted that the faculty code locates the authority to set curriculum with the entire faculty, including chairs of departments and curriculum committees, and not the faculty council. He stated in terms of the relationship between the College Council and the Dean, a collaborative process is key, “several documents put the responsibility of the curriculum and its management in the hands of the Dean.”

Jeff Hou thanked everyone for their input and stated that the College Council will go back to the Faculty Code to determine the appropriate language.

Carrie Sturts Dossick raised a question about the change from 15 to 5 in the number of voting faculty required to endorse a written request made by non-voting faculty. Jeff Hou responded that the intent is to lower the threshold to make it easier for non-voting faculty to have a voice. The College Council has looked at the faculty code and other colleges and feels comfortable with the proposed revised number.

A discussion arose, beginning in the chat messages, about the naming of the College Council. Brandon Born offered the suggestion that the name of the College Council be changed to Faculty Council, noting that the code calls the body “Faculty Council.” Lynne Manzo agreed the current name is misleading- stating that the name of the College Council is renamed to the “CBE Faculty Council” instead. Jan Whittington responded that colleges and schools use either term, but in the Senate, the College Council is referred to as an “Elected Faculty Council.” Manish Chalana stated he feels renaming the College Council to Faculty Council is confusing as there existing several Faculty Councils at the university level. Lynne Manzo responded that the name of College Council suggests it covers matters of staff and students, quoting the following: “The Council shall be concerned with all domains of faculty authority and duties of the College Faculty.” Jeff Hou responded that our College is not the only one to refer to its faculty council as College Council and that the name change would require more discussion.

Brandon Born raised the question about the language that refers to elections of College Council members rather than being assigned by the Chairs of the Departments. Jeff Hou stated that no change has been proposed, and encouraged the faculty to contact the respective department chairs on matters concerning conformity to the College bylaws.

Ann Huppert stated she appreciates this discussion and followed up on Branden Born’s point that there is a widespread understanding of what it is the Faculty Code. She asked that the comments in the chat message make it difficult to follow two conversations at once and asked for an opportunity to have further discussion on these matters.

#### b. Updates: Proposed BE Curriculum

Julie Parrett introduced herself as a faculty member in Landscape Architecture and Graduate Program Director. She sits on both the BE Curriculum Working Group and the CBE Curriculum Committee. The following transcribes her presentation. She first provided some history on the proposed BE Curriculum which came out of the Strategic Framework that was adopted in Spring of 2020. In the winter of 2021 Vikram Prakash, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, formed the BE Curriculum Working Group which included faculty from all 5 departments, UG and Grad advisors, and students. There was a discussion about the BE Curriculum at the All-Faculty Meeting in Spring 2022. The BE Curriculum proposal has been reviewed by multiple groups over the winter 2023 quarter. The revised proposal that is being shared today for discussion by the full faculty has been approved by the Dean, the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, and the Chairs of the departments.

Julie Parrett stated that the proposal emerged from the CBE strategic framework “to provide equitable access to all students at UW to learn about built environments, to focus on the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration and learning, and to provide the highest quality of education possible by advancing critical thinking and collaborative practices.”

The goal of this proposal is to provide “a framework for oversight and infrastructure” and not to determine “what the pedagogy should be for the curriculum. The voting faculty “hold the power and the duty for managing and advancing academic and curricular matters which is well established.” The CBE follows a two-tier process for this responsibility.

- **Origination Committees**  
These are responsible for “the development of pedagogy, analysis of capacity and need and financial and other impacts of curriculum changes.” This is the existing structure consisting of departmental curriculum committees and the college-wide BE PhD. The UDP PhD is actually housed in the graduate school so it is not overseen by our college.
- **Administrative Review Committees**  
After the proposals are put forward, the Administrative Review Curriculum Committee is responsible for compliance with university-wide requirements and processes and coordination across courses offered in CBE to reduce redundancies and build upon potential synergies. The CBE Curriculum Committee is a CC standing committee of faculty representatives from all the departments with one member also on the College Council. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs serves as ex officio.

The BE Curriculum Committee:

The proposed BE Curriculum Committee is a new college-wide origination committee. It is composed of 5 faculty members, 1 from each department, with an annual service appointment of up to 3 years. The Associate Dean of Academic Affairs and the Director of BE-PhD serve as ex-officio. The committee will be supported by staff who are financially supported through the Dean's office).

The responsibilities of this new BE Curriculum Committee would be to originate and administer all BE courses except for BE-PhD, determine pedagogy, identify teaching faculty, resource needs and viability, and ongoing administration of courses

A diagram was presented showing the current structure of the 5 department curriculum committees and the BE PhD committee as origination committees. The proposal is for a 2nd college-wide origination committee, the BE Curriculum Committee. It would follow the same protocol in place for origination curriculum committees. Any curriculum proposals or changes will go to the CBE Curriculum Committee for administrative review. The CBE Curriculum Committee is acting for the College Council. Once approved by the College Council, the proposal would go to the dean for review and approval and then onto the University Curriculum Committee.

#### BE Curriculum Finances:

Julie Parrett addressed some of the questions that have been raised about how finances would work for the BE Curriculum. Presently the financial base is provided by the dean's office- this would more-or-less stay the same and would still be centrally funded but would shift to coming out of the CBE Commons fund managed by chairs, associate deans, and the dean's office. Currently, the Dean's office protects against fluctuations in enrollment ( if there is insufficient enrollment, the Dean's office would continue to cover faculty buyouts and TA salaries), this would continue. Finances for BE courses would continue to be reviewed annually by the dean and the chairs. All of this would be governed by a Memorandum of Understanding which has been reviewed, approved, and signed between the dean and chairs. Direct costs include faculty buyouts and TA salaries, publications, and student travel related to the fieldwork

There have also been questions about how BE courses have impacted the college in particular financially. Over the last 5 years, there has been a net revenue from BE courses of more than \$450,000. The 200-level courses which have the greatest enrollment are generating the highest revenue and in fact, the BE seminars are showing a loss of revenue. Additionally, the BE courses are allowing support, particularly for the BE PhD program and students as BE PhD students serve as pre-doctoral instructors, TAs, and graders for the 200-level courses. Over the last 5 years BE courses have provided 38 quarters of work for BE PhD students. Revenue from BE Courses has also supported the BE PhD Fellowship symposia, planning, and travel for conferences.

A chart was shown that will be included with the proposal shared with faculty to review showing the Annual Net Income of BE Courses over the last five years. The first 5 columns show 200-level courses with rows showing net income, costs, and TA positions. The chart shows that there is net revenue for 200-level courses. The next column is BE studios and shows for most years' net financial revenue, although some years there has been a loss. But over 5 years there has been a financial positive. Seminars BE 498/598 show a loss but overall due to the BE 200-level courses there is net financial gain.

Julie Parrett noted that other questions have been raised around the BE curriculum enrollment and whether the BE classes are taking students from courses already offered. She presented a diagram entitled BE Curriculum Enrollment showing Major vs Non-Major Enrollments for existing BE Courses, showing the vast majority of students taking 200-level are non-majors. For studios and seminars, around 90% or more are our students.

The BE Curriculum Committee is eager to hear some feedback and questions and the proposal will be shared out by College Council.

Discussion:

Manish Chalana (chat) asked if there has been a self-evaluation study for the BE Curriculum.

Jan Whittington (chat) asked "What the word 'net' in net revenue is referring to? Is it limited to revenue and costs just within the Dean's office? Or is it an actual "net" for the College (which would have to include the reductions in departmental courses as a result of overlapping topics in BE Courses."

Kate Simonen (chat) posed the following question: "Will you have a similar report for Departmental large open classes at that same time frame? Is this increasing total revenue to the college (due to) shifting from other larger courses that have historically been offered and taken from those outside our college (eg. Arch History series and 150)." She followed up that the report does a really good job at helping to understand the success of those classes. But she questioned whether it fully understands what might be shifting, noting that architecture has had historic courses like the 350 and 150 series that are taken by people outside of our major- so it is difficult from a department perspective to understand whether or not that is a net increase to the college or not.

Julie Parrett responded that it is virtually impossible for us to determine whether people who have been taking ARCH 150 have shifted to a BE course. But what we do know is that we are predominantly pulling people for BE courses from outside of our college and ARCH 150 courses are remaining high so it would appear that it is not a direct conflict in that way.

Dean Cheng (chat) asked if the previous questions from Kate and Jan might be "answered by the current slide that the courses are not enrolling CBE students in the large classes."

Jan Whittington (chat) stated that major designations presented in the chart are not an adequate measure of whether or not a course pulls from other departmental offerings.

Carrie Sturts Dossick stated she believes Daniel Coslett did an analysis last year on Arch 150.

Alex Anderson stated that he is teaching Arch 150 this quarter and believes enrollment in Arch 150 has its highest enrollment in history- and that 150 is feeding into the CBE 200 level courses.



**6. Good of the order**

**7. Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 1:20 pm.

Schedule: The upcoming College Council Meeting will be held on June 5 (Mon) — 9:30 am