

UWT Faculty Assembly
Minutes of Meeting
February 12, 1997

Members Present:

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Bernard Booms | 10. Julie Nicoletta |
| 2. Jim Brown | 11. Tome Owens |
| 3. Denise Drevdahl | 12. Sam Parker |
| 4. Patricia Fandt | 13. John Peterson |
| 5. Kathie Friedman-Kasaba | 14. Janet Primomo |
| 6. Cheryl Greengrove | 15. Jill Purdy |
| 7. Mike Kalton | 16. David Secord |
| 8. Kären Landenburger | 17. Richard Stackman |
| 9. David Morris | 18. Marcy Stein |
| | 19. Tracy Thompson |

Members on Sabbatical: Rob Crawford, Anthony D'Costa

Members unable to Attend: Mike Allen, Ron Butchart, June Lowenberg, Rachel May, Bill Richardson

Minutes of December 9, 1996 approved as written.

Committee Reports

1. Bylaws Committee: Report by Marcy Stein. The bylaws are in the process of being analyzed. Major issues which have been raised are: 1) Faculty voting procedures, 2) Search procedures, and 3) Tenure and promotion procedures. Cheryl Green grove will be contacting the chairs of each standing committee for the purpose and/or mission of the committees
2. Faculty Affairs Committee: Report by Sam Parker. The revised recommendations on evaluation procedures were discussed. In addition a discussion on the goals of the committee about the use of the evaluations for promotion and tenure was initiated. Kathie Friedman-Kasasba suggested that we look at issues of gender, race, ethnicity, age and how these factors correlate with faculty evaluation scores.
3. Commencement Committee: Tracy Thompson reported on the site for commencement. UPS will be the site for 1997 commencement. A subcommittee of Tracy Thompson, Pat McCarthy, and Rebecca Gallogly will conduct a search for a commencement space for the next ten years. UPS is seen as a short term solution and is a good example of cooperation across institutions.
4. Search for Director of Financing: Richard Stackman is faculty representative on the search. He requested that comments and questions be sent to him and he will forward information to the committee.
5. Denise Drevdahl willingly volunteered to be the faculty representative on the search for Director of Facilities Management.

6. Potential Action Item: Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Student Teaching Evaluations. Questions raised were: How will the procedure be implemented? Who makes the decision to inform the Office of Educational Assessment to have evaluations sent to individual faculty? At this time evaluations are sent back in group packs to program coordinators. Bernard suggested that it may be up to Dean Carwein to change the operating procedure with OEA. David Morris states that evaluations are under the control of individual faculty and the decision is made by the faculty senate. The yellow sheets are not made available to anyone but individual faculty. David Morris suggested that since evaluations can be obtained by anyone through the Office of Educational Assessment, that how evaluations are handled is meaningless because ultimately there is no confidentiality. Faculty Affairs will look further into implementation of the procedure as a formality. Mike Kalton encouraged us to look at the issue of an individual who does not send in their evaluations for Promotion & Tenure, or what will be use as a replacement? It was suggested that faculty choose to send in evaluation forms and in not doing so one is raising a red flag. Jim Brown noted the issue of uniformity across programs must be reviewed. Do we want a programmatic response or a campus wide response? Some of the issues in regards to faculty teaching evaluations will be discussed further through the Faculty Affairs/Director committee reviewing the procedures for Promotion and Tenure.
7. Faculty Search Committee Procedures: Janet Primomo proposes that current chairs of search committees review current procedures and develop a process for streamlining the process. Mike Kalton asked whether we have guidelines available and just need to write them down or do we need to fix something. The response was that there is a need for clarity of the procedure. Bernard Booms suggested that we look at the guidelines as available from the Office of Branch Campuses. Marcy Stein requested that the guidelines be written in one place.
8. Report from Joint Faculty Council: Janet Primomo reported that joint faculty council is involved in the discussion on articulation between campuses.
Articulation of the federated campuses: Nancy Hooyman's committee is meeting now and a report is expected soon on the types of "steering" committees that will be established to address issues. The Seattle Faculty Senate Chair, Joan Martin, has requested names of faculty to serve on committees. Names suggested are yet to be approved by the UWB and UWT faculty; suggestions by the Joint Council are Bernard Booms, Belinda Louie, and myself. This would create linkage to the Joint Council this year.

Evolving Program Governance Issues: UWB and UWT will be invited to the Joint Council next month to discuss problems in nomenclature and the need to review governance models in programs. As the UWB and UWT campuses grow and evolve, it is time to address policy and procedures regarding Program Director's review and how we fit into the faculty code.

Course drop policy: We discussed the current issue regarding the proposed "drop" policy and determined that each campus has already responded individually and there was not a consensus or need to address this further at the Joint Council level.

Salaries: We discussed whether a letter should be written to the Provost about our concerns related to salaries. Further discussion will occur at the next meeting.

9. Report on Faculty Survey: held over until the next meeting
10. Goals for the rest of the academic year: held over until the next meeting
11. New Business:

Bernard Booms proposes that representatives from the faculty write a recommendation handling of faculty salary inequities. Claudia Gorbman has agreed to take a crack at developing a recommendation.

Richard Stackman proposed that we discuss the form on faculty productivity that was sent to faculty from Karen Reed. Richard Stackman will take the responsibility to write a letter to the faculty with suggestions.

Faculty Affairs Committee Recommendations on Teaching Evaluations

This proposal is based on the following premises.

The procedures and questions used by the Office of Educational Assessment at the Seattle campus were designed to provide faculty with useful feedback on the course. They were not designed to assess the teaching competence of faculty. Over time they have come to be used for that purpose. While student evaluations may be one among several useful methods of documenting teaching competence, decisions about their uses are the responsibility of faculty. The purpose of these recommendations is to ensure the integrity of the procedures. The Faculty Affairs Committee will continue to work on procedures for collecting and reporting student data.

1. As on the Seattle campus, secured lock boxes should be placed in each campus classroom building. Students who administer teaching evaluations should be directed to place completed evaluation forms in a sealed envelope and drop the envelope in the locked box. One staff member (preferably from the Dean's office) should be designated to collect teaching evaluations from the locked boxes and put them in the campus mail.
2. Results of teaching evaluations should be returned from the Office of Educational Assessment (OEA) directly to faculty members in sealed envelopes. Copies of faculty evaluations should be sent to program directors at a (should be changed to "the") faculty member's request.

Program directors need access to representative evaluation data for a variety of purposes including program evaluation. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to respond to the requests of program directors to eliminate the cumbersome process of requesting data from the OEA. Efforts should be made to protect the privacy of the data. Data should not be published or made available to staff or students without the faculty member's consent.

The recommendation was passed with a vote of 17 yes and 2 no (one proxy vote) on the first part of the recommendation. The second part was passed with a vote of 14 yes and five no.

The Meeting was adjourned.

Karen Landenburger