

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
THURSDAY, MAY 8, 2008
TACOMA ROOM
12:50-2pm

In Attendance: Orlando Baiocchi, Buck Banks, Bonnie Becker, Erin Casey, Donald Chinn, Erica Cline, Brian Coffey, Rob Crawford, Linda Dawson, Tom Diehm, Joyce Dinglason-Pandillo, Marjorie Dobratz, Eshan Feroz, Jerry Finn, Sharon Fought, Jim Gawel, Cheryl Greengrove, Teresa Holt, Linda Ishem, Michael Kalton, Diane Kinder, Bill Kunz, Janice Laakso, Kären Landenburger, June Lowenberg, Nita McKinley, Divya McMillin, George Mobus, Beverly Naidus, Stern Neill, Julie Nicoletta, Mark Pendras, Janet Primomo, Jennifer Quinn, Deirdre Raynor, Ruth Rea, Johann Reusch, Jose Rios, Beth Rushing, Peter Selkin, Marcy Stein, Christine Stevens, Ankur Teredesai, Larry Wear, Daniel Zimmerman

Guests: Shelby Fritz, Kacey Jurgens, Marcia Killien, Alison Navarrete, Patrick Pow, Jan Rutledge, Milt Tremblay, Ysabel Trinidad, Catherine Vogt

The meeting was called to order at 12:55 pm

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of Agenda
2. Approval of Minutes from April 9, 2008
3. Report from the Chair of Faculty Assembly
4. Report from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
5. Report from the FCTCP
6. Remarks from Marcia Killien, Secretary-elect of the UW Faculty Senate
7. New Business:
 - a. UWT budget report from Ysabel Trinidad
8. Old Business:
 - a. Standing Committee Reports
 - b. Brief description of the Phase 3 Project
9. Adjournment

1. Approval of Agenda:

The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes:

The minutes from April 9, 2008 were approved.

3. Report from the Chair of Faculty Assembly:

Marcy Stein announced the showing of the “Last Lecture” co-sponsored by the Faculty Assembly and Staff Association on May 27, 2008. She also reiterated the need for someone to step forward to run as Vice Chair of Faculty Assembly for next year. Without a Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly, including standing committees, will not be able to function properly. Elections for the Executive Council slate and positions for Chair and Vice Chair will be conducted via a Catalyst vote. By May 29, 2008, the Executive Council will make a decision regarding a proposal for Schools and Colleges based on the decisions regarding this proposal from each academic program’s faculty.

4. Report from the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:

Beth Rushing announced that there will be a reception on May 29 for faculty promoted and tenured at UWT. On June 6, she will be conducting a workshop for faculty thinking about being reviewed for promotion from Associate to Full Professor.

Beth then took questions regarding her Schools and Colleges proposal (see attached). One question was that is the proposal all or nothing; that is, do all the programs have to be included in some kind of schools and colleges structure? Beth’s answer was yes.

Another issue that came up was how does reorganization to schools and colleges affect promotion and tenure? This question, though beyond the scope of today’s discussion, is something that will have to be addressed, whether there is a campus-wide council or council within each school and college. Faculty would like to avoid duplicating Faculty Assembly committees within schools and colleges, given the high degree of service demands on UWT faculty already. Since some programs are not yet ready to transition to a school or college, the proposed model provides flexibility to allow programs that are ready to move forward to do so, while retaining a programmatic structure for units not yet ready to become a school or college.

Social Work and Nursing both have accreditation issues regarding reorganization; the current proposal seems to allow an ongoing discussion concerning this issue.

Other questions that arose: How will budgeting issues be resolved? Who within schools and colleges will have control over budgets? Would a dean be needed to oversee the smaller programs not yet part of a school or college? The Institute of Technology expressed concerns that under the proposal, it would be the only program represented by a director rather than a dean.

This is a general proposal; working out many details between the faculty and the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor will need to continue. By May 29, however, programs need to vote on whether or not they support Beth Rushing’s proposal for moving forward to a schools and colleges model and to provide comments on specifics. Every program will need to support the general proposal in order for the campus to move forward toward a schools and colleges model.

5. Report from the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP):

Janet Primomo first thanked Marcy Stein for her years of service on the FCTCP. Janet then announced that Class B Legislation is being prepared to codify cross-campus enrollment, which has always been determined on an ad-hoc basis before. The FCTCP has also been studying where UWT and UW Bothell (UWB) need to be represented on University of Washington Faculty Councils and committees, such as the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB). Next year the FCTCP will work on Class A Legislation to change the Faculty Code in order to allow both UWT and UWB to have faculty representatives on the SCPB. But in other cases, simple faculty linkages among campuses to keep up-to-date will be important. Another thing the FCTCP is doing is reviewing the three-campus review process for new program proposals. The FCTCP is working on making teleconferencing and videoconferencing more available so UWT and UWB faculty can participate on faculty councils without having to be physically in Seattle. This would help increase participation. Marcy reiterated the importance of UWT faculty participation on university-wide councils.

6. Remarks from Marcia Killien, Secretary-elect of the UW Faculty Senate:

Marcia Killien introduced herself to the Faculty Assembly. She comes from the School of Nursing at UW Seattle (UWS) and has had many years of service on various councils and committees at the university. She also has a great deal of knowledge regarding UWT, including helping to hire the campus's first dean.

Marcia explained that the Secretary is responsible for the welfare of the faculty and to provide linkages between the faculty and the university administration. She will be available for one-on-one consultation, as well. As the keeper of the code, the Secretary provides advice on interpreting the code. She will also be responsible for appointing various review committees, including Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination of Program (RCEP) committees, among other duties.

7. New Business: UWT Budget Report:

Ysabel Trinidad and Jan Rutledge spoke to the Faculty Assembly about the campus budget process and ways to promote more and better dialogue. Faculty Assembly has been working to become more involved in the budget process and to ensure that the Chancellor consults with the faculty when making budget decisions. Ysabel has been interested in more interchange with other constituencies on campus, as well, and has met with some of those representative groups, such as Faculty Assembly leadership, student government, and the Staff Association. Any of these groups can make comments directly to the Chancellor regarding the budget.

Marcy Stein reiterated that the faculty has a special responsibility to be involved in the budget process under the Faculty Code.

Ysabel announced that the budget recommendation reallocating money for information technology has been tabled, but Ysabel could not provide an answer regarding what that reallocation means for program budgets for the rest of the fiscal year. There are also outstanding questions regarding budget reserves, including how much money is in reserve, how much is being held back from the biennial budget, and when that money will be released. The reserve is

in the range of \$7-8 million dollars, but some of that money is tied up in capital expenses, connectivity, renovating buildings, and soil clean-up. UWT needs to find other revenue sources to deal with the growth of the campus, rather than depending on the state legislature. One question concerned how to pay for the repairs to the Mattress Factory Building's sick building problems. Can't UWT get money from the UW? Perhaps, but UWT would have to borrow the money.

8. Old Business

a. Standing Committee Reports

Because the Faculty Assembly meeting had gone past 2:00 p.m., some of the committee chairs had to leave, but chairs will be asked to submit written reports for posting to the Faculty Assembly website.

1. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure: Kären Landenburger briefly reported that APT has met all but one of its goals for 2007-08. A written report will be forthcoming.
2. Faculty Affairs: Johann Reusch reported that the committee has still been working on a workload policy mutually agreeable to administration and faculty. One concern is the rapid increase in student enrollment, as well as the fact that many courses at UWT are five-credit courses, making our teaching load higher than comparable institutions where the courses are mostly three credits each. The UWB has done a great deal of work figuring out how to lower their faculty course load, while accommodating their FTE targets. This year the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences (IAS) program at UWB instituted a five-course teaching load for its faculty; all UWB programs now have a five-course load per year. The Faculty Affairs committee has prepared a proposal for moving toward a five-course teaching load at UWT.

b. Phase 3 Project

Milt will send out the url for Phase 3 for faculty to look at online. Programmatic work has just been finished; now work is starting on the schematic design. Visuals are available for faculty to review on the terrace by the Tacoma Room right after the meeting.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

DRAFT: Presented by Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs Beth Rushing
4/22/08

The proposal presented here is for a new organizational structure at UW Tacoma, with ideas for how we would transition to the new structure. It combines features of those structures proposed by the Faculty Assembly, comparisons with other similar-sized universities, conversations with and recommendations from academic units and the academic dean/directors.

The next steps are in the hands of the faculty: do you wish to adopt this structure, modify this structure, or continue as we are currently organized. If we cannot reach agreement on a new structure, we will not go forward to the Provost with a request for reorganization. If we can reach general agreement on a new structure and a transition plan for reaching it, we would ask the Provost for authority to move forward with the reorganization. If we receive that authority, we would begin work in the autumn of 2008 to work out the details. Following that, we would then initiate the RCEP process as outlined in the Faculty Handbook (Section 26-41).

I would be happy to answer questions about this proposal, or to have further conversations as you see the need to do so.

Beth Rushing

Proposed new structure

- Milgard School of Business – Dean
- School (or College) of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences – Dean
- New College (could have another name) - This college will not have a Dean until approximately 5 years after its formation. In the transition period this unit might rotate or divide College administrative responsibilities among the leadership of the programs that make it up. Until a Dean is appointed, Program Directors (who may be appointed as Associate Deans) will continue to report to the VCAA.
- Institute of Technology – Director

School or College?

While there are no clear and consistent guidelines on this, UW Tacoma might reserve the term “College” for large units that have multiple subunits (departments, divisions, or schools) led by associate deans, directors, and/or chairs.

Thresholds for Schools or Colleges

As the campus grows, it may become necessary or desirable to create new schools or colleges. As a general guideline, we propose that for the next 5 to 7 years, a unit would not be considered for restructure as a school or college unless it was responsible for at least 15 percent of the student FTE of the university and/or a compelling case can be made based on the unique portfolio of degrees that unit contains. Please note that future administrators (at Tacoma and/or Seattle) may take a different approach.

Accreditation

No structural actions will be taken that might negatively affect accreditation at the institutional or unit level.

Visibility

One of the concerns some have expressed about reorganization and changing unit names is that students and other external constituencies may have trouble finding the information they need on particular programs. Many universities resolve this problem by having degree programs listed on their web pages either instead of or in addition to the schools and colleges. One example can be found at the University of Maryland Baltimore County (www.umbc.edu), where a list of majors and programs is provided (<http://www.umbc.edu/academics/degrees.html>). The UW Seattle admissions page presents majors in a slightly different way (admit.washington.edu/Academics/Majors), but doesn't restrain that presentation to the formal organizational structure. UW Tacoma's admissions page for transfer students also presents the majors in a way that would not require that students understand the university's organizational structure (www.tacoma.washington.edu/enrollmentservices/admissions/academics/transfer.cfm). Recruitment brochures and degree checklists would maintain their separate identities. The name of the New College would need to be selected with attention to how descriptive it is of the constituent units.

Budgets

The current academic programs have separate budgets, and the directors/dean manage those budgets. If we were to develop schools and colleges, responsibility for management of program budgets would remain with the administrative head of the program. In the transition phase, at least, Directors/Associate Deans/Deans of the seven current programs will make budget requests directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Staff Assignments

In the transition to Schools/Colleges, current staff members' positions would remain as they are since the essential functions of the units would not change. No staff members will lose their jobs due to the reorganization, but over time, there may be some shifting of staff responsibilities across units to enable cross-training and to gain economies of scale. There would also be more staff promotion opportunities as the organizational units are larger and more complex, since the scope of responsibility for some positions would increase.

Faculty Assignments

Faculty members would retain appointments in the programs to which they currently belong.

Tenure and Promotion Standards and Process

The existing academic programs have developed their own standards and processes for promotion and tenure. These standards and processes would remain with the program, until modified by the program.

One possible change in tenure and promotion would be that we could adopt elected school or college advisory committees, rather than continue with the university-wide council (UW Handbook, 24-54). This has an advantage of having that review take place by faculty members who have closer affinity to the work of the candidates.

Governance

If we choose to transition to schools and colleges, we will continue to adhere to the University of Washington Handbook guidelines on faculty governance, policies and procedures. One of the key relevant sections of the Code is printed below.

Section 23-43. Campus, College, and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties

In accord with Sections [13-23](#), [13-24](#), and [13-31](#), Subsection A.3, the President and the University faculty grant to the faculty of each campus, college, and school, with 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 (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. Except for the graduate faculty, the faculty of each campus, college, or school:

A. shall, with respect to academic matters,

1. determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
2. determine its curriculum and academic programs;
3. determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
4. recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
5. exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students;

B. shall, with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its chancellor or dean in accord with the provisions of [Chapter 24](#) and of Section [25-41](#);

C. may, if it is departmentalized, delegate to the faculties of its several departments any of the powers and duties specified in paragraphs A and B of this Section.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 115, June 15, 2007: both with Presidential approval.

How would this organizational structure differ from our existing one?

In a number of respects, the proposed organizational structure does not represent a great departure from our current structure. Faculty and staff stay in their current units, budgets continue to be managed by unit leaders, tenure and promotion criteria stay the same, and the reporting relationships essentially stay the same.

The titles for most unit leaders would be different, as described here. Another set of changes is the title of units – IAS would become a school or college, and may have divisions or departments within it. The existing programs that go into the new college could stay as programs, or might elect to be renamed divisions or departments.

There would be some differences in governance, if we adopt school/college councils. It is the responsibility of faculty to determine how they will be governed.

The New College would potentially provide an environment for some new programs to eventually develop somewhat independently, perhaps into a departmental structure.

DRAFT proposed organizational chart:

