

Faculty Assembly Minutes

January 23, 2003

Key Auditorium

The meeting was called to order at 12:50 pm.

1. The last set of minutes were approved.
2. Jack Nelson, Vice Chancellor, mentioned a news item that suggested making the branch campuses into a four-year program. According to him this is unlikely to pass but nevertheless it could be perceived as initiating a discussion. Current thinking is to provide lower division of courses for incoming students rather than attracting new students. Washington State University, like UWT, is moving toward a Chancellor-based system.

Among other items, Jack indicated that budget reductions are expected to be serious this year. He also mentioned that a meeting was held with tenured faculty to discuss tenure and promotion issues. A similar meeting will be held with non-tenured faculty.

Jim Gawel asked about the secrecy of the budget process. Jack responded that it was not the secrecy of the process but rather to protect the members of the budget committee from handling queries from anxious employees.

On the issue of lower division courses, Divya asked which areas of study were being discussed. To this Jack said that mainly computer, math, language, and statistics related courses were being targeted, especially CSS 142/143. If the community colleges don't offer these courses then UWT will.

3. Janet Primomo briefly reported on the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy. She mentioned that members from the different campuses have agreed to discuss openly issues pertaining to new program approvals and curriculum through information sharing and websites. However, there is a general impasse at this time on these issues with Seattle insisting on the existence of a single handbook. It is on Class A legislation where there is an impasse. UWT and UWB are not interested in watering down the code.

A fundamental issue that is being raised through these deliberations at the FCTCP level is the very definition of a "campus" as interpreted by both faculty and administration.

She also mentioned that the President's medal is not applicable for transfer students in Tacoma. So she suggested that we think about instituting a "Chancellor's" medal as proposed by Bothell.

Mike Kalton, Chair of Faculty Assembly thanked Janet for her significant contributions for representing Tacoma and tackling such vexing issues.

4. There were some corrections/modifications made to the Program Review Process. Questions arose as to the role of RAPP. Tracy Thompson informed us that RAPP was an advisory body.

The Subcommittee on Academic Programs cannot mandate new programs, nor could veto power be exercised by the committee. Janet Primomo reminded us that the committee "recommends" rather than "decides".

Cathy Tashiro asked why we were changing the language of the program review process. Mike Kalton responded saying that UWT does not have a faculty involvement at this time, hence we need it. Otherwise Seattle will be doing it for us.

Janet suggested that the process be collegial rather than simply a matter of vetoing. She also mentioned that the process is detailed for approving new programs. The HEC Board proposal I placed at their website.

Janet Mobus supported the idea of this committee.

The motion to accept these changes was moved. They were approved by faculty.

Michael Kalton presented the proposed resolution from Faculty Affairs on one course release per year for chairs of standing Faculty Assembly committees. A discussion ensued about the rationale for this proposal. Janet Primomo moved that that this proposal be adopted, and Cheryl Greengrove seconded. The proposal passed unanimously.

Michael Kalton then returned to the discussion on the promotion and tenure (P&T) process that Faculty Assembly had begun at the previous meeting. The first issue that he addressed concerned proposed wording to remove the advising and mentoring role of the review committee for a candidate that is going up for tenure. He introduced a proposal discussed by the EC to create a Faculty Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FACPAT). It would offer advice concerning preparation for promotion and tenure to junior faculty and also have a broader charge to advocate for junior faculty on campus and to provide a forum for discussion among junior and senior faculty concerning campuswide expectations for tenure and promotion. There was a general discussion of the FACPAT committee proposal, including 1) broadening the language to include that the committee also be concerned with advising associate professors interested in promotion to full professors, 2) whether this committee would scale as the campus grows, 3) distinguishing FACPAT from the Faculty Council on P & T, and 4) the continued need for candidate mentoring at the program level. Jack Nelson pointed out that the program directors had all agreed at the start of the current academic year to appoint a senior faculty mentor for each new junior faculty hire.

There was continued discussion of suggested changes to the P&T process. This included clarification of the review committee's role to advise candidates on the viability of going forward with their case for tenure in the event that the candidate was going up for tenure early, and further discussion of the relationship of the candidate to the review committee, and more broadly to colleagues and the institution. This discussion concerned whether this relationship is meant to be supportive and mentoring, impartial, or adversarial, and how this affects the role of the review committee. Michael Kalton stressed that the proposed changes are not intended to make P & T review an adversarial process.

The meeting adjourned at 2:15pm..