

# Faculty Assembly Minutes

## 25 January 2005

### Attending:

Robert Jackson, Josh Tenenberg, Steve Olswang, Jack Nelson, Tom Carlson, Donald Chinn, Chris Demaske, Stephen Detray, James Gawel, Cheryl Greengrove, Robert Howard, Michael Kalton, Diane Kinder, Karen Landenburger, Marcie Lazzari, Don McLane, George Mobus, Janet Primomo, Ruth Rea, Bill Richardson, Moshe Rosenfeld, Marcy Stein, Christine Stevens, Cathy Toshiro and Tracy Thompson

- The meeting came to order at 12:55pm.
- Bob Jackson made introductory remarks and introduced the agenda.
- Bob Jackson asked if there were any changes to be made to the minutes from the December 12, 2004 meeting. Gawel requested correcting the spelling of "chancellor". The minutes were approved as amended.
- Jackson discussed plans for the rest of the academic year. These include:
  - a. Reviewing the bylaws and making necessary changes;
  - b. Receiving nominations by the peculate FA meeting for FA committees that will have vacancies during the 05-06 academic year;
  - c. Maintaining up-to-date records of all FA committees and councils, including agendas, minutes, reports, and other written documents;
  - d. Securing funding for staff help at least the current level for the next year.
- Jackson mentioned that he would like to have an Open House for the new FA office in WCG 309, as a way to introduce the office and also for faculty to get together on an informal basis.
- He also added a note to the faculty to view the term expiry dates of the members of the committees and take an active participation in applying for the positions to open. He asked the present committee members to forward all the files regarding the committees to Mythri so we can have a running record of the work happening so far.
- Janet Primomo discussed recommendations that she and Josh Tenenberg have been developing changes concerning to the UWT bylaws. She referred to two documents; one a [summary of the changes as a grid](#), the other a document that provides details on [changes to bylaw wording](#). The goals of the suggested bylaws changes are to 1) add the Faculty Councils into the By-laws formally since they were passed as legislation but not ever placed in the By-laws, 2) reduce redundancy, 3) reconsider membership (e.g. is it possible to get by with less than one representative per program on some committees?), 4) clarify language in the bylaws, 5) unify voting processes and procedures, 6) and include the process of electronic voting, which the UW Senate has already done.

She stated that she and Tenenberg had reviewed the UWT bylaws as well as faculty governance structures at the other UW campuses. Primomo then summarized the suggested changes, briefly discussing the current and the proposed structure.

The main changes that she highlighted were:

- o Renaming the Executive Committee to be a "Council", and adding a responsibility to create ad-hoc committees as needed;
- o Eliminating the current Council on Academic Policy, as its function is subsumed by the Executive Committee and the Admissions, Academic Standards, and Graduation Committee (AASG);
- o Adding "Appointment" as a responsibility of the Faculty Council on Promotion and Tenure;
- o Eliminating the Faculty Affairs committee, as its responsibility could be subsumed by the Executive Committee;
- o Moving the subcommittee on Academic Programs from being a subcommittee of the Executive Committee to being a subcommittee of AASG.

Primomo then solicited comments on these recommendations.

Cheryl Greengrove asked why is the subcommittee on Academic Programs a *subcommittee*? Primomo responded that this parallels what has been done in Seattle, but that it need not necessarily remain as a subcommittee. Greengrove suggested having it to be a committee that reports to the Executive Committee.

KäRen Landenberger suggested that "Development of curriculum policy" be added as one of the Curriculum Committee responsibilities.

Cathy Tashiro expressed concern about eliminating Faculty Affairs. She cited examples of two issues that this committee has been working on this year that she believes are representative of the need for a separate and standing committee to address important issues of faculty concern. The first of these concerns full-time lecturer course loads, and the second concerns recent changes to the letter to external reviewers for tenure and promotion so that this letter no longer contains language about the context of UWT. If Faculty Affairs is eliminated, she asked how would we ensure that these functions are not lost?

Michael Kalton suggested that we take a longer view on changes to the bylaws, and design our committee structures to respond to the likely changes that will occur as the campus grows over the next several years. He suggested that we might consider mothballing Faculty Affairs but not doing away with it so that it is easy to deactivate without having to go through making changes to the bylaws. We will certainly need it further down the road, he commented, as it has done important work in the past. The Executive Committee will probably become overburdened to adequately address the sorts of issues that Faculty Affairs has addressed in the past. He counseled that we use caution in eliminating committees.

Greengrove responded that under the new proposal, the Executive Committee could create ad-hoc committees for projects of special faculty concern.

Jim Gawel suggested that perhaps the Faculty Affairs Committee be kept as a standing committee, but that it is active only when there are specific issues to address, analogous to the subcommittee for Academic Programs that may have little to do when it is not directly reviewing new programs.

Primomo indicated that what she is hearing is that there is interest in maintaining the Faculty Affairs committee.

Gawel mentioned that Faculty Affairs could be a check on the P&T committee, since junior faculty is on Faculty Affairs but not P&T.

Ruth Rea indicated that she thought that the idea had been to merge Faculty Affairs with the P&T committee when Faculty Assembly added the new responsibilities for P&T policy and communication to the P&T committee.

Bill Richardson asked why the prefix "Campus" is used on each of the new councils? He suggested that if it were to clarify the committee function for those outside the campus, then we would be better served using "UWT".

Kalton returned to the issue of the overlap between Faculty Affairs and the P&T Council on issues of P&T policy. He mentioned that this overlap on such a crucial issue, where each committee views P&T policy through its own lens, is a good thing.

Jackson asked if there were objections to Primomo and Tenenberg incorporating points from the discussion into a new draft of the bylaws, and moving ahead with this process of making changes to the bylaws? There were no objections to moving ahead with the process.

- Jackson announced that he, Mobus, and Kinder, are marshalling the first new program proposals through the tri-campus review process. Tracy Thompson suggested that the Academic Programs subcommittee target programs and people who might have an interest in particular new programs that are under review for comment, rather than soliciting faculty as a whole.
- **Report from the Chancellor.** Steve Olswang stated that the Senate Executive Committee did not vote on the tri-campus program review process, and that it is on hold until the Board of Deans meets. He said that the Board of Deans had concerns about the process, and that they will be discussing these with Ross Heath, Chair of the Faculty Senate.

He stated that the 2707 report was endorsed by the HEC board, and extended kudos to everyone involved. He said that it is not realistic to admit freshmen in 2006, and that 2007 would realistically be the earliest that this could happen. He also mentioned that the admission of freshmen students is likely being contested. Olswang will be meeting with state legislators, who may introduce bills to change UWT's status from 2-year to baccalaureate institution.

Olswang stated that he is seeking 400 additional enrollments, and will likely get these. He also stated that capital requests continue to be discussed. Olswang then entertained questions.

Tashiro asked what is meant by *comprehensive*, which was referred to in the email memo that Olswang had sent earlier to the university community concerning the HEC board's endorsement of the 2707 report. Olswang commented that the HEC board said that we should be funded at the "comprehensive" level. He said that that is a lower per student rate than most but not all of our current enrollments. He stated that it is not clear what this means for the future.

Tenenberg stated that Olswang's comments that the Senate EC had not approved the new program review process contradicts what Tri-campus council chair Killien announced at the last council meeting. Further, faculty on all 3 campuses, through participation both in Tri-campus council and through their own internal processes are all proceeding to implement a coordinated 3 campus new program review. Olswang reiterated that approval of the current process was not a "done deal". Tenenberg responded that faculty had worked together on tri-campus council in good faith, and that regardless of whether Olswang or Tenenberg had the facts straight about Senate EC approval, that all 3 campuses are moving ahead to follow the process approved by tri-campus council.

Responding to this, Vice Chancellor Jack Nelson stated that he is concerned that if new UWT programs are put out for comment to the entire Seattle faculty that this could cause undue delay for new UWT programs.

Tenenberg responded by indicating that currently none of the campuses puts new programs out to the entire faculty for comment. He said that the decision about how to do program review at the campus level is determined independently by each campus. The governance leadership coordinates program review and the committee charged with evaluating new programs for each campus.

- Jackson announced that at the next meeting he would like to have a report from Fred King, Director of Real Estate/Facilities at UW, on physical developments planned for UWT.
- Jackson also invited the membership to contribute agenda items for next meeting.
- Gawel stated that he cannot attend the next Faculty Senate meeting in Seattle, which will vote on a new Vice Chair position for Faculty Senate. He said that it is important to get at least one UWT representative there who can get UWT onto the radar screen for these candidates.
- Greengrove reported that she had talked with Fred King earlier in the day concerning a recreational facility next to the Swiss. He said that the design came in at \$3.5M -- \$1M to make the recreation center and \$2.5M to bring the center up to code. She suggested that faculty might want to think about other ways to team with students to build such a facility in the future.
- The meeting adjourned at 2pm.