

# Faculty Assembly Minutes

## Feb. 14, 2002

Approved 3/6/02

Members in attendance:

- |                               |                      |                       |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Janet Primomo, Chair       | 18. Brian Coffey     | 35. Michael Forman    |
| 2. Jack Nelson, V. Chancellor | 19. Bill Richardson  | 36. David Secord      |
| 3. Tracy Thompson             | 20. Marcie Lazzari   | 37. Julie Nicoletta   |
| 4. Kären Landenburger         | 21. Moshe Rosenfeld  | 38. Richard Stackman  |
| 5. Anthony D'Costa            | 22. Janet Mobus      | 39. Ruth Rea          |
| 6. Marjorie Dobratz           | 23. Janice Laakso    | 40. Suzanne Goren     |
| 7. Steve DeTray               | 24. Martyn Kingston  | 41. Cheryl Greengrove |
| 8. Jim Gawel                  | 25. George Mobus     | 42. Bob Howard        |
| 9. Charles Emlet              | 26. Katie Amundson   | 43. Don McLane        |
| 10. Marcy Stein               | 27. Marcy Stein      | 44. Jose Rios         |
| 11. Sharon Fought             | 28. Zoe Barness      | 45. Mark Fiegener     |
| 12. Rob Crawford              | 29. Deirdre Raynor   | 46. Patricia Fandt    |
| 13. Michael Kucher            | 30. Sam Parker       | 47. DJ Parker         |
| 14. Mark Fiegener             | 31. Yonn Dierwechter | 48. Alexis Wilson     |
| 15. Diane Kinder              | 32. George Mobus     | 49. Janet Mobus       |
| 16. Myrth Ogilvie             | 33. Kathy Beaudoin   |                       |
| 17. Denise Drevdahl           | 34. Diane Kinder     |                       |

Members excused:

Katie Baird	John Banks	Sam Chung
Larry Crum	Linda Desmarteau	Tom Diehm
Claudia Gorbman (on leave)	Michael Honey	Subin Im
Michael Kalton (on leave)	Belinda Louie	June S. Lowenberg
Ginger MacDonald	David Morris	Kent Nelson
Stern Neill	John Peterson	Joe Sharkey
Cathy Tashiro	Josh Tenenberg	Carolyn West
Rogene M. Eichler West	Rachel May	Zoe Barness
Vicky Carwein		

Members missing:

Mike Allen	Vanessa Chio	Chris Demaske
Christine Salazar	Richard O. Abderhalden	

1. a. Opening remarks: Chair Primomo assured the Faculty Assembly of her commitment to undertake the work of the faculty in her new, unexpected role as Chair of the FA for the remainder of the 2001/2002 academic year. She reminded the faculty of the important work that her predecessors have accomplished in ensuring the active voice of faculty in formulating policies, rules and regulations guiding UWT. Furthermore, she reminded faculty that we share responsibility with the President of the University of Washington ("Legislative Authority," Volume II-13, Sect. 23 of the University of Washington Handbook), and with the administration of UWT, especially the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in such matters as:

- i. educational policy and general welfare;
- ii. policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities;
- iii. scholastic policy, including requirements for admission, graduation, and honors;
- iv. approval of candidates for degrees;
- v. criteria for faculty tenure, appointment, and promotion;
- vi. recommendations concerning the University budget; and
- vii. formulation of procedures to carry out the policies and regulations thus established.

b. The meeting of the Faculty Assembly of UWT was called to order at 1:12 by Chair Janet Primomo.

c. There being no additions to agenda offered, the agenda for the meeting was approved by voice vote.

2. Approved minutes from Dec. 12, 2001 with the following correction:.

Tracy Thompson was excused from the Dec. 12, 2001 meeting

b. Suzanne Goren moved to approve minutes

c. Jim Gawel seconded the motion

d. Minutes were approved, as amended, by unanimous voice vote.

3. Chair report:

a. Faculty Honors legislation has been sent to the President by Chancellor Carwein.

i. First honors will be awarded this June at graduation

ii. Chair recognized Rob Crawford, Ruth Rea and Admissions, Academic Standards, and Graduation Committee for their accomplishment.

b. Executive Committee is working with Registrar regarding correcting the print and on-line catalog regarding time limit on student's 'Change of Grade' appeals. The 10-day limit for initiating an appeal was left off of UWT policy announcements.

c. Additional funding for Faculty Assembly course releases is being requested. The Bothell campus has double what UWT offers in release time for faculty to participate in governance. This still may be an inadequate incentive for allowing UWT faculty to participate given our high teaching load.

d. We are working with Vice Chancellor Nelson to identify permanent storage space for FA records.

e. Tracy Thompson will serve on the UWT Budget Committee as FA representative

f. Budget and Legislative Updates

i. There is important collective bargaining legislation affecting faculty that is currently before Washington State legislators. UWT comments into this process will be forwarded to UWS faculty representatives.

ii. Changes in tuition setting authority are being considered as one means by which UW may address state budget reductions.

iii. Marcy Stein has volunteered to serve on Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy. This group is working on defining 'campus' within the UW system.

4. Elections:

a. Call for Nominations to fill the position of Vice Chair of the UWT Faculty Assembly

- i. Anthony D'Costa nominated
  - ii. No other nominations received from floor
  - iii. Mail ballots will be distributed via email to all eligible faculty
- b. Call for nominations to fill the position of Education representative to Faculty Assembly Executive Committee
- i. Diane Kinder nominated to Faculty Executive Committee
  - ii. No other nominations from floor
  - iii. Election of Diane Kinder approved by unanimous voice vote
- c. Call for nominations to fill the position of CSS representative to Faculty Affairs Committee
- i. CSS faculty member Josh Tenenberg nominated to Faculty Affairs Committee
  - ii. No other nominations from floor
  - iii. Election of Josh Tenenberg to Faculty Affairs committee approved by unanimous voice vote
- d. Call for nominations to fill the position of UWT representative on Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy
- i. Marcy Stein nominated
  - ii. No other nominations from floor
  - iii. Election of Marcy Stein as UWT representative on Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy approved by unanimous voice vote
5. Introduction of UW Senate Leaders Brad Holt (chair) and Sandra Silberstein (vice chair)

- a. Chair Primomo noted the importance of collaboration with UWS faculty governance leadership.
- b. Chair Holt addressed the Faculty Assembly.  
He noted the wide variety of input that is solicited by the Faculty Senate from departments and faculty on various governance issues. He also noted the importance of faculty discussions regarding legislative issues in Olympia. He stated that he and Sandy will be available after FA meeting for further discussion with interested faculty outside of FA meeting.

He discussed the topic of budget advising by faculty governance, noting the importance of faculty having input on budget issues. The Faculty Senate is talking to various college council faculty bodies. The latest word is that revenues for the State are worse than previously considered and that the Governor's budget is likely to be the 'high water' mark. This means that the budget crunch isn't a 1-year issue. The next 2 budget cycles (the next 5 years) look more severe than previously projected, so solutions need to be long-term, not just the current biennium, which runs through June 30, 2003.

He conveyed to UWT faculty that there is a "fiscal fire wall" between UWS and UWT. That is, UWT tuition and state contributions stay at UWT. They are not allocated to a single UW pool, which is then divided among campuses by UWS administration.  
Chair Holt concluded by noting that an important purpose of their visit today is to hear from UWT faculty.

- c. Vice Chair Silberstein addressed the Faculty Assembly.  
She noted that every 3 months there are updates from Olympia and most recent reports are worse than previous views. Provost Huntsman is trying to avoid as much as possible across-the-board cuts within university operating units. This position might be eroding to a 'we'll try to avoid these' position.

Vice Chair Silberstein emphasized that it's important for faculty to be apprised of actual budgets so that faculty and administration can work collaboratively. That means budget transparency with faculty

participation. Faculty should be able to speak with informed positions. Budget discussions are important for everyone to be protected to the greatest extent possible.

## 6. Colleges at UWT

Introductory remarks by Chair Primomo: The topic of colleges and schools at UWT is not new but we now have a specific proposal before us. Chair Primomo turned the floor over to Vice Chancellor Nelson.

Vice Chancellor Nelson had two handouts distributed to the faculty: "The Establishment of Colleges at UWT" and a series of four models of the Tenure and Promotion process depicting various alternative structures should UWT adopt a colleges and schools organization to academic units. Vice Chancellor Nelson addressed the Faculty Assembly and summarized much of the document he disseminated on email prior to the meeting.

Additional comments by Vice Chancellor Nelson:

In response to the original 'critical mass' issue raised by Provost Huntsman: Since some of our programs are much smaller than any unit at UWS, what if we combine a 'professional studies' group to create critical mass. IAS is internally already of a size and complexity to warrant college structure. A Professional Studies unit would allow us to bring together the strengths of these units.

Unofficially we need to change the way UWT relates to UWS – we are viewed as 'a school' on a list of schools at UWS. We're not a 'school' – schools don't have development offices, student affairs, administrative units, etc.

It doesn't help to have UWT thought of as a 'school', particularly in financial discussions. We continue to be told that we're not treated any differently than any other school and that's true. But we have the complexity of a campus, not of a school. Part of the motivation is to change the UWT-UWS interaction.

Academic directors here suggested that we have a College of Professional Studies with a School of Business inside of it, and down the road a School of Nursing, Social Work, etc. UWS said this was premature. UWT administration thinks the best deal we can get is 2 colleges with agreed upon criteria for when to go to schools: critical mass of faculty, critical mass of students - - a basis for independent accreditation.

Academic directors said if we can't get colleges and schools they suggested we have a College of IAS and leave everything else alone. Board of Regents said 'that's not enough'.

The proposal won't go forward from here until due deliberations are completed.

Handouts are relevant here.

Charts on T&P now and under alternative models:

Model 1 – nothing changes in IAS from current. Others depend on whether Dean position in Professional Studies is filled. If this position is not filled, all T&P files goes to Vice Chancellor. Vice Chancellor Nelson would like to have a campus-level Faculty Council, and we will have to change the University Faculty Code to conform to this. Administration in both Seattle and Tacoma agree - 'don't let code drive policy, change code if that's what we want'.

Model 2 – Allows for Faculty Council at Dean's level in each of the two proposed colleges, and a Faculty Council at campus level. There could be combined Faculty Councils for Urban Studies and the Institute of Technology. The campus-level Faculty Council could be eliminated in favor of the college/program-level Faculty Councils.

Model 3 – if we reintroduce the 'only change IAS to a college' option then the T&P chart remains as

currently formatted.

c. Questions raised and comments/opinions expressed:

Under model 1: There are 2 colleges with schools under them – do these colleges have deans? What do we get locked into if we start with a College of Professional Studies? VC Nelson: The question of whether these colleges have deans is an issue. We haven't tied our hands on this. In the long run, it's easier to move to school within an existing college than to establish a school when the college structure doesn't already exist. At this point, nothing is concrete about the future path of structural development.

The establishment of colleges and schools should strengthen, not diminish, the role of Faculty Assembly according to the Vice Chancellor's document. VC Nelson clarified that the University Faculty Code specifies that it is colleges and schools that have a Faculty Assembly (not campuses), and we can change code. VC Nelson thinks the change enhances the role of Faculty Assembly at UWT because it enhances our status. He feels this would give UWT a greater ability to chart its own direction.

Serious reservations were expressed on whether proposed change enhances or even sustains FA authority. Concerned that this proposal will have opposite effect. Code changes are substantial undertakings. Rob Crawford noted there are two substantial problems; 1 – our nascent shared governance structure (not yet operative on all issues), and a new and assertive VC – we will have a dispersal of authority to colleges. 2 – given our limited energies with our number of faculty we are not only decentralizing but we are also doubling our efforts. We are both reviewing and developing curriculum issues, budget, etc. Study carefully what happens if FA is indeed weakened as a result. There has been a transformation at Tri-Campus level – we are recognized as a campus. We were originally analogized to a college or school, but that is changing now.

We haven't thought of changes to Faculty Councils under the colleges/schools models. Not just at the Faculty Council level but the recognized committees under these.

Where do we become weaker if we have multiple Faculty Councils? Why can't we change Code Section 23?

UW Senate Chair Holt offered insights into the Faculty Code. The way UW is organized currently is fairly decentralized. Schools and colleges are very powerful entities. Almost all of them do their own admissions and other administrative levels activities. The power of the University is embedded in the schools and colleges. And they have certain duties that are required of them like T&P, etc. (Section 23-43 outlines Powers and Duties of the faculty of colleges and schools). The role of the Faculty Senate and the administration is to make sure that what one college does doesn't impact others – minimum admissions standards, etc. Colleges and schools have their own Faculty Councils and committees. UWT can change that if you want. This is class A legislation that after being reviewed twice in the Faculty Senate comes to the full faculty for a vote and is only approved by a majority vote of those eligible or a two-thirds majority of those voting. It is sent to the President for approval or veto (See Faculty Code, Chapter 29).

With this decentralized model was there already is a strong Senate to oversee the functioning of the colleges and schools. There is a concern if we go to this model without a strong 'senate' body in place to oversee.

Chair Holt confirmed that it was the strength of the Faculty Senate that created the colleges/schools model at UWS.

At the meeting with the Provost last June the tenor of the discussion was 'what was in the best interests of the students, and this question isn't addressed in this proposed plan.

VC Nelson commented that to most students this change would be transparent. Students in Business want to have a degree from the School of Business and employers already think this is what they are getting, and we don't always correct them. If it advances the institution and allows us to enhance our goals it helps them get better jobs and it helps attract better students. In IAS it would allow concentrations that better attract students. Existing students probably wouldn't notice. But what is in our interests to improve the institution in the interests of our students.

What is it that makes our concentrations any different than they are currently by going to the College of IAS? VC Nelson commented that what is odd about the IAS 'program' is that it has 3 programs inside of it –BA,BS, and MA.

It sounds as if at the administrative level at UWS we aren't being recognized and this proposed structure improves our bargaining with UWS administration and in that way the benefits trickle down to the rest of UWT members.

What's the rationale for the organization of Professional Studies into a college and Urban Studies remaining on its own? VC Nelson suggested that was convoluted. UWS says not everyone is ready but IAS clearly is, so we should have 2 colleges. Urban Studies was designated a cross-program program and shouldn't be put inside of a particular program. The Institute of Technology is such high visibility that no one wanted it buried inside something else.

Michael Kucher asked 'What are the dollar costs of each of these models when we're being asked to cut costs? How can we justify it?' VC Nelson offered that if we fill the Dean of Professional Studies position then we have real costs. But we aren't contemplating that. If we don't fill that there are no material costs to the models.

Chair Primomo concluded that on March 6, at the next Faculty Assembly meeting, we will continue with more discussion on this issue.

If it can be shown that it's advantageous to students, faculty and UWT then it's worth considering. But look carefully to see if it is to our advantage. If we do this we have to change the University Faculty Code because we don't fit the current code. There is another layer between current directors and VC.

The history of Faculty Assembly has been one of struggle. It isn't clear that we wouldn't be compromised if we went to this structure. We don't have the bodies to maintain the faculty voice in a decentralized structure. It takes a tremendous amount of work to maintain our faculty voice at UWS. Is this the appropriate time to do this? Do we have enough senior faculty members to participate?

Chair Primomo noted there was a proposal to introduce a resolution that FA not move forward until faculty have had the opportunity to undertake a thorough review of the implications of the proposal to adopt the colleges and schools organizational structure at UWT.

A motion to adopt the resolution was made by Michael Kucher and seconded by Jim Gowel:

"Whereas there are extraordinary implications for faculty governance at UWT by moving to a schools and colleges structure; and

Whereas faculty have a right to determine their position on this issue,

Be it resolved that no formal action be taken regarding schools and colleges until Faculty Assembly conduct a thorough review of the implications of schools and colleges, and furthermore

Be it resolved that if faculty support a structural change to colleges, the faculty governance structure to ensure the power and authority of one UWT faculty body be determined before formal action is taken.'

Question raised about what the implications are to negotiation with UWS of doing 'thorough review'. UWS has been thoughtful and they are ready to move. If we take 18 months to think about it we will probably miss our opportunity.

VC Nelson reported that Steve Olswang had assured UWT administration that nothing would go to the Board of Regents w/out the support of faculty.

Chair Holt added that it is very unlikely that the Faculty Senate would take action to change the University Faculty Code handbook without support at this campus.

It was noted that the current proposal (the document attached as Appendix A to these notes) gives a deadline to implement this before next academic year and it's unlikely that FA can undertake a thorough review in that time frame.

Chair Primomo called the vote on the motion before the FA. The motion carried by voice vote. The resolution regarding Colleges at UWT (that the UWT Administration not move forward until faculty have had the opportunity to undertake a thorough review of the implications of the proposal to adopt the colleges and schools organizational structure at UWT" was passed. A letter will be sent to Chancellor Carwein by the Chair.

#### 7. UWT Handbook update on Promotion and Tenure:

Jim Gawel, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee reported on the work of this committee regarding T&P procedures at UWT. Jim Gawel distributed an outline of proposed clarifying language to Chapter 24 of the University Handbook/ University Faculty Code. This document is attached as Appendix B to these minutes.

#### Comments and questions:

In addition to the points listed on the handout, institution building service vs. normal service should be distinguished.

Part of building the institution is raising visibility of campus within our professions.

Service to the community is another aspect of service that should be distinguished.

Jim Gawel commented that he believed these aspects are already contemplated within the framework.

He asked that faculty look at what Faculty Affairs has proposed and provide feedback.

A question was raised as to whether Faculty Affairs is thinking about these proposals as clarification of an existing system or as changes to the existing system. Jim Gawel responded that Faculty Affairs conceived of these as mostly formalizing unwritten understandings that already exist.

c. Chair Primomo advised that Faculty Affairs will continue to discuss the development of UWT Handbook updates to the P&T policy, and perhaps this year revisions can be brought to a vote of FA.

#### 8. Resolution acknowledging role of full-time lecturers

a. Chair Primomo noted that the following resolution is before the Faculty Assembly.

'Whereas, UWT faculty acknowledge that our full time lecturers and senior lecturers teach courses that are integral and essential to our curricula,  
and

Whereas, losing those faculty positions would be detrimental to the intellectual integrity of our programs,

Therefore, UWT faculty urge the campus and university administration to recognize the contributions of

our full time lecturers and senior lecturers, particularly during this time of budget constraints.'

b. Lacking a quorum the vote on this resolution will be discussed at the next meeting.

9. Noting the time for adjournment having passed, Chair Primomo adjourned meeting at 2:35.

Items to address at a later meeting:

Interdisciplinarity at UWT

Diversity Report - Steve Smith

Faculty Mediator Roles

Future Faculty Assembly Meetings – 1-2:30 PM in the Tacoma Room:

Wednesday, March 6

Tuesday, April 16

Thursday, May 2

Wednesday, June 5

Appendices: Feb. 14, 2002 meeting of the UWT Faculty Assembly

## Appendix A

### Academic Affairs

#### The Establishment of Colleges at UWT

##### The Context

Discussions of establishing schools and colleges at UWT, both those that occurred last year and the ongoing discussions of this year, have been guided by a number of assumptions, explicit and implicit, including the following:

Shared governance is an integral part of the past and future development of UWT. Faculty governance has always played out through a campus wide faculty body, the Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Assembly will continue to be a campus wide faculty body, and will continue to be the locus of faculty governance, with all the rights and responsibilities it now has. The establishment of colleges at UWT should strengthen, not diminish, the role of faculty and the Faculty Assembly in campus governance and in relations with Seattle. If changes to the Faculty Code are required to make this so, then these changes will be sought. Promotion and tenure decisions will continue to involve multiple levels of review. The process will be very similar to the one now in place, with fundamentally the same functions and levels of review by faculty and administrators.

Academic programs and Academic Program Directors have, in reality, functioned for some time now as colleges and deans, respectively. Establishing colleges simply transitions the campus from a structure and a set of labels that are no longer appropriate to what actually exists, and has for some time, at UWT.

##### The History

During the 2000-2001 academic year the possibility of establishing schools and colleges at UWT was discussed in a number of forums (at meetings of the Academic Program Directors, at a meeting of the Faculty Assembly Executive Committee on March 9 attended by then Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Ginger MacDonald, at an open brown bag lunch meeting on April 26 led by Interim Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs Marcie Lazzari and Ginger MacDonald, and a Faculty Assembly meeting on May 15 chaired by Rob Crawford (Dr. MacDonald led the discussion on this topic). These meetings were well attended, with well over half of the faculty and several staff participating in at least one if not more discussions. These discussions revealed that most participants were favorable to moving to a school and college structure for UWT, and led to the development of a specific proposal. That proposal, which called for each academic program to become either a school or a college, was forwarded to Provost Lee Huntsman in late spring 2001.

Provost Huntsman met with the Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and the Academic Program Directors in June 2001. He noted that academic units at UWT (at least most of them) lacked the critical mass of faculty and students that is appropriate for school or college status, and expressed the view that UWT should remain innovative and experimental, and should not move to a school and college structure simply because it is the traditional structure of academic institutions.

During the following six months the academic directors discussed the rationale for a school and college structure and how to address the critical mass issue raised by the Provost. Jack Nelson and Vicky Carwein also had a number of discussions with the Provost and other senior administrators in Seattle. It was proposed that the critical mass issue be addressed by forming a College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences and a School of Professional Studies, the latter to consist of the present programs in Education, Nursing, Social Work, and Business. This structure would recognize the fact that IAS is now and has been for some time functioning as a college and needs to have that status recognized. It would also encourage the four professional programs to explore new ways to collaborate and cooperate. Provost Huntsman encouraged a discussion of this model.

Upon further discussion, Academic Directors suggested two additional options; 1. establish a college rather than a

school of professional studies so that the four professional programs can become schools as each reaches critical mass and, 2. establish a College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences and leave all other programs exactly as they are now.

### The Current Proposal

The proposal now being discussed, on campus and with University of Washington senior administrators, is as follows:

Establish a College of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences and a College of Professional Studies, effective for the 2002-2003 year.

The College of Professional Studies will consist of the present academic programs in Business, Education, Nursing, and Social Work. A title more appropriate than "Academic Director" for the heads of these academic units, as well as of Urban Studies and the Institute, will be sought.

There will be a natural evolutionary path by which programs within the College of Professional Studies can become schools as they acquire the appropriate critical mass of students and faculty and, where relevant, when they are ready for independent professional accreditation. These criteria also provide guidelines for when the Institute and Urban studies will move to school or college status.

There will be a Dean of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences.

The two colleges will each have a faculty council, as specified by the Faculty Code.

The Institute (CSS) and Urban Studies will retain their current status as academic programs, and remain independent of both of the new colleges.

A "Council of Deans and Directors" will replace the current Academic Directors, and will include deans, all academic program directors, and other senior administrators as appropriate. It will be chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Faculty Assembly will continue to be the campus wide faculty governance organization with all of its present rights and responsibilities.

### Issues/questions to be addressed

Obviously, there are a number of issues and questions that need to be addressed. It is expected not all issues and questions can or even should be fully addressed before the college structure is put into place, as the structure should be flexible enough to allow change as the campus continually evolves. Some should be resolved before the establishment of the college structure; others can be worked out as or after that structure is established. Individuals with expertise in issues of the University Code have advised that we should not let existing provisions of the Code (a Code that was written for and still pertains primarily to a single-campus university) drive our discussion of these issues. The Code can and certainly should be amended as appropriate once we have collectively determined what structure best serves the needs of UWT and positions the campus for the future. The following are some of the issues that need to be addressed. Others will surely emerge as the discussion continues.

Should there be a Dean of the College of Professional Studies? One suggestion has been that the position remain vacant for the foreseeable future. Another is that the program directors of the units making up the College of Professional Studies hold, on a rotating basis, the deanship of that unit. That person would simultaneously serve as director of her or his academic program. What would the term of office for the rotating deanship be? Are there conflict-of-interest or other issues for the individual holding both positions of Director and Dean simultaneously? If there is a Dean of the College of Professional Studies, what will the responsibilities of that person be? He or she might be responsible for coordinating the activities of the component units as is appropriate, and for establishing appropriate joint initiatives. Would program directors of the component units report only to this Dean or also report directly to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on some issues? Who will have responsibility for establishing three-year and tenure and promotion review committees in the College of Professional Studies? How should tenure and promotion recommendations be handled? One model would be to make effectively no changes to the present process. We would retain a campus Faculty Council. Tenure and promotion decisions would flow, as they do now, from program directors (in all cases except IAS) to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who would, as now, consult with the campus Faculty Council. In IAS, recommendations would flow from the Dean to the Vice Chancellor, who would, again, consult with the campus Faculty Council.

This would mean either not involving college Faculty Councils in tenure and promotion decisions or adding consultation with them as a step in the process. Recommendations would flow, as they do now, from the Vice Chancellor through the Chancellor to the Provost of the University of Washington.

Tenure and promotion decisions for Urban Studies and for the Institute could flow from the initial review committee to the voting faculty of their respective programs to the program director to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, who would consult with the Campus Faculty Council.

Will the organizational change require adjustments in membership of Faculty Assembly or other committees?

Will the role of Faculty Assembly change?

What, if any, will be the costs of this structure?

If we fill the position of Dean of the College of Professional Studies the holder of that position may not be able to hold that office, administer a program, and teach.

If we fill the position of Dean of the College of Professional Studies, will that person need staff support and office space, an administrative stipend?

## Appendix B

(Addendum to Agenda: Feb. 14, 2002 meeting of the UWT Faculty Assembly)

**Colleges at UWT**  
**Sent via email by Janet Primomo, Faculty Assembly Chair 2/14/02**

At the meeting, we will be discussing 'Colleges at UWT.' Vice Chancellor Nelson will introduce the proposal. The Executive Committee had an initial discussion last week about colleges at UWT and hopes to generate additional questions to address through our discussion. Below is a summary of current questions and concerns raised by the Executive Committee and faculty:

- \*Is a two college structure or another model the best structure for us at this time?
- \*What is the definition of 'campus'? (The Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy is addressing this.)
- \*What about moving to departments within a college structure?
- \*What are the benefits and risks to faculty in this structural change?
- \*What is the time frame for this process? (Administration would like to move forward in about a month).
- \*What happens to faculty governance structures at UWT with schools and colleges? (According to the Chap. 23, powers and authority currently delegated to the Faculty Assembly move to schools and colleges.)
- \*With the creation of Councils within colleges/schools, how will the shared governance and consultative role played by Faculty Assembly be assured?
- \*How we can ensure relative autonomy and identify as a CAMPUS faculty?
- \*How would we function as a CAMPUS regarding admissions and graduation, curriculum, academic standards, and instructional oversight of students?
- \*As a UWT Faculty, without changes to the Code, we would no longer have authority and power as a campus as this would be delegated to the colleges. In the 'College of Professional Studies,' does this make sense from a disciplinary perspective? It seems prudent to clarify the faculty governance structures before we advance any further with the proposal for schools and colleges.
- \*What are the financial implications if we go to schools and colleges?  
 (We need to discuss administrative costs, and the added burden on faculty to maintain duplicate Faculty Council structures (a 'hidden cost') and faculty responsibility for the divisions within IAS.)
- \*Issues related to grouping Business, Education, Nursing and Social Work into one school:
  1. Many of the programs are nationally accredited and grouping them into one school may create challenges.
  2. "Professional programs" have no intellectual/disciplinary identity. If anything, they are joined by common research methods and roots in the social sciences. But the programs have fundamentally different paradigms guiding them (public vs. private employment, social welfare vs. economic, etc.)
  3. Development (fundraising) will be hampered by the linkage of the 'professional' programs.
  4. National identity and prestige of each program is likely to be reduced by grouping the programs under a shared school.
  5. There is a question of equity (and bias) if computer science and urban studies can be separate units, while the other programs belong to a College of Professional Studies.

6. Under this proposal, the Business, Education, Nursing and Social Work programs would be headed (technically) by an individual who does not come from any of the professional areas. The Dean title carries with it great power in the Faculty Code, which should be a concern for directors and faculty in the "professional" programs.
7. Each of the 'professional programs' already has multiple programs within its structure (Business - BA & MBA; Education - Teacher's Certification & Masters; Nursing - BSN & MN; Social Work - BSW & MSW). If structural changes occur, this should be taken into account as it is in IAS.
8. Continuing to have academic directors vs. Deans leave the perception of them being 'less qualified' than their counterparts at universities across the country.

Should we consider a resolution about Colleges at UWT?

'Whereas there are extraordinary implications for faculty governance at UWT by moving to a schools and colleges structure; and

Whereas faculty have a right to determine their position on this issue,

Be it resolved that no formal action be taken regarding schools and colleges until Faculty Assembly conduct a thorough review of the implications of schools and colleges, and furthermore

Be it resolved that if faculty support a structural change to colleges, the faculty governance structure to ensure the power and authority of one UWT faculty body be determined before formal action is taken.'

#### Appendix C

#### Outline of Proposed Reconstruction of the UWT Handbook

UWT Faculty Affairs Committee

February 14, 2002

#### Governing Principles

The University of Washington Handbook governs the entire UW system, but the UWT Faculty have the authority to create a UWT Campus Handbook that addresses the distinct needs of this campus within the framework of the University of Washington Handbook.

To ensure compliance with the University of Washington Handbook, the UWT Campus Handbook should be organized as a set of substantive and clarifying amendments to the University of Washington Handbook rather than a rewriting of it.

#### Faculty Issues that Require Addressing in UWT Campus Handbook

Greater equity among teaching, research, and service as criteria for promotion, tenure, and merit considerations. Clarification of procedures for tenure, promotion, and merit decisions, with deadlines published, materials required, and personnel involved.

Guidelines for evaluation of teaching.

Shopping list of required materials for tenure, promotion, and merit decisions.

Flowchart of personnel involved in tenure, promotion, and merit decisions, especially since (i) the University of Washington Handbook does not account for UWT's unique organizational structure and (ii) organizational restructuring may alter those personnel in the near future.

Tenure, promotion, and merit decisions should be based primarily on criteria established during yearly conferences with program directors.

Possible impacts of restructuring on Faculty Assembly.

#### Proposed UWT Handbook Language Clarifying Chapter 24 for UWT

UWT Faculty Affairs Committee

(revised 2/12/02)

#### Chapter 24

...

#### Section 24-32. Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

...

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.

UWT Addendum 24-32-F-1. Service at UWT. Whereas the University of Washington, Tacoma, is a growing institution and will continue to be for the foreseeable future, the demands on its Faculty for University and community service –developing new programs and curricula, designing new facilities, hiring new staff and faculty, establishing the groundwork for shared governance, etc. – will, in general, exceed the service burden on faculty at the Seattle campus. Furthermore, substantial participation in University and community service is required of the Faculty at UWT for the University to successfully fulfill its educational mission. Therefore, this service component at UWT constitutes an “unusual circumstance” as indicated in 24-32-F above. Thus, UWT requires that a faculty member's individual service contributions be integrated similarly with teaching and scholarship for assessing that faculty member's qualifications in deciding upon appointment to a specific rank, tenure, promotion or merit.

...

#### Section 24-34. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

##### A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks

...

Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

UWT Addendum 24-34-A-3-a. Associate Professor. At the University of Washington, Tacoma, community and University service are integral to the mission of the campus and thus participation in service is required of its Faculty. Therefore, in order to fulfill the specific educational mission of UWT, an outstanding record in teaching, research, or service and competence in the other two shall be required for appointment to the rank of associate professor.

Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

UWT Addendum 24-34-A-4-a. Professor. At the University of Washington, Tacoma, appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition, as well as substantial community and University service.