

Faculty Assembly Minutes March 6, 2002

(approved April 16, 2002)

Members in attendance:

1. Janet Primomo, Chair
2. Vicky Carwein, Chancellor
3. Jack Nelson, V. Chancellor
4. Tracy Thompson
5. Kären Landenburger
6. Marjorie Dobratz
7. Jim Gawel
8. Charles Emlet
9. Sharon Fought
10. Rob Crawford
11. Michael Kucher
12. Mark Fiegener
13. Diane Kinder
14. Myrth Ogilvie
15. Denise Drevdahl
16. Brian Coffey
17. Bill Richardson
18. Marcie Lazzari
19. Moshe Rosenfeld
20. Janet Mobus
21. Janice Laakso
22. Martyn Kingston
23. George Mobus
24. Katie Amundson
25. Zoe Barness
26. Deirdre Raynor
27. Sam Parker
28. Yonn Dierwechter
29. George Mobus
30. Kathy Beaudoin
31. Diane Kinder
32. Michael Forman
33. David Secord
34. Julie Nicoletta
35. Richard Stackman
36. Ruth Rea
37. Suzanne Goren
38. Cheryl Greengrove
39. Bob Howard
40. Don McLane
41. Jose Rios
42. Mark Fiegener
43. Patricia Fandt
44. DJ Parker
45. Alexis Wilson
46. Tom Diehm
47. Rogene M. Eichler West
48. Cathy Tashiro
49. June S. Lowenberg
50. John Banks
51. Josh Tenenberg
52. Larry Crum
53. Joe Sharkey
54. Stern Neill

- 55. Linda Desmarteau
- 56. Carolyn West
- 57. Ginger MacDonald

Members missing:

Mike Allen	Vanessa Chio	Chris Demaske
Christine Salazar	Richard O. Abderhalden	Sam Chung
Subin Im	Zoe Barness	
Rachel May	Belinda Louie	

Excused

Katie Baird
 Sam Chung
 Anthony D'Costa
 Steve D'Tray
 Suzanne Goren
 Mark Harniss
 Michael Honey
 Beth Kalikoff
 Diane Kinder
 Rich Knuth
 David Morris
 Kent Nelson
 John Peterson
 Deirdre Raynor
 Myrth Ogilvie
 Marcy Stein

Minutes of the UWT Faculty Assembly**March 6, 2002**

(approved April 16, 2002)

1. Call to order at 1:05 by Chair Janet Primomo**2. Approve minutes from Feb 14, '02 meeting**

Passed by unanimous hand vote

3. Chair report

- a. Noted the volume of intellectual activity across campus in seminars, etc. was impressive.
- b. Commended UWT administration for a proposed initiative to fund untenured faculty for one quarter release from teaching and service to develop research. This may begin next year.
- c. Anthony D'Costa was elected as Vice Chair and will begin serving next quarter.
- d. Solicited feedback on email distribution of ballots for Faculty Assembly elections to faculty:
 Suggestion to blind copy faculty on ballot distribution in order to prevent voted ballots being distributed to entire recipient list when they are returned via the email "reply" method.
- e. Commented on faculty role in approving programs at UWT. UWT faculty, as a whole, has never approved programs on this campus. Chair Primomo believes this needs to be built into the procedures for this campus.

4. Chancellor Remarks

Chancellor Carwein gave a review of the Senate version of the State Budget that is currently in deliberations. A summary of the Senate version was distributed to the campus community via email earlier in the day.

5. Vice Chancellor Remarks

The Vice Chancellor's office is trying to put together program whereby junior untenured faculty will have one quarter with no teaching/service responsibilities in their third or fourth year of appointment. It is currently proposed that this would be funded 50% by administration funds and 50% by individual program funds. Program Director's have indicated that they will be able to support the required matching funds. The proposal does not represent an entitlement, and may not be funded forever. The administration funds will be one-time funds, or 'soft money', and not part of the state supported budget funds. Faculty will prepare a research proposal, which will be reviewed and supported by program faculty and program director. Proposals will be solicited in Sept. for the following year. Faculty must be in residence (a 3 week workshop somewhere would be acceptable, but it will not okay to spend the whole quarter away from Tacoma). The release quarter will never be taken in the 1st or 6th year of appointment. There are complications in starting this initiative because of the large number of initial applicants anticipated. We want to start it next fall so we have to move forward quickly. A question was raised about how many could be funded in any given cycle. Maybe 10 slots are possible; as we grow, the pools of soft money will also grow. The first couple of years would be larger. We have lots of people coming up in for promotion and tenure in '03 and '04.

Faculty commended the Vice Chancellor for undertaking this initiative.

Concern was voiced on the perceptions of staff regarding this initiative given that staff reductions may be required as a result of the very tight budget circumstances facing the University. Vice Chancellor Nelson explained that the funds used for this initiative would not be taken out of the state budget monies that support staff positions. However, he agreed that the issue of staff morale is a substantial concern, and that the message the administration wants to send to staff is one of concern for the long-term health of the institution.

Chair Primomo recommended that Faculty Executive Committee provide feedback to the Vice Chancellor so we can proceed with all haste.

6. Resolution: Acknowledging role of full-time lecturers

Review and discussion of resolution. The resolution is intended as an important symbolic message. Motion to support the resolution was made and seconded.

Amendment offered - remove "full-time" from language of the resolution. Part-time lecturers in some programs are equally vital to the support of the program. Motion to remove "full-time" from the language was made and seconded. Vote on amendment to strike 'full time' passed by hand vote. Vote on resolution, as amended: Passed by hand vote.

Faculty Assembly Resolution: Acknowledging the Role of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers:

'Whereas, UWT faculty acknowledge that our 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 lecturers and senior lecturers, particularly during this time of budget constraints.'

The resolution will be forwarded from the Faculty Assembly to the Administration.

7. Colleges at UWT – Reports and Discussion

The resolution passed by the Faculty Assembly on 2-14-02 has been passed on to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor. Chair Primomo used this resolution as the context for a thought-piece (attached to Minutes as Appendix A) on the discussion. She underscores the importance of faculty governance. She incorporates language from both UWT and UW governance that feeds into this discussion on what the roles and responsibilities are. Her concern is: how do we create a structure that facilitates rather than burdens us?

Extensive discussion followed, which has been categorized as follows.

Faculty and Faculty Governance

Summary of understanding gleaned from Steve Olswang on faculty governance structures: The only required college-specific governance structure is a Faculty Council to advise the Dean; by the same token, there is nothing to preclude a campus-wide structure like Faculty Assembly. Alternative structures can be constructed by changes to Code/Handbook if they are desirable for the campus.

Changes to the Code/Handbook are Class A Legislation that requires tremendous time and energy to successfully pass through UW Faculty Senate processes.

New college functions may require us to work, to a greater extent, with UW Faculty Senate. We are not yet autonomous in their eyes. UW Faculty Senate may perceive that we are trying to go around them and that can do more harm than good for UWT.

Whereas the role of FA won't be compromised formally, informally and practically we either devolve responsibility to colleges on P&T and budget or we have added burdens to develop campus-wide committees. With limited tenured faculty to populate these committees, we tax faculty and, as a result, compromise faculty governance.

Program level

The suggested/proposed structures pretty much represent the way IAS is currently operating according to Bill Richardson. For IAS, the college structure is more relevant to legitimacy with external community connections.

Marjorie Dobratz stated that those programs that share accreditation with UWS programs are very much under the UWS faculty. We don't own our own curriculum. Our autonomy is very important and the colleges' structure would be a step in the direction of autonomy as a transitional structure. The college structure would facilitate programs to seek independent accreditation, perhaps as quickly as 5 years from now for some.

Campus level

Big advantage seems to be increased legitimacy in the eyes of UWS. We are part of an institution and we gain legitimacy by adopting the 'language' of that institution.

Disagreement was voiced that changing name of organizational units will change the way we're perceived in Seattle.

Fiscal considerations

Currently we are treated like a single school for budget purposes. Having two colleges might double our visibility from the perspective of getting state resource allocations.

UWT administration is not anticipating hiring Deans as administrative heads of the proposed colleges; therefore they believe there would be no fiscal impact of the proposed structural change.

We are adopting a partial structural change if we don't actually have Deans of the colleges. If we're going to go to a college structure, then let's do it. That means there are Deans of Colleges, and that's expensive.

Timing

Tri-Campus committee is trying to define what a “campus” is vis a vis the Code/Handbook. We are putting the cart before the horse by determining ‘campus’ structures before we have defined ‘campus’ in the larger institutional structure. UW Faculty Senate is concerned about the difference between a college and a campus. Perhaps a lot of the conceptual problems we are having with this issue will be more easily resolved once the definition of a campus is resolved.

There is no urgency from UW administration to act on this. Steve Olswang said we’re probably out of time to get the Board of Regents attention on this issue for implementation next year.

Our programs are very different in their respective relationships to UWS counterparts. We’re not going to come to consensus across all UWT programs quickly on whether the proposed change to colleges helps, hinders, or has no effect.

Thanking the faculty for the discussion, Chair Primomo asked the Executive Committee to consider what the organizational structure of a change to colleges at UWT would look like, and what the advantages/disadvantages of such a change would be.

8. Promotion and Tenure Handbook Addenda to be discussed at a later meeting.

Noting the time, the meeting was adjourned at 2:35.

April 16 next meeting 1-2:30 in the Keystone Auditorium (NOTE ROOM CHANGE)

Future Faculty Assembly Meetings:

Thursday, May 2, 1-2:30 PM Tacoma Room

Wednesday, June 5, 1-2:30 PM, Tacoma Room

Appendix A

***** A Memo from the Chair of the Faculty Assembly*****

Colleges at UWT: It's Not Just a Name Change

Background:

On Feb. 14, 2002 Faculty Assembly passed the following 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.'

To date, many questions have been raised regarding structural changes and the implications of colleges at UWT. In my conversations with faculty and UWT Administration, it is clear that we all value and desire a strong overall faculty body that maintains the powers and authority it has been granted. Indeed, the quality of our programs and campus is dependent on faculty involvement in curriculum and program development; academic policy; appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty; and other aspects of shared governance. To develop innovative programs and initiatives that are responsive to the need of the communities we serve, it is vital to maintain a flexible structure that allows faculty to work with others outside of their disciplinary boundaries. As we deliberate on structural changes and a possible 2-college structure at UWT, I urge us to keep this point in mind. We do not want to overburden ourselves with structures that may limit our time and energy to be the creative faculty that we are.

In this paper, selected questions regarding structural changes are addressed. How we can ensure our identity as a CAMPUS faculty? What happens to Faculty Assembly and its structures (Curriculum Committee, Academic Standards, Faculty Affairs) with a 2-college structure? What are the costs to faculty in the 2-college model? Is there a critical mass of faculty to sustain 2 colleges at this time? Is an expedited move to colleges wise at this time of constrained resources?

Maintaining a UWT Campus Faculty Governance Body:

According to our UWT Faculty Assembly By-Laws, 'The purpose of the Faculty Assembly is to provide a forum for faculty deliberation and to represent faculty as a whole in shared governance at UWT. Faculty Assembly serves as the legislative agency of the faculty with responsibility for formulating policies, rules, and regulations for UWT. The faculty shares 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:

- (a) educational policy and general welfare;
- (b) policy for the regulation of student conduct and activities;
- (c) scholastic policy, including requirements for admission, graduation, and honors;
- (d) approval of candidates for degrees;
- (e) criteria for faculty tenure, appointment, and promotion;
- (f) recommendations concerning the University budget; and
- (g) formulation of procedures to carry out the policies and regulations thus established."

According to the UW Handbook Chapter 23-45¹, 'schools and colleges have the authority with respect to academic matters to:

- determine its requirements for admission and graduation;
- determine its curriculum and academic programs;
- determine the scholastic standards required of its students;
- recommend to the Board of Regents those of its students who qualify for the University degrees;
- exercise the additional powers necessary to provide adequate instruction and supervision of its students;
- and with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its dean in accord with the provisions of Chapter 24 and of Section 25-41;

Given the various charges of schools and colleges in the UW Handbook and our current UWT Faculty Assembly authority, it is evident that UWT currently functions as a 'college-plus.' We have all the authority of a school or college, and share governance with administration for 'educational policy and the general welfare.' The Faculty advises the Chancellor/Dean on matters of budget, promotion and tenure, and academic policy. Indeed, the Dean title carries with it great power in the Faculty Code. If we move to a 2-college structure, the Faculty in the individual college advises the Dean. There is not a parallel role for the Faculty Assembly structure to advise the Chancellor. Rather, there is a conflict in the powers and authority currently delegated to the Faculty Assembly with a move to schools and colleges. By building in a role for overall faculty governance, this would weaken the role of colleges and the deans. Furthermore, we will have to determine how Urban Studies and the Institute of Technology fit into a governance structure to ensure that the faculty is not disenfranchised.

The Faculty Code (23-45) is clear that an elected faculty group must advise a Dean. In order to ensure an overall role for the Faculty Assembly and its governance structures, a change in the Faculty Code (Class A Legislation) would be required. A faculty governance structure that advises the Chancellor (not the Dean) is not in the Handbook at this time. It is necessary to think carefully about the roles of Faculty Assembly and the colleges and the authority of the faculty to share governance. Changes in the code are very serious and must be done carefully in order to protect faculty rights and responsibilities.

What are the burdens on faculty in this structural change?

In a 2-college structure, each college would have its own Curriculum, Academic Standards, Faculty Affairs and Committees. While this may be a natural evolution for IAS, it does not appear to benefit the programs in the proposed 'College of Professional Studies.' The 'professional programs' [each having multiple programs within their structures (Business - BA & MBA; Education - Teacher's Certification & Masters; Nursing - BSN & MN; Social Work - BSW & MSW)] have no intellectual or 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.) To have an academic affairs committee and a curriculum review committee for this college as well as a campus-wide committees is a duplication of efforts and a clear burden on faculty in that college. In my view, we would add to our workload tremendously in a way that limits our ability to engage in creative efforts to develop new programs and engage in scholarly work.

A legitimate question can be raised about whether we have a critical mass of faculty to support faculty governance in 2 colleges. For example, at the current time, there are only 9 tenured faculty members (excluding directors) among the faculty in 'College of Professional Studies.' Faculty in this college would have to serve on both college AND campus committees. In the case of promotion and tenure, this becomes particularly problematic, as the number of voting faculty on the Faculty/College Council would be extremely limited. Some of the colleges on the UW campus have 12-14 members (and alternates) on their Faculty/College Councils. We would have at the most 4 members unless more than one person per program served on the Council. Furthermore, if we want to maintain a faculty review at the CAMPUS level for promotion and tenure, it is highly unlikely that there would be faculty

from the College of Professional Studies who have not already voted as a member of the review committee, a voting member of the faculty, or a member of the college. Our numbers remain too small to support a legitimate review at all the levels necessary. It is my view that we have not achieved a critical mass to support a 2-college structure.

Financial Implications of Structural Changes

The financial implications for a structural change to colleges at UWT should be examined carefully, especially during this time of constrained resources. There is an inherent contradiction in changing to a 2-college structure and adding high-level administrative titles while we are also discussing budget reductions. Administrative costs increase as we add Deans and structures that support the growth of the colleges. If we have 'Interim' Deans, at some point in the near future, the cost of recruiting Deans must be factored in. In addition, there is an added burden on faculty to maintain duplicate Faculty Council structures and committees for curriculum, academic standards, and faculty affairs.

Summary

Structural changes may indeed be desirable at UWT. However, I do not believe UWT is large enough to accommodate a 2-college structure or has the resources to do so at this point in our evolution. An expedited process for this major structural change is not in the faculty's best interest. The 2-college structure based upon the current faculty code poses tremendous challenges for us. We should engage in a genuine deliberation about structural changes that can be backed by resources to support the changes. The current work of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy to define 'campus' is vital groundwork for us as we discuss structural changes. As we continue our exploration of structural changes at UWT, I suggest we pose subsequent questions including:

- 1) What structural changes would be beneficial to faculty, administration, and the campus?
- 2) What alternative models might there be? (i.e. departments within the current 'one-college plus' structure?)
- 3) Should the current role of Dean be separated from the role of Chancellor?

Respectfully submitted,
Janet Primomo, Faculty Assembly Chair 3/5/02

¹Relevant sections of the UW Handbook, Volume 2 (website below) where Deans and Schools/Colleges are referred to include: <http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsenate/handbook/Volume2.html>

Section 12-24. The Deans

Section 13-21. Authorization for the Faculty to Share in the Formulation of Rules

Section 13-24. Faculty Authority Concerning Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

Chapter 23, COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, AND DEPARTMENTS (in particular Section 23-43).

College and School Faculties other than the Graduate Faculty: Powers and Duties