

# Faculty Assembly minutes

## March 12, 2003

Keystone Auditorium

The meeting was called to order at 12:50 pm

(Since the FACPAT proposal was the major discussion item, a copy of the proposal is appended to these minutes).

1. At the invitation of Mike Kalton, Chair, Faculty Assembly, Jack Nelson, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs briefly stated that there was nothing to report on the budget. He mentioned that the Washington Institute of Public Policy was asking for various data from UWT, following their visit to UWT. He felt that this might spark some debate on students taking lower division courses at our campus.

2. Janet Primomo, member of the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy informed the assembly that the next FCTCP meeting in Seattle will have to settle the issue of who approves programs at the non-Seattle campuses, even though the approval process is at the Senate level. She wanted to know whether the faculty here would like the curriculum approval process carried out locally, that we maintain our autonomy. In any case we already have own process.

Mike Kalton mentioned about Class C legislation. At present, by-laws demand two weeks notice. He recommended that we immediately express our sentiments on this issue of local autonomy for program approvals. Janet will pass around a one-pager on this issue.

3. Mike introduced the subject of Faculty Council for Promotion and Tenure (FACPAT). Two questions were initially broached. Should there be a new committee? How important is the issue that purportedly FACPAT would address?

Mike stated some of the principal reasons for the need to form this committee. They are as follows:

1. Junior faculty need advising;
2. Senior faculty need to connect among themselves to maintain and/or determine campus culture for T&P;
3. Campus culture is a matter of interpretation, FACPAT can provide this function on a continuous basis.
4. Faculty needs to consult with and advise administration regarding T&P.

Mike suggested the charge to consult with and advise administration might be added to the charge of FACPAT. He also elaborated on the context of changing needs. They are:

- Expectations of T&P are changing. Part of the reason for this is that there is a “cultural drift.” It has also to do with campus growth that induces change in culture.
- This culture is always under negotiation. For example, we are a part of a research institution but we are not a research campus. Yet, we know we are a campus that needs to be active in scholarly research.
- We have a new vice chancellor who plays a significant role in T&P. Faculty also has a similar responsibility though it is not part of the job description.

Mike then pulled up the relevant portions of the handbook to show where faculty had a responsibility for T&P. It was in Section 13-23 Legislative Authority of the Faculty, which stated that faculty shared governance, T&P, and appointments.

It is clear that we have to work with administrators, who spend far more time on these issues than faculty in general.

4. Mike Kalton opened the floor for discussion of FACPAT.

Cathy Tashiro asked as to what other committees, such as Faculty Council on Academic Policy (FCAP), and Faculty Affairs, do. Mike Kalton responded, stating that FCAP ensures that the process of T&P has been carried out. Belinda Louie reminded the assembly that Faculty Council was established by Chancellor Vicky Carwein to advise her. It only plays an advisory role. Belinda felt that FACPAT could provide an important service. The smaller programs have problems with respect to T&P since faculty in these programs must advise candidates and judge them as well. There is a conflict, which presumably FACPAT might be able to resolve.

Zoe Barsness asked if FCAP has become more substantive. A lively discussion ensued on the form of FACPAT, composition of members, frequency of meetings, etc. It was clarified by Mike Kalton that FACPAT would not be expected do substantive reviews of T&P files.

Jim Gawel suggested that the process and advising aspects associated with T&P should be separated out. He felt that the Faculty Affairs Committee could do a good job of FACPAT's mission with a good mix of junior and senior faculty and administration.

Mike emphasized that we need to know how things work without necessarily ignoring junior faculty. On the basis of these deliberations June Lowenberg was less skeptical of the idea of FACPAT than she was before the meeting. Similarly, Janet Primomo changed her mind about the importance of the committee as it brings back faculty to the center in governing ourselves. Michael Forman, in concurring with Moshe Rosenfeld, however, felt that FACPAT will affect the process of T&P review. He felt that there would be more negative voting. Moshe questioned if there was something wrong with the current process. He was vehemently opposed to a committee of the likes of FACPAT. Others were not so convinced of how negative voting would increase or for that matter if the current T&P process, as practiced, should be left alone as "business as usual" despite some visible shifts in the culture, expectations, and goals of UWT.

Mike Kalton reiterated that FACPAT is NOT meant to substitute for current advising practices at the program level. It is meant to act as an ADVOCACY group for junior faculty who may not have that opportunity at the program level. Marcy Stein stressed the need to have lines of communications with administration and between programs. It was evident from these discussions that faculty has the responsibility.

Belinda Louie pointed out that mentoring is desired but cannot be demanded. With FACPAT there will be a structure, which will provide the basis for helping junior faculty to obtain information, advising, etc. Both Rob Crawford and June Lowenberg felt that faculty has to advise and consult on matters of T&P. Both felt item number four should really be a program responsibility. June in echoing her earlier skepticism switched to favor this FACPAT without number four, which reads: "Provide individual guidance as needed, including advice concerning putting together one's P & T dossier."

Ruth Rea reiterated the importance of communication between administration and senior faculty as there were several areas of differences in expectations and subsequent miscommunications. For example, she brought up the issue of "sole authorship" of publications. For some fields collaborative work is more important as it is valued more by the particular field. A general rule on sole authorship cannot be used for assessing scholarship that come from a wide variety of fields. This issue is a faculty matter and can be settled by senior faculty.

Jose Rios elaborated on his experience in going through the T&P process. He said that he performed items 1-4 all by himself and received little or no help. This was risky for him since there was no formal guidance and it was possible that his expectations could have deviated from that of his program and the administration. He felt that targets for items 3 and 4 must be met and he could have benefited greatly from a committee such as FACPAT.

5. Mike Kalton thanked everyone for their participation. He said no matter what the final outcome is regarding FACPAT or what form it could take, it was important to recognize that junior faculty need support from every quarter to achieve their professional goals and we as faculty have a tremendous responsibility in facilitating that process. This dialog is a healthy sign of that facilitation.

Submitted By:

Anthony P. D'Costa  
Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly

## **Faculty Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FACPAT)**

A subcommittee of the Faculty Assembly, composed of senior faculty members from all programs, appointed for two-year terms by the Executive Committee. *Faculty members will be requested to submit nominations of senior faculty members from their own and/or other programs who they view as especially qualified for this subcommittee.*

Charge:

Consult within the committee on P & T processes and expectations across the campus, and on the situation of junior faculty with respect to meeting them.

Advocate for an appropriately supportive environment for faculty to meet program, campus and university expectations regarding P & T.

Meet semiannually with junior faculty as a whole to address questions and issues regarding P & T.

Provide individual guidance as needed, including advice concerning putting together one's P & T dossier.