

Faculty Assembly Minutes

May 28, 2003

12:55-2:15 pm,Keystone Auditorium

1. In the absence of Jack Nelson, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Mike Kalton proceeded to ask Janet Primomo for a brief report on the work currently being undertaken by the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP). Janet covered some of the discussions on “campus” definition that were under way.
2. Mike said that he would write a report and e-mail it to the faculty. He will summarize the activities of the Faculty Assembly (FA) for the past year, identify the main accomplishments, and the issues he has been engaged with during the year. He admitted that the issues have been difficult ones but he was also pleased with the high quality conversations contributed by the faculty.
3. Cheryl Greengrove of IAS and a member of the Teaching Assessment Group made a few announcements. She specifically mentioned that Beth Kalikoff and she will distribute a Teaching Assessment Package to all faculty. This package was prepared to identify alternative ways of assessing teaching and learning on the part of students and faculty. It is expected to complement existing assessment tools such as quantitative evaluation scores, which most faculty have perceive as an unreliable instrument for measuring teaching and learning outcomes.
4. There was some concern from the floor that a few critical positions might be eliminated due to the budget crisis. A letter was being drafted emphasizing the importance of retaining a minimum support staff for faculty research. Faculty was asked to sign the letter for retaining Jessica Roshan and Sondra Perdue, both of whom provided significant research support services.
5. Mike Kalton announced post-commencement faculty gathering. As there was no money he recommended that we meet at the Swiss. He will send out an email with details.
6. He placed a slate of nominees to serve on committees starting next academic year. Janet Primomo moved and Sam Parker seconded. He then switched the order of the Faculty Assembly agenda by proposing to discuss the conversion of Faculty Assembly to a representative body later in the meeting.
7. Mike then brought up the Faculty Advisory Committee on Promotion and Tenure (FACPAT) issue. Based on a previous FACPAT document (circulated earlier), which outlined the committee composition and described the charges of the Committee, Mike reflecting faculty concerns said that Charge #4 could be dropped. This charge stated that the Committee would “provide individual

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

Based on the discussion that ensued it was generally agreed that another charge could be added that would entail advising administration on matters pertaining to P&T. A modification to the FACPAT proposal was suggested. Instead of creating a whole new committee it was felt that **Faculty Council on Academic Tenure and Promotion?** could take on the responsibility. As the members of this Council were looking at P&T reviews (the integrity of the process), they could also give advice in open meetings.

Cheryl Greengrove asked the question on the charge of FCATP. Mike explained the charge. The first motion to accept the first charge under FACPAT as the first charge of the now reconstituted FCATP was moved, seconded, and passed.

Regarding the second charge, Janet Primomo stated each program has their own criteria, so it was important to advise administration on P&T. Anthony D'Costa saw program representatives in the FCATP as representatives of Programs, who would then form a bridge across campus with the administration. Jim Gawel asked if a meetings with administrators could be mandated. Mike indicated that faculty will have to share governance on these issues.

Denise Drevdahl recommended that these committees have chairs so that there is a strong sense of responsibility. In this connection Jim asked what the link of this committee was to the Executive Committee. Mike responded by saying that there was an overlap. Faculty Assembly in the end has the ultimate responsibility so discussion is necessary within the committee.

The second charge passed unanimously.

The third charge was moved, seconded, and amended. The FCATP was to be constituted by one member from each program. Janet favored the change to make the Council as part of the Executive Committee (tenured members only) as there were not enough people to serve on different committees. She pointed out that by-laws will have to be modified to include Faculty Councils.

The third charge of the FCATP passed unanimously.

With respect to the composition of the Council, Jim asked about those programs where the Director was the only senior faculty member of the program. On this issue Mike brought up the issue of campus and governance culture. He felt that exceptions could be made so that Directors could participate as faculty members in these important groups. June Lowenberg agreed with Jim, noting that Directors recommend candidates for tenure and promotion, while Marjorie Dobratz felt that Directors could play a consultant role. Mike thought that it was possible to serve on the candidate's Review Committee, the Council, and Program faculty. S/he could vote in all three arenas. He said that details of these committee compositions will be taken care of by tweaking the by-laws.

Anthony reminded the floor that currently members of Faculty Council from the candidate's program must recuse themselves from voting. To this Karen Landenburger responded by saying that there was inconsistency if one member (of the same program) recuses at the Faculty Council because this member would be at the FCAPT and yet not participate at the FCAPT's role in consulting with the Vice Chancellor. Anthony felt there wasn't any inconsistency since this voting at the Council level is the last stage of the process at this campus, presuming much has happened process-wise with the particular P&T case.

8. Mike Kalton returned to the question of representative body of the Faculty Assembly. It's not a matter of quorum rather what kind of conversations can take place with limited participation. Both Karen and Josh Tenenberg preferred not to have a representative body in the Faculty Assembly as all faculty members should have the option of expressing their opinions. Cathy Tashiro and Bob Jackson echoed similar sentiments, preferring a large body like the Faculty Assembly, sort of like a town hall meeting. Myrth Ogilvie felt that having a large body like the Faculty Assembly was a win-win situation. Mike responded that nearly a third of the faculty members are not sending out emails, excusing themselves from the meetings. Janet suggested that we keep the Faculty Assembly as it is. But we should come up with ways of passing legislation. She reminded the faculty that there were different classes of legislation—A, B, and C. Need to identify the modalities by which we could accomplish business through the Faculty Assembly.

Janet pointed out on the need to work on governance issues. Denise felt that we needed a "sacred" hour for meetings, suggesting that program meetings not be held during a Faculty Assembly meeting. However, Mike acknowledged the difficulties in coordinating meeting times with faculty. Jim felt that a representative body would discourage participation even more. Mike announced that the proposal to change the Faculty Assembly body will be shelved at this stage.

9. Mike ended the meeting saying that there will be answers on the P&T process. Thus far there was no alternative proposal.
10. June Lowenberg thanked Mike Kalton for coming on board as Chair and steering faculty governance at UWT.

Submitted By:

Anthony P. D'Costa
Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly