

# Faculty Assembly Minutes

**29 November 2005**  
**Carwein Auditorium**

Attending: Robert Jackson, Josh Tenenberg, Patricia Spakes, Orlando Baiocchi, Katie Baird, April Boutillette-Brinkman, Tom Carlson, Stephen Detray, Thomas Diehm, Marjorie Dobratz, Charles Emlet, Mark Fiegenger, Jerry Finn, Michael Forman, Cheryl Greengrove, Marian Harris, Turan Kayaoglu, Diane Kinder, Willam Kunz, Janice Laakso, June Lowenberg, Don McLane, George Mobus, Janet Mobus, Stern Neill, Myrth Oglivie, Janet Primomo, Johann Reusch, Marcy Stein, Christine Stevens, Cathy Toshiro, Mythri Raj.

- Jackson called the meeting to order at 12:48pm.
- Minutes of the May 18, 2005 and October 19, 2005 Faculty Assembly meetings were approved without revision.
- Jackson introduced Chancellor Spakes, and opened a conversation among faculty and the Chancellor.

Spakes began by discussing the transition in Academic Affairs.

Transitions are difficult in the best of circumstances; transitions work best when you can plan. At the same time, all administrators serve voluntarily. Two weeks ago, Vice Chancellor Nelson informed the Chancellor that he wanted to return to the faculty and that he wanted to do so immediately.

This left us faced with a number of important decisions related to sabbaticals, promotion and tenure, and curriculum. With the help of the Directors, Chancellor Spakes has developed both a short-term and a longer-term plan. In the short-term Nelson's responsibilities will be divided among the Directors and the Chancellor. Spakes will work closely with Jackson and Kalikoff on development of new curriculum for the freshmen cohort. Fought takes over curriculum associated with academic programs. Baiocchi assists with promotion and tenure reviews (academic personnel). The Chancellor will take a more active role on promotion and tenure than the past Chancellor, reading all of the cases.

Making a longer term appointment to the Vice Chancellor position would not have allowed for more consultation with faculty. Spakes is responding to earlier concerns voiced among faculty about needing more openness of administration and greater consultation. So the short-term and long-term approach allows for this openness and consultation. Spakes hopes to have decisions about a longer term solution by mid-December.

An early decision was to decide not to do the VCAA search immediately for next year. Doing so would have left insufficient time for advertising and for having conversations about criteria for the VCAA. It would also have been late in reaching candidates, so it would not have resulted in an optimal candidate pool. Spakes is therefore looking at an interim VCAA appointment through the end of the 2006-2007 academic year.

Spakes would like to develop an "academic profile" for the VCAA position. It is not uncommon to hold focus groups to develop criteria for VCAA's. But we can benefit from having that conversation up-front prior to advertising, ready to hit the ground running in Autumn 2006. Spakes then asked if there were questions.

Greengrove asked "what are your ideas about key characteristics for the VCAA?"

Spakes responded that one of the key needs for the campus is to have a strategic plan. So the VCAA would need to do the piece of the strategic plan for Academic Affairs as part of that effort. For example, do we need more majors, do we need the traditional majors? The 2707 report said we needed to develop additional majors at both the undergraduate and the graduate levels. How will we decide which majors? How do we make these choices at a campus level when resources are scarce? We need someone who can help us with "decision rules" or "parameters" or priorities for making these kinds of choices. Spakes has a particular bias for the Health Sciences. This is certainly a growth area, regardless of the ups and downs of the economy.

A second characteristic that is important is to respond to concerns that have been voiced about central administration, the need for openness and collaboration, and a kind of leadership that works well in partnership with others. She is amazed at how Directors have stepped forward to help. This provides us with a unique opportunity to help the campus to work together more collaboratively.

Third concerns leading a conversation about how teaching, scholarship, and service can be integrated.

Lowenberg commented that this is an impressive list of characteristics. Delegating responsibility broadly prior to making the interim decision is a great sign and quite welcome.

Spakes thanked Lowenburg for her comment, and mentioned to also thank the Directors.

Primomo mentioned that the promotion and tenure process is on many people's minds. The Faculty Council on Promotion and Tenure can take leadership in terms of working with Baiocchi concerning P&T criteria in particular programs. We have existing processes to follow, and it is important to have a dialog between the Faculty Council on P&T and Baiocchi. Having someone move into the P&T role in place of the Vice Chancellor without a good deal of conversation makes Primomo uneasy.

Baiocchi responded that these are valid concerns. One thing that he has noticed since he came here is that faculty have often surrendered their responsibility. He will do his best to work with the faculty committee. This is the Academy. The role of the VCAA is to certify that due process has occurred, but promotion and tenure is a faculty decision.

Lowenberg stated that she feels that promotion and tenure are quite important right now. It is important to look at P&T criteria not only currently but at the time when people came to UWT. It is important to examine this as criteria change.

Spakes indicated that she has been through this on other campuses. Her question as Chancellor is "did the person have adequate time to adjust to the different standards?" And that is the role that she plays; to ensure that fairness exists in the review process.

Baiocchi concurred with Spakes's comment.

Carlton stated that he wanted to return to comments Spakes made a few weeks earlier about drops in morale. Could Spakes indicate specific ways for restoring trust in central administration.

Spakes indicated that she can talk about some of her ideas, but many of the ideas have to come from faculty and faculty leadership. Engaging in more open decision making is one, especially with respect to budget. The budget review committee needs faculty representation. Each Vice Chancellor presents their budget to other Vice Chancellors and the faculty. But in order for faculty to be more fully represented, it really needs to be for more than a year or two at a time -- it is a steep learning curve given the complexities of the budget. One of our tasks is to figure out how we do that. This will make progress on issues of trust/mistrust if we had open processes like that. She has heard about one area of campus that is overfunded and one area that is underfunded. Having an open budget process would help considerably. Student Affairs is clearly underbuilt and underfunded. But shouldn't the decision about who gets the resources be made by more people in an open process around the table?

Another idea is to formalize a group that went to the retreat this last summer, a larger group of people with access to the administration. She is interested in broadening the number of people who are active on campus.

Greengrove stated that we had processes such as that before. Related to this, one thing that we need to do concerns the fact that we don't have a history of UWT. If each of us wrote a page, and put that together on a webpage, it can help new faculty to have some context for who we are. It would be helpful to not lose where we came from in our development for the new people. She has talked with Jackson about doing this for faculty and staff. People's perspective is quite helpful, and you don't want to lose these.

Stein mentioned that it is important to implement shared governance on our campus. There is a history of shared governance in Seattle, but missing on this campus. For instance, there are different voting procedures in different programs; things as simple as that tend to be problematic. Openness and transparency will come when we have more success in implementing shared governance. We need to have a shared understanding that this is important, and that people don't get punished for participation.

Spakes said that we have to understand the question of shared governance and what it means to us as a campus. Often new campuses start with a faculty assembly model, where faculty as a whole makes decisions. As campuses grow, it often moves to faculty representation in decision making. She cautions against adopting Seattle's solutions completely. We live with the same policies, but not same the procedures.

Primomo mentioned that she wanted to return to a discussion about a strategic plan for Academic Affairs from a few weeks ago. There should be a good deal of faculty engagement if there is a restructuring of the Academic Affairs office. A number of creative ideas can come from faculty for how to do that. It also allows for more clarity for faculty governance.

Spakes stated that this not an issue we need to resolve this week, so there is time for consultation.

Spakes mentioned that she wanted to return to Carlton's original question about how to restore trust. She has scheduled meetings with each academic program, to discuss strategic planning and criteria for the VCAA. She is also following up with staff, and will be having a series of "coffee with the Chancellor" by invitation, with a goal of getting to all staff by the end of spring.

Greengrove mentioned that this is a great idea. It might be nice to have a mix of staff and faculty given that we work closely. Everyday she works with great staff, and couldn't do anything she does without the terrific staff on campus.

Spakes remarked that we can look for ways to make that faculty/staff dialog happen.

Spakes mentioned that she wanted to comment on a couple of topics. First, she inquired if people were aware of the Storty case? She indicated that we will probably get an email from the President about this. There was a court decision that went against UW (brought by Storty) about denial of 2% merit pay to all faculty several years ago. The case is ongoing, and was brought as class action suit. The next phase is to determine who is in the class and who is not. The result of the decision could cost the university \$15 million. The President is extremely supportive of higher salaries for faculty, but is not sure where he will find \$15 million, as the legislature did not fund this. It is still in the courts, and Emmert and Spakes are constrained in terms of how much they can speak about it.

One other issue: the President's *Community, Values, and Leadership* (CVL) initiative survey included both the Bothell and Tacoma campuses. She cannot tell how many respondents there were. We have requested the data for our campus. She has seen a brief summary, but does not have the data. She has requested it from the Vice Provost, who has agreed to come herself (or someone else on the committee) to share the Tacoma results with us. The Provost also wants to come and do a town hall here. She plans to do a series of those in Seattle. We are working diligently to get these two events scheduled. It is important that our data be seen in the context of the whole study, and that the Vice Provost explain what the results mean. From what she can see, it confirms what we already know: concerns about a lack of confidence in central administration and loss of morale.

J. Mobus mentioned that this is both good news and bad news. Making a continuity with the positive history at UWT is a big challenge.

Spakes stated that this is why she spent so much time in her talk two weeks ago on the history of the campus. There are many good things to return to: open dialog, working collaboratively. But the processes might have to look different because we are growing, e.g. an assembly vs senate model.

- Tenenberg gave a report on the November 17, 2005 Executive Council meeting with Donna Kerr, Secretary of the University Faculty. He read selected comments from the minutes of the EC meeting related to faculty governance and the Tacoma campus. The EC minutes from which he read can be found at: [http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/faculty\\_assembly/executive\\_council/executive\\_council\\_minutes\\_index.html](http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/faculty_assembly/executive_council/executive_council_minutes_index.html)

Laakso mentioned that Kerr also underscored the erosion of shared governance at UW over the last several years.

Greengrove asked about the relationship of our UWT Handbook to the UW handbook.

Tenenberg responded that Kerr indicated that our Handbook is like the policies of schools and colleges.

Greengrove asked how this will work when we get schools and colleges?

Stein stated that Tricampus Council is dealing with how campuses are different than schools and colleges.

Primomo stated that we are not just the same as schools and colleges, and that this is now in the Faculty Code.

Stein stated that we don't know what that means in terms of how we organize our governance structure. In early days, we wanted so much independence from Seattle that it was harmful. Following this was a phase of coming back to Seattle's Faculty Code, that it isn't just UW Seattle's, but that it is the code for all campuses.

- Jackson stated that in his time as Chair of Faculty Assembly, he has observed a struggle with where decisions can and should be made. What is the next evolution of that? Trusting is a good word to consider in going forward to the next steps. Jackson believes that we should consider representative government. There are many regular attendees to the Faculty Assembly meetings, but we don't *represent*. He suggests that in the next period of months that we study this, and see what the next adaptation ought to be. Conditions are set for shared governance, with emphasis on *shared*. Jackson initiated a discussion of having a *representative governance* structure at UWT.

Greengrove said that we had this discussion about representative government a few years ago. At that time we voted not to, but perhaps it is now time to reconsider this. We shouldn't lose the work that was done earlier on this, though.

DeTray stated that improving rewards for service will help considerably.

Greengrove agreed, stating that there have been lots of mixed messages about being involved in faculty governance. Having representatives provides a way to raise the profile for governance work and might increase communication about governance.

Marcy said that she applauds the Executive Council, since it has functioned much like this representative body for a long time. Perhaps we need help with implementation of shared governance at the program level. When we restructure this, there might be other ways for us to increase morale and bring transparency and clarity.

Jackson said that the Executive Council wants to talk again with Donna Kerr.

Tashiro stated that she would like to provide a different perspective. She has not heard convincing arguments for why we should go to a representative model. We have 110 faculty. The Faculty Senate manages to get business done, and it is larger. Size might not be the major reason. We need more engagement of faculty across the board. If it devolves to a few representatives then we will have further disengagement. The level of engagement seems like the key issue, not size. We should focus on what the real needs are, and the structure should flow from the needs.

Kinder stated that it is more vital that we take our part in shared governance, than the actual governance structure. Perhaps if we were actually engaged in real decision making more people would be involved.

Carlton stated that when he started 7 years ago, this room would be mostly full. Over the last several years, what happens here has mattered less. The challenge concerns how to re-engage people who used to be here but who are now pulling back.

J. Mobus said that there is a missing link between individual programs and the institution as a whole. More of the day-to-day life and focus is internal to programs. There may be a lot of reasons for that. But in some ways we have lost the connection of the programs to the institution as a whole. How do we tie those back to some sense of central, institutional purpose and vision. Many faculty are wholly involved only within their program domain.

Emllet added that when a group of people over time do not feel heard and connected, then we retrench to the basics: I'll teach my classes, I'll do my research, and that is the level of commitment that I will give. We are at a crossroads to reengage those conversations and reconnect people.

Lowenberg stated that things have been more problematic the last three or four years, and people might be more willing now. Senior people have spent their time here and in Seattle on shared governance and have not been able to be promoted.

Related to this, Tashiro asked that in scheduling the meetings in a quarter, if the leadership could please alternate the meeting days between Monday/Wednesday and Tuesday/Thursday.

Jackson responded that we will take a look at the remaining Faculty Assembly meetings.

G. Mobus said that a bedrock for democracy is public forums. Trust comes from interacting with people on a regular basis. We do not have a mechanism for doing that. As these meetings become reduced in size, let us look for ways to increase the public discussion. We need to make it very transparent, not just the Executive Committee.

Jackson adjourned the meeting at 2:05pm.