

Faculty Assembly Minutes

December 11, 2002

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 pm.

1. The minutes of October 16, 2002 Faculty Assembly were unanimously approved. The minutes are posted on the UWT Faculty Assembly website.

2. Chair's Report:

Mike Kalton began the meeting by informing the faculty that Cheryl Greengrove of IAS is working with the Teaching and Learning Roundtable (TLRT) for exploring alternative ways of evaluating teaching. He also mentioned the significance of discussing new program "approval" process.

Janet Primomo pointed out that such a process was already in existence in Bothell since 1995. It's time that UWT had it too. It is at the campus level that such a review process needs to be instituted. The challenge, however, is how to incorporate the process at the Tri-Campus level. After all we are part of a three-campus university system. Previously UWT programs did not get through the review process in Seattle. Both Tacoma and Bothell on this score wants to have autonomy over their respective program approval process.

Mike indicated that these are the sorts of issues that are being hammered out at the Faculty Council for Tri-Campus Policy committee level.

Mike also announced that there will be a voting item in January 2003, i.e. proposed by laws revisions. A subcommittee is to be created to review standards, integrity, etc. While the Executive Committee of the Faculty Assembly does not vote on such legislation, they do formalize it. Mike mentioned that in the end it is "will of the faculty" that is important. UWT faculty can strive to have the process here by voicing our needs strongly. In this manner UWT can thus create the opportunity to vote for it.

3. Josh Tenenberg of IT sent a memo regarding reduction in teaching load by one course for Chairs for Faculty Affairs. Since faculty governance is a time consuming process, often at the expense of professional development, it is important that the leadership of key faculty-driven committees be given some incentives. Mike Kalton informed that this is an important facet of faculty governance and that faculty will vote for it in January 2003. He did, also point out that a favorable outcome, does not necessarily translate into an automatic course reduction since there are budgetary concerns. What is, however, important is the process by which the faculty strongly express their needs so that the institution runs well.

4. Mike Kalton mentioned that he had brought up the subject of a “coffee room” at the All Directors meeting. According to him there was strong support for this. Sandy Boyle, Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration is involved in the discussions as well. Mike mentioned that another faculty member participate in the deliberations. Anyone interested in promoting wholesome faculty life on this campus are requested to send an e-mail to Mike.

5. Cheryl Greengrove said that the TLRT has offered to look at various aspects of teaching evaluations such as the teaching assessments, tools, student evaluations, etc. She and Beth Kalikoff of IAS have met the staff at the Center for Instructional Development and Research (CIDR) in Seattle. CIDR has prepared a draft document, which lists the resources available.

The next step according to Cheryl was to put together a framework that will look at many tools used for evaluations. Don Wolf at CIDR will give two presentations on these issues. She strongly suggested that the faculty must now take on these issues so that a system is set up for evaluating teaching effectively. While different programs are likely to have different tools, the general guidelines ought to be the same for all programs at this campus.

She said that she will first organize an informational meeting. Don Wolf will help in this endeavor in addition to creating a task force for this purpose. He is expected to be on campus in late January 2003. The task force is expected to comprise members from the administration, Faculty Affairs, and the Executive Committee. After a framework (guidelines) is developed, a campus-wide discussion will be held to thrash out the nuts and bolts of teaching assessments. All programs will then look at the logistics of implementing the framework.

6. Mike Kalton announced two action items for the day. The first was a motion to make amendments regarding the role of committees and mentors in the T&P process. The second motion raised the question of how to handle the process of soliciting external reviewers for the T&P process.

Mike Kalton said that he had a proposal to work on during the Winter of 2003 for developing a system for mentoring junior candidates. He thought that a “Board of Senior Faculty” with appropriate expertise could serve as a mentor by setting certain professional standards. It was important to have a mentor from the very first day when the faculty joins the UWT community. This Board was expected to act in lieu of the review committee.

At this point Jim Gawel of IAS asked as to why a Review Committee could not be “mentoring” committee. Mike Kalton said that he was not suggesting a “firewall” between the two committees but simply a way to separate the conflicting roles of the two committees. Michael Forman of IAS asked if “advising” and “reviewing” was being differentiated. These questions were clearly reflective of the ambiguities of the committees’ roles. However, Mike Kalton pointed out that among faculty there is a

general culture for untenured candidates to succeed thereby creating a certain bias in the entire T&P process. By changing the outlines of the committees, he argued that the institution will be compelled to support mentoring in a durable, long-term way.

Janet Primomo asked if a compromise could be obtained. Anthony D'Costa pointed out that two kinds of mentoring of faculty were involved, both of which were being conflated in the discussion. One had to do with individual, long-term professional development, and the other was about getting advice and guidance in putting the T&P file together. On this a lively and informed discussion on the separation between review and mentoring committees ensued. In the end, Mike Kalton said that the issue could not be resolved that day and so the discussion will continue into the next meeting. He said he would work on a clear proposal for mentoring purposes by going back to the drawing board. He withdrew this item for discussion.

Charlie Emlet brought up the issue of specifying when changes, if any will go into effect.

7. The second action item was the process of soliciting external reviewers. It was pointed out that the majority of reviewers will be obtained by the review committee, adding credibility to the process. Michael Forman asked if there was an attempt to raise the bar for candidates coming up for T&P. Mike Kalton responded that such was not the case. It was an attempt to make the process more transparent and credible. Another very lively discussion followed.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 pm.

PLEASE MARK YOUR CALENDARS: Upcoming Meetings

Faculty Assembly Meetings at Keystone Building

January 23, 2003 (Thursday): 12:45-2:15

March 12, 2003 (Wednesday): 12:45-2:15

Submitted by:

Anthony P. D'Costa

Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly