

# Faculty Assembly minutes

## October 16, 2002

Tacoma Room

The meeting was called to order at 12:58 pm.

1. This is the first Faculty Assembly meeting for the 2002-02 academic year. The new chair, Mike Kalton of IAS opened the meeting by introducing the various committees working under the Faculty Assembly and contributing significantly to faculty governance on this campus. He introduced the following committees:
  - i. The Executive Committee
  - ii. Faculty Affairs
  - iii. Faculty Council for Tri-Campus Policy (a 3-campus committee) with three representatives from Tacoma.
  - iv. Faculty Council for Academic Policy and Standards
  - v. Admissions and Academic Standards
2. The minutes of the last Faculty Assembly meeting was approved. It was moved by Michael Forman and seconded by Josh Tenenberg.
3. Chris Demaske of IAS was voted to Executive Committee.
4. Mike Kalton reiterated the importance of faculty governance but stressed the “joint” nature of the operation between faculty and administration. He invited Jack Nelson, Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs for some comments.
5. Jack reported on a number of areas. The first was the establishment of the Strategic Planning Initiative. The initiative is meant to be a vision statement, to figure out what kind of programs we might need, given that most of the professional programs are in place. He suggested that thinking about niche programs would be integral to strategic thinking. Thus a “glass” program which might serve the larger community could be part of such thinking. Also, he noted that the SPI will be critical for raising funds at a time of budget shortfalls. There was a goal of raising \$26 million. A small committee will be formed and then a campus-wide discussion will take place sometime during January and March of 2003. Rob Crawford of IAS asked Jack as to who was going to lead the Strategic Planning Initiative and Janet Primomo of Nursing suggested if individual program strategic plans would be taken into account. Jack responded saying that it was not expected to be a bottom-up nor a top-down plan. He mentioned that Kent Nelson of Business has been retained as a “consultant” to the Strategic Planning Initiative. He will not be representing the business program in this capacity.

In addition to new program, there were several other areas that the SPI could be looking at. These included:

- identifying ways to strengthen the undergraduate education; whether to improve students' preparation at the community colleges or to implement a four-year program at UWT;
- how we think about research;
- how we envision UWT to look like;
- what kind of programs we should offer;
- what our peer institutions look like (currently UWT doesn't really have them as UWT falls under UW Seattle's peer institutions).

The second area Jack covered was Tenure and Promotion. There were some questions about the "review committee", the number of members composing it, whether the same group of individuals helping put the candidate's file together can also evaluate the file. He was interested in separating the two functions. With respect to external reviewers he mentioned that not too many from the candidate's list can be selected. Some minor issues included noting the candidate's contribution to a multi-authored article and including the number of pages for published materials.

The question of the timeline is a faculty and administration matter but the calendar is to be set by Jack's office. Jack is advisory to the Chancellor Vicky Carwein. She ultimately signs the tenure decision. Jack felt that it was appropriate for him to talk to review committees and consult with Academic Directors about the expectations across programs.

The third area was the budget. Jack mentioned that a \$2 billion shortfall is likely at the state level in the next biennium. He hoped that this will not raise significant concerns, although it was evident that new enrollments for UWT may not materialize. While Seattle cannot take any new enrollments, he suggested that UWT could. What exactly will be the budget situation, whether the budget cuts will be 5 or 8% depends on enrollment. Also, the budget figures will depend on the 2% salary increase, which at this time is not known.

Jack also announced that the Chancellor's office is sending two faculty members to Atlanta for a conference on faculty governance.

6. Mike Kalton announced that he will need one or two faculty members to participate in the honors program. Brian Coffee of Urban Studies and Bill Richardson of IAS will co-chair this committee. The issue was how to create something academically meaningful for our bright students. If there were any volunteers they should contact Mike Kalton.

He also noted the significance of the budget for this campus and announced a faculty vacancy to be filled on the budget committee. He requested that volunteers contact him.

In making his report, Mike Kalton felt that this year will be an important year for joint faculty governance as the university-wide 2% salary increase last year was rejected by the administration with backing from the Regents. There was clearly a need to make the three campuses work together, especially in such areas as approval of programs.

Janet Primomo from Nursing and representative of UWT at the Faculty Council of Tri-Campus Policy (FCTCP) said that FCTCP is responsible for coordinating policies across campuses. One of the issues being addressed is cross-campus coordination on new program proposals (minors, concentrations, etc). While the Graduate School reviews all Graduate programs for all three campuses (June Lowenberg of Nursing represents UWT at the Graduate School Council), no such centralized system exists to review our undergraduate programs. At UWS, the Sub-Committee on Academic Programs (SCAP) of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards reviews and approves all undergraduate programs. Last year, this group voiced concern that our programs at UWB and UWT did not go through SCAP. At UWT we have our own review process. Currently, RAPP (Review and Approval of Program Proposals Committee) reviews and approves all new proposals. RAPP is composed of primarily directors but does have 2 faculty representatives (Faculty Assembly and Faculty Council). Janet mentioned that is important for Faculty Assembly to put a review process in place this year.

Janet stated that the FCTCP will be developing policy on program approval this fall. Guiding principles are:

- a) each campus has its own review
- b) proposals are shared among all campuses (using U-Week as an official register like the Federal Register or web-based posting)
- c) before approval, the home campus must ensure that all comments from other campuses have been addressed

The FCTCP felt that this was a policy and coordination issue and not a legislative or code issue. Operating procedures on each campus and academic coordination of policy must be addressed. Logistics need to be addressed with Tim Washburn. Janet is serving on a sub-committee with Jack Meszaros of UWB and Carolyn Plumb, current chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards to further develop the principles of cross-campus coordination on program approval processes.

Jack Nelson said he agreed that there is no faculty approval process at UWT and he supports instituting one. While he is optimistic that a collegial solution will be worked out among all three campuses regarding cross-campus program approval, it is conceivable there could be veto power for each campus or that all programs would be reviewed by SCAP.

Other issues the FCTCP are working on include awarding a President's Medal at UWT, similar to the one given in Seattle to an undergraduate for the highest academic performance. There is draft legislation at this point. She emphasized the importance of faculty input for three-campus issues such as program approval, President's Medal, changes in the academic calendar, and campus definition.

According to Mike, the tri-campus issues will play an important role in joint-governance with Seattle. Here, the most immediate issues are faculty concerns regarding tenure and promotion. He said that some adjustments were needed to the T&P process. He mentioned that he had initially set up the process, revised it, and now he believes he will have to revise the revision. There were several issues that demanded further scrutiny. For example, what is the role of the

Review Committee and how external reviewers were selected. In the early years there was some uncertainty and insecurity regarding outside reviewers' ability to understand the UWT context, but new experience has shown that this is generally not a problem if the letter sent them clearly explains our situation

Mike said that faculty would be well served by a strengthened process that would inspire more trust as T&P cases proceed up the line of administrative review. No doubt there are systemic weaknesses in the present arrangements for review committees and soliciting outside reviews. Especially for cases that require some judgment calls, as opposed to the solid T&P cases, it is in the faculty's interest to have a strong process in which positive as well as negative points of evaluation will carry due weight. The mentoring role of the committee, and a plurality of candidate-selected outside reviewers actually dilutes the weight of positive evaluations. A committee will work on revising this process and present their proposals for faculty review and discussion before presenting an amended draft for a vote at a full Faculty Assembly meeting. It is imperative that concerned faculty voice their views on this.

With respect to the timeline for T&P, Jack wants a decision by Winter, so we could vote on it at our last meeting this quarter or first meeting of the Winter quarter. This will be a handbook change, which the President must sign.

On the weighty subject of teaching evaluations, there were a number of issues that seemed to create uncertainty. For example, it appeared that the teaching evaluation forms are not mandatory, they were not valid instruments of measuring good teaching, and so on. So what were the options? Alternatives seem to take too much time to implement.

Jack Nelson pointed out that according to Steve Olswang, Vice Provost, all teaching evaluations must be submitted for T&P. Evidently some clarification will have to be sought on this legal matter with the assistance of Steve Olswang, representing the university administration and Lea Vaughn representing the faculty.

The final T&P issue was service. In the handbook service is item number three after teaching and research, in that order. It is of course an illusion that service needs are declining with growth of the campus, in fact they are increasing. The question remains how to give service the weight it actually has on this campus. If we cannot write such "weight" into the Handbook guidelines, an alternative route might be in the way we frame the director-faculty consultation that takes place annually. The service component could be incorporated with explicit weight in the annual plan worked out between junior faculty and their director, and this will provide a written record to be recognized accordingly in the T&P process. Certainly there are some cases where service should be taken into greater account.

7. Mike Kalton mentioned impending changes in committee structure based on the recent Rose Report, where Norm Rose, former Dean and Chancellor of UW Bothell, recommended restructuring the Council System at the University of Washington. According to Mike, UWT could follow in letter and spirit the recommendations offered. The report proposes eliminating

overlapping committees set up by both administration and faculty. We will need to look into this proposal as well as part of our Faculty Assembly deliberations in the coming months.

8. The final point raised by Mike Kalton was his utmost desire to promote wholesome, faculty life. He stressed that this campus lacked any physical facility that brings faculty together to communicate and foster true collegiality. One of the distinctive features of this campus is the wealth of experience, knowledge, and unconventional viewpoints that faculty have brought to this campus. It is imperative that these faculty endowments be enriched further with such common facilities. Mike Kalton pledged to work very hard to bring this into fruition, even, as he admitted, that it could be several years before his wish actually materialized.

9. Deirdre Raynor of IAS thanked Mike Kalton for taking up the Faculty Assembly leadership. A round of applause followed.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:12 pm.

**PLEASE MARK YOUR CALENDARS: Upcoming Meetings**

Faculty Assembly Meeting: December 11, 2002 (Wednesday): 12:45-2:15 Tacoma Room

Submitted by:

Anthony P. D'Costa

Vice Chair, Faculty Assembly