

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA**  
**Faculty Assembly (FA) Executive Council (EC)**  
**Thursday, October 20, 2011**  
**12:30 – 2:00 p.m.**  
**Minutes**

**Present: Zoe Barsness (Chair), Katie Baird (Vice Chair), Donald Chinn, Linda Dawson, Marjorie Dobratz, Charles Emlet, Debra Friedman, Diane Kinder, Marcie Lazzari, Nita McKinley, Beverly Naidus, Garth Novack, Peter Selkin, Larry Wear**

**Excused: Yonn Dierwechter, Mark Pendras, Tracy Thompson, Charles Williams, JW Harrington**

**1. Approval of minutes from October 11, 2011**

Approved with changes as noted by Barsness.

**2. Standing Committee Updates**

**Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) (Donald Chinn):**

Chinn reported decision to split FAC meetings into different times on different weeks to accommodate greater attendance due to faculty schedules.

In their most recent meeting they discussed issues/projects FAC Committee will work on for the next year such as:

- Child Care Issue – keep tabs on process and progress
- Research (Faculty) Report – talk to Chancellor about getting a report on how administration can support grant administration
- Invite VCAA or Chancellor to come to FAC meeting to share their vision and how research affects faculty workload

Barsness noted that Kelly Fitzgerald will be attending the October 21<sup>st</sup> FA Roundtable Retreat. Fitzgerald will attend to take notes on research and document obstacles perceived, strategies or tactics faculty have found productive and pass that information on to FAC.

Chinn indicated that Matt Weinstein's task on the FAC will be to do a follow-up on the research report now that we have broad views from faculty; Chinn suggested it might be fruitful to conduct semi-in-depth interviews with faculty who are fairly active in research.

Friedman indicated that she had had such conversations with faculty who are most productive from a sponsored research view; she will compare notes with FAC's findings when she meets with them.

A general discussion among EC members followed. Themes that emerged:

- Sponsored (infrastructure) and non-sponsored research - each needs to be studied as they may not have the same criteria or needs – or fit all faculty/disciplines.
- Faculty who do not fit into a traditional sponsored research model based on discipline, may be eligible for some sponsored research (e.g., lab research conducted by psychologists or management faculty); is there enough support for this kind of group?
- Those who haven't landed NIH funding may be group of very active scholars. It's hard to get NIH funding (only 7% acceptance rate); how might we better support this type of scholarship effort.

Chinn indicated several other possible FAC topics/issues to address this coming year:

- Introduce idea of stationary P & T criteria, when an assistant professor starts at UWT – and when they reach P & T preparation – so they won't find expectations have changed.
- Evaluation of teaching quality; alternatives to the top 4 on scantron.

**Academic Policy Committee (APC) (Nita McKinley):**

- They have set meeting schedule for the fall.
- Met on Monday, October 17.
- Voted to table the math changes for entry passed last year while coordinating math assessments with other groups on campus.
- Should APC be the quantitative literacy forum for these discussions?
- Is it the charge of APCs to facilitate decisions?

McKinley: The discussion was tabled pending how the new statway agreement works. APC is not clear if it is up to them to do more about this subject, until conversations about math across the curriculum have taken place by people who are in the math field.

- Statway what happens when students want to change majors?
- Quantitative Literacy – should there be a task force pulled together which would be the body that makes recommendations to APC regarding any proposed changes in regards to promoting quantitative literacy across the curriculum?

**Curriculum Committee (Katie Baird):**

Baird wants it noted that she thanks Jose for all of his support and patience in the transition. Baird also reported:

- They have had two meetings.
- Baird identified some concerns about the purview of this group.
- CC's interpretation of by-laws leads, but bylaws prescribed role for CC is very narrow. According to UWT bylaws, CC is responsible primarily to evaluate the merits of proposed courses.
- Currently going over course proposals that have been submitted.

Committee decisions taken:

- need to work on the process for submitting course proposals

- have a committee point person to review proposal before full committee votes; Baird reports the CC is sending proposals back for technical reasons which prolongs the process and causes challenges to the proposing unit.
- There is a need for CC to spend time on evaluating for merit only.

Barsness noted that Nicole Blair (who is not on the CC) has generously offered to do this help with an audit of “W” courses.

Baird indicated she appreciates the offer as CC needs to spend time doing other curriculum objectives such as: what sort of writing assignments are being done on campus and how are they serving to help students meeting our writing objectives.

A question arose as to whether course proposals go to APC and then CC for review.

Barsness provided an update on the chairship of curriculum committee. Janet Primomo offered to facilitate discussion of the issue at the most recent CC meeting. The ensuing discussion among CC members clarified that none of the faculty members on the CC was in a position to chair the committee, insufficient volunteers were available to adopt a co-chair solution, the members of the committee informed that adopting the solution of having Baird chair the committee with the approval of EC did not violate the faculty code. The CC voted unanimously to have Baird chair the CC for the coming academic year. All recognize this is a one year solution.

### **APT Committee: (Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure)**

Barsness reported that Yonn Dierwechter could not here today, but she had corresponded with him. He indicated to her that he and Emily Ignacio (former APT chair) will be meeting to review the following;

- Edits to P & T process made by the Secretary of the Faculty and Academic HR since the APT approved its changes to the UWT handbook and the VCAA website.
- When these minor edits are finished, APT will review and vote a final time, all relevant documents and websites at UWT will be updated to reflect final changes to these procedures.

### **3. Update on Service Opportunities**

Barsness reported the following

- Vote for the Strategic Budget Committee (SBC) At-large Faculty representative positions was our first contested election in some time. Of 159 voting faculty, 118 voted.
- Cheryl Greengrove and Tracy Thompson will be our new at large representatives on the SBC. Thompson will be completing a 2 year term and Greengrove a 3 year term in order to ensure a staggering of terms going forward. After each has completed her term, all future at-large faculty representative SBC terms will be 3 years.

- There is no one who can immediately fill our remaining vacant UW senator position, but Anne Wessels from Urban Studies will step forward as of Jan. 1.
- Still looking for volunteer for the Student Activities & Fees Committee (SAFC) to serve in ex officio role, Vanessa Tucker was filling the role, but is not able to continue.

Baird asked about the appropriateness of having a faculty serve on SAFC given the description of the faculty position on the committee. She asked if they are on the committee because in the past there were issues regarding allocation of monies, and code violation, and if so, is that a proper role for a faculty member?

Chancellor Friedman stated that a faculty member will not be responsible for whether SAFC is following allocation procedures or conforming to the requirements of the Washington Administrative Code. Cedric Howard and Ysabel Trinidad are aware of this and are ultimately responsible for providing this type of support to and oversight of the SAFC – per discussions with the Chancellor. Having a faculty person on the SAFC is primarily to help them think about the distribution of resources that is appropriate given student needs and the institutional context.

Barsness is to coordinate how and where a faculty member is a good fit.

Barsness then thanked the Chancellor for the recent personnel support from her office for FA during their transition period with no one staffing the Faculty Assembly.

#### **4. Chancellor's Updates:**

Chancellor Friedman reported the following:

##### **Institutional Research Department Changes:**

- There were 4 FTE for IR; two of them have left, Jim Posey and Eric Elkins, for positions outside UWT.
- This has been an opportunity to evaluate the department for future UWT needs
- Friedman stated Kelly Cadman and Michael Crosby have been sent to Seattle for further training because we need to plan for the future. While there, they will be evaluated by the head of IRP (Carol) at UWS for how to best utilize them, and how to best fill UWT needs. 4 FTE are too many for UWT. The current thinking is that Kelly and Michael may stay at UWS, and UWT will get an MOU. It's possible that Michael will come back to UWT and Kelly will stay at UWS. Currently, Michael is the 911 person for all faculty requests; Friedman is to be copied so she can help decide the priority level.
- Carol assumes the extra FTE, while enabling UWT to utilize the UWS system. Carol is a great benefit for UWT based on her experience.

At the next Executive Council meeting, Chancellor Friedman will give an update on how the IRP situation is falling into place.

### **Portland State Field Trip:**

Chancellor Friedman indicated that we need to be clear about what kind of institution we are. Our nearest peer is PSU, which is an urban serving university.

Friedman provided this specific definition:

- A university that is an anchor tenant of a revitalized downtown, always concerned with access, engaged in community development, engaged in economic development, community inspired research, which may extend out to the world at large.
- UWT leaders want to have conversations with their counterparts at PSU.
- Trip is scheduled for Friday, Dec. 2, to get a sense of benchmarking. Even though PSU is ahead of us in size, etc. Friedman indicated that she and President Wim Wiewel have been working together in an organization called Urban Serving Universities for the last five years.

Barsness indicated that Katie Baird, Marcie Lazzari and she have drafted several together questions for our faculty governance counterparts at PSU. She will send these around to others to see what they want the FA representatives want to learn from their counterparts at PSU.

Friedman stated the importance at this point of opening an important dialogue about our peers. She indicated that:

#### **UWB and UWS are not UWT's peers:**

- Size, different missions, and different ways of serving are just some of the areas of difference.
- In the area of operational issues UWB is a peer
- Not healthy for us to be unclear of who our peers are. Based on this, the Chancellor requested that Jim Posey do a study to find our peers – the ones UWT has been using and the ones who are urban center universities.
- He used a set of metrics: % of pell grants, size, financial aid, number of tenure track faculty, retention, and graduation as points of comparison.

Friedman stated that these are the places we need to benchmark. She welcomes input in identifying peers and comparison metrics.

Per Friedman: “Every academic unit is also doing the same thing. In about three month’s time, we will have a good list of peers. Why I think it is important: to make sure we are paying attention in a national context, and be curious about what is happening in other places where we have a quite similar mission. This is the purpose of the search for peer institutions.”

Q: With all those variables used, how do you determine what is the most important to determine a match.

Per Friedman: “There is no perfect UWT match, but I want to know we are in the ballpark in areas like: graduation rates, diversity, etc. And, where we are clearly not in the ballpark – why? I didn’t choose peers with a specific list – but instead looked at how we match up in a national way.”

Q: Are we looking for a Canadian counterpart?

Per Friedman: “Not currently, but if you have one let us know.”

A discussion followed regarding:

Question and observation from a faculty member: Will the peer search have an influence on the current process for determining peer groups for faculty/staff for the external P & T process? It seems ad hoc at present – but the process will have to pass the muster of the Provost Office, and their lens isn’t our lens.

Friedman agreed that it is currently an ad hoc process, and since there are program reviews currently taking place - she has been looking at the lists of external committees. She thinks there is a mismatch. The nature of the institutions the disciplinary peers come from reflects on UWT and she doesn’t think that it does the UWT faculty justice. Can’t do anything about those coming up this year, but does want to work on future external committees.

Barsness indicated that this is a dialogue that should be happening at a unit level and that the FA can help facilitate these discussions with faculty and departmental heads.

Friedman stated that the directors and dean are under expectation to have a list of peers for future discussion by January and to communicate these to faculty. And, faculty can help them by advancing ideas regarding the excellence we aspire to.

Barsness indicated she will share the list from Debra and suggested that we can do some brainstorming in the Executive Council and then report back to Chancellor Friedman.

Friedman requested EC members to share with her any suggestions or concerns they have.

**VCAS’s update (Chancellor Friedman):**

Per Friedman: “The VC for Administrative Services is leaving and I have verbal confirmation for a search committee that will be chaired by Marilyn Cox, Ysabel’s counterpart at UWB. There is a national search organization NACUBO that has a deep pool of qualified people for this type of position.”

Friedman stated that the new VCAS will need to have:

- Experience in public/private partnerships
- Diversifying the financial base of higher Education and to have demonstrated this

### **Additional item for the group from the Chancellor:**

Friedman stated that previously there was a division of labor between Chancellor and Vice Chancellor, and while there is still a division of labor, based solely on what makes the best sense, there is no division in the Chancellor's Office. "JW and I are a team. There will be no separation within the office."

### **5. UWT Bylaw Changes**

Barsness reported the following:

- Sent bylaw changes for review spring 2011.
- Some edits you received are responses to questions and copy editing requested by "Code Cops"
- Another impetus here is to document the reconceptualization of the Strategic Budget Committee in the official capacity of shared governance (see additions suggested and visible on pages 8 – 9 – under E.1)

Discussions followed:

Should VC for Enrollment Services be included as a member of the SBC?

- Per Chancellor Friedman: "Yes he should be included as an Ex Officio member."

Open item: student representation on the SBC. Have Friedman and ASUWT yet coordinated on this request?

- Per Friedman: "We have made the request to ASUWT to provide a representative to SBC."

Lazzari asked how academic unit director/dean representatives to SBC are chosen. How representation among the directors and deans occurs is currently not indicated – are they nominated or elected?

- Friedman responded they will decide among themselves.
- Barsness responded they are elected from among and by the administrative members of the academic council.

Per Barsness: "Before asking for a vote on accepting the bylaw revisions, is there any major issue that we have with charge, membership, or any other area? If so, this is a good time to bring it up."

Wear posed a question regarding hiring of full time lecturers vs. full time faculty and asked about the impact of there being more full-time lecturers than full-time faculty when unit faculty vote whether or not to hire a full-time lecturer.

Barsness suggested that Wear send an email to Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty, to ask whether such a proportional composition of an academic unit as he described is problematic in the hiring process for full-time lecturers. Barsness indicated that it is the Faculty Code which stipulates which faculty, by rank, have authority regarding such

hiring decision recommendation votes. She indicated it would be useful to ask the Secretary of the Faculty to clarify if this is something within our domain of authority to change so as to reflect our local circumstances or if it is dictated by the code in a universal way.

Emlet suggested that our circumstance is about 3 or 4 yrs old and primarily budget driven, and questions if this will this shift in staffing proportions will remain the norm.

Wear indicated that having more lecturers than faculty in a unit is still a question.

Friedman indicated that this is a national conversation and one worth having at UWT. She suggested developing an awareness of what is going on in other universities and having an academic conversation regarding the subject at a future date, rather than addressing the question as policy at this point.

Barsness suggested that this might be a question for Faculty Affairs to address and then a report back to the Executive Council.

- What are developments nationally?
- Common staffing strategies – what are the national developments in terms of proportions of faculty across the various ranks
- The impact upon students, the various staffing patterns – can be argued differently

Friedman responded:

- This is a question that should be asked during the visit at Portland State.
- This is an important topic.
- Is there any interest in making this a focus of next academic year, bringing in people who are knowledgeable about this area, and have them do workshops vs. having a quick report?

Barsness then brought the conversation back to the bylaws for approval

Comments from EC membership:

- Consistency in past chair and immediate year-chair usage
- No abbreviations
- Font changes – consistency

Barsness agreed to make these changes.

Baird: page 4

- Program chair and standing committee chairs comment

Baird: page 7: C.1

- Question regarding whether resources are adequate, is it our decision to decide?
- Budget vs. institutional language difference

Barsness response: “Each course proposal has to document that resources are in place before submitting a proposal. Should it be whether institutional resources are adequate to support delivery of the course?” This notation was agreed upon.

Baird: Vice chair question

- Remove that wording
- Change made.

Vote called for and bylaws were approved as amended.

Barsness: Final official agenda item: Gail Dubrow’s upcoming visit

## **6. Campus Dialogue on Interdisciplinarity (update by Chancellor Friedman)**

Friedman reported on consultant Gail Dubrow, Professor at University of Minnesota

Leadership Retreat topic in September:

- Interdisciplinarity has been the identity of UWT at its core, from the very beginning, and while it comes out as a defining piece, it isn’t clear what it means. We need to bring definition to the term and the institution. How do we stimulate the next conversation – by bringing in a national expert. Gail has had conversations with top institutions and how they deal with the question of Interdisciplinarity both intellectually and institutionally, and how to embed this in procedures and evaluation reports. There are two visits to UWT: once for IAS and the Leadership team (first visit to take place November 4th) and a second time in early in winter quarter.

Barsness: “This is possibly a relevant topic for Faculty Assembly for our January meeting. We have an opportunity to lay the groundwork with the facilitator and develop her understanding of us, broader issues of interdisciplinarity and our more specific issues regarding interdisciplinarity, and we can use this to inform the larger body when it meets to discuss the issue in January.”

Barsness asked how people felt about that idea? She indicated that Larry Knopp is gathering questions, concerns, and issues to provide to Gail as preparation to facilitate discussions on November 4. He welcomes any suggestions to shape this discussion.

Guidelines for Knopp to consider:

- Issues of identity, community, and common purpose in interdisciplinary context
- How to nurture a culture that values interdisciplinarity, develop leadership around it, and avoid vulcanization
- Consensus of identity
- Issue of once we understand our identity, how do we communicate it to external and internal constituency; explain it in a way that promotes the attractiveness and appeal, which they will use in understanding and interpreting our actions
- What are some issues around best practices

Per Emlet: “Is there a place in this conversation for the topic of barriers to implementation to occur? Such as co-teaching across the disciplines and the institutional or structural barriers that inhibit us from working together team teaching; workload, how does one get credit, etc.”

Baird indicated that IAS has more experience with interdisciplinarity, whereas other disciplines don't . Baird suggested that it may a lack of structure, as is the case in IAS, that may be prohibiting as well.

There was general agreement that more discussion needs to take place in this area.

Barsness suggested that since the EC meets again just before G. Dubrow's UWT consultation, we will take this issue up for discussion again the next EC meeting on November 2.

**Meeting adjourned 2PM.**

Minutes by Nan Geier, [njg3@u.washington.edu](mailto:njg3@u.washington.edu) .