**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC)**

**Meeting Minutes**

Friday, 04/19/2024, 12:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
GWP 320/Zoom

***Present:*** *Chair Huatong Sun, APCC Chair Julie Masura, APT Co-Chair Matthew Weinstein, APT Co-Chair Christine Stevens, FAC Chair Sharon Laing, Kurt Hatch, Monika Sobolewska, Zhiquan (Andy) Shu, Barb Toews, Andrea Hill, Robin Evans-Agnew, Rupinder Jindal (via phone), Gary Viers, Julia Eaton, Jenny Xiao, Alex Miller, Margaret Griesse, Ruben Casas, EVCAA Andy Harris, Erika Bailey.* ***Excused:*** *Past Chair Menaka Abraham, Davon Woodard, Mary Hanneman, Vice Chair Anne Taufen.* ***Guests:*** *Jie Sheng (APT Taskforce Member), Michelle Garner (APT Taskforce Member), Sarah Davies Breen (Director of Faculty Affairs and Academic Human Resources)* ***Absent:*** *Sushil Oswal* ***Program Coordinator:*** *Andrew Seibert*

1. **Opening:**
   * **Land Acknowledgement, Consent to Agenda, Meeting Minutes, Permission to Record, Approval of Meeting Minutes from 4/08/2024.**
     + The Program Coordinator read the Land Acknowledgement. The agenda was consented as written. Permissions to record for minutes purposes only were granted with no objections. The Executive Council minutes for April 8th were approved with no edits.
2. **Updates & Conversation**
   * **Faculty Assembly Ground Rules and meeting goals**
     + The Faculty Assembly Chair reviewed the Ground Rules document approved at the start of the 2023-24 academic year.
       - Rules of interest
         * Once you have spoken, stop speaking so others may have an opportunity.
         * We value deliberation and dissent, and we expect each member will treat others with dignity and respect even during heated debates.
     + Process and Timelines:
       - Steps 1-3 (Planned time April 2024)
         * Gathering faculty feedback through the Draft report and bylaws revisions
         * Executive Council reviews the documents and votes when finalized
         * Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Academic Human Resources provides feedback to the documents

Feedback from the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will be shared today verbally and in written communication to Executive Council.

* + - * Steps 4 and 5 (Planned time May 2024)
        + UW faculty code advisor reviews the approved documents and changes.
        + *UW Seattle Office of Academic Personnel and Office of the Provost will review the documents and changes*
      * Step 6: Full faculty at large vote (end of May 2024)
      * This project is a shared governance project. The Chair provided a document around information on the Shared governance structure.
      * The bylaw amendments need to be motioned on and voted on by the executive council before moving to the faculty at-large.
      * The Chair reviewed how the APT Bylaw Revision project progressed to the review process during the Academic Year 2023-2024, and how as a faculty body can be together, even with differences.
  + **Tenure-track faculty listening session debriefing: Faculty Assembly Chair**
    - Communication is important for legislative success. Goals of the listening session
      * Clarifying confusion around the project deliverables
      * Collecting feedback from tenure-track faculty
      * Exploring the next steps as a faculty body
    - 30 Faculty participated in this event. Guests included APT Taskforce members, Executive Council representatives, Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Director of Faculty Affairs and Academic Human Resources.
    - An anonymous form of questions and comments were shared from this meeting
    - Next steps:
      * A non-tenure track faculty listening session has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 24, 12:30-1:30 PM
        + Secretary of the Faculty Mike Townsend will be attending as a guest, along with the EVCAA, Director of Faculty Affairs and Academic Human Resources, APT Taskforce members, and Gautham Reddy.
  + **Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs response to the APT Taskforce Report**
    - A motion was proposed to move this Agenda item last and seconded.
      * Discussion ensued
        + Votes: 4 yes, 8 no, 5 abstentions
    - EVCAA shared recommendations. Please see Appendix A for the written and in-person feedback given

1. **Discussion about APT Taskforce Report and Bylaw Amendment Proposal**
   * + Current status of the deliverables
       - APT Taskforce diligently worked on this first draft during the winter quarter and on the Easter weekend.
       - The project was designed as a collective process between the EC and the APT Taskforce. Being an initial draft, the current draft was not intended to be circulated outside of the EC. Revision is expected.
     + It was clarified that advisory votes cast by APT committee members of the teaching faculty intended to be equal.
     + Question was raised why there was not a clear procedure outlined concerning how the vote would happen
       - Taskforce response: As part of the legislative writing, faculty code and bylaws are principles based to provide room for changes over the years. It was intentional not to provide clear procedures. The details need to be sorted out by the Executive Council and the APT committee. In addition, there was not enough time for the taskforce to develop procedures on a crunch schedule.

* An EC Rep expressed disagreement with the Taskforce that the report portrayed teaching track faculty as a group of vulnerable faculty who need to be protected.
* Benchmarks language for Teaching Faculty: The general focus of Faculty Code on “either teaching or research” is not reflected in the proposed benchmark language.
  + - * This is not reflected in the bylaws amendments. EVCAA stated it is a way to expand on items considered in a file.
    - Recommended to include racial and gender demographic data of full-time teaching track faculty from National Center for Education Statistics. Taskforce responded that they were not able to find it and requested to share the link. EVCAA states that local demographic data is available in the BI-portal.
    - EC Reps requested to remove the sentence that not all teaching-track faculty have terminal degrees because faculty with master’s degrees mentor tenure track professors and make evaluations and serve on master’s and Ph. D committees.
      * Taskforce Response: It is a fact-based description of one sentence in a report of 10 pages. And a major issue this report tried to address is “how do we implement and enforce a predictably just and equitable process and address implicit systemic bias?” As we look at the difference between tenure-track and non-tenure track, we should also see the intersectional issues such as gender, race, and other factors. People who don’t have direct experiences with tenure review might not be able to read through subtle languages between multiple layers of the reviews to discern biases.
    - Discussion ensued whether the membership of APT should be based on degree titles which put teaching faculty in disadvantageous positions.
      * Multiple EC Reps provided cases of the tremendous values teaching faculty have provided to our campus and to their career lives. One EC Rep of teaching faculty member acknowledged that not all tenure-track faculty might think in the same way.
      * APT co-chair observed from the reading of the P&T files that teaching track faculty faced much different requirements across the units in a materially different work situation from tenure-track faculty. While teaching track faculty know more about their work world, they need to be prepared for enormous variability in comparison with the tenure-track faculty.
      * EC Rep pointed out that there is not a clear standardized criteria for assessing teaching faculty, which creates problems for the campus, pitting faculty track against each other unfortunately.
  + Code conflict issue in 2022 vote: Question was asked to clarify about code violation in 2023 faculty vote in the Intro of the Recommendation Report. EVCAA described two points
    - * Point 1: APT review needs to be substantive, not just procedural only.
      * Point 2: Opportunity for extra layer of response, which is not at the code at this time, however this could be in the future. EVCAA recommends removing layer of responses until it is on the code.
    - Chair called EC to do diligent work this time as the first code violation was reviewed multiple times at EC in two consecutive years.
      * At the [EC meeting of 5/28/2021](https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/2021-09/executive-council-special-meeting-minutes-05_28_2021_approved.docx), EC voted that the APT review cannot be procedural.
      * At the [EC meeting of 6/7/2021](https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/2021-09/ec-060721_minutes_approved.docx), EC reinforced the previous EC decision with a dominant yes vote.
      * At the [EC meeting of 6/6/2022](https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/2022-09/EC_06062022_Minutes_APPROVED.docx), EC cast a unanimous yes vote for removing the word substantive, and the dominant yes for approving the amendment of doing procedural review.
  + Next Step
    - EC Rep recommended the Taskforce take the advisory suggestions uttered at the meeting to revise the report, calling to be more sensitive about the divisiveness of the language, not the intent.
    - There will be a revised draft sent to the Executive Council, and it is requested to not distribute the document until finalized
      * EC Rep recommended adding language regarding not circulating the document.

1. **Adjournment**

* The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.
  + Next meeting: May13, 2024, Zoom.

**Appendix A: EVCAA Feedback on the 2023-24 APT Taskforce**

EVCAA feedback on the 2023-2024 APT Task Force Report and by-law proposals

Shared at Faculty Assembly Executive Council meeting, April 19, 2024

Andrew Harris, EVCAA

I thank the APT task force for their diligence and work on this, and Faculty Assembly Executive Council for the time to provide further input. While the report and by-laws cover many points, I am only going to refer here to elements of the report that impact the by-laws directly or impact future steps directly.

1. From the report, top of p.5: “For the increasing number of teaching track faculty review cases, we recommend including teaching faculty higher in rank who have promotion experience, full teaching professor preferred, serving on the APT committee to review teaching track faculty files only.” I recommend that “higher in rank” be specifically articulated in the by-laws as specific rank or ranks.
2. From the report, top of p.5, and by-laws: “Three seats of teaching-track full-time faculty from at least two units, should be elected across campus, by the teaching faculty, each as a committee member-at-large, to provide input and review teaching faculty’s files as advisory votes.” I recommend removing the phrase “advisory votes,” as all APT votes are advisory. Furthermore, I assume that the spirit of this proposal is that teaching-track members of the committee voting on teaching-track files should be weighted the same as tenure-track faculty (if that assumption is not accurate, I recommend this be discussed further to clarify).
3. This also raises a larger question about APT composition in general. From the report, bottom of p.5: “All units are required to send a representative to serve on the APT, even in a year when they have no cases to be reviewed.” I suggest reconsideration of this point. Smaller units without faculty going up for review should be given the option of opting out of participation in a major service commitment. We have units with 11 faculty and units with 55 and units with 125, and to expect the same service from each of them is a significant equity concern and practical challenge for the smaller units.

If teaching-track faculty can participate based on this distribution model, does this open a space for considering different models for tenure-track faculty as well? If you want 7 tenure-track faculty on a committee, for instance, you could have an open call and require that they be from at least four schools with no more than three people from one school, or other variations on this. There are ways to allow for larger schools to provide more people and smaller schools to provide fewer.

1. From the report, p.6: “We urge EVCAA and AHR to reissue a new guidance document concerning all levels of reviews in Tacoma campus at its earliest convenience, as being planned by the EVCAA and Director of AHR.” I agree and commit to working on this, with the Director of AHR, and in consultation and collaboration with Faculty Assembly leadership.
2. The by-law proposals see the APT committee ensuring consistency across school criteria. I agree with this in application of those criteria, but ask if it should be a separate body, perhaps the Faculty Affairs Committee, that ensures the consistency of the criteria themselves. The report recommended updating annually and then reviewing substantially every 3-5 years; I recommend these be updated every 5-7 years, and not annually, except as requested by units specifically. Updating more frequently creates a confusing and shifting set of guidelines for faculty applying for tenure and promotion.
3. From the report, p.7: clarifying scholarship for teaching track faculty. The code language in the first bullet is partial, and its partiality is worth noting. Code’s expectation (24-34.A.3) is that promotion to the highest rank for all faculty—tenure-track and teaching-track—requires “outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and/or accomplishments in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.” It is up to the schools to define what that looks like.
4. While it was not mentioned in the current report, the 2022 Task Force also recommended that the APT and the EVCAA should regularly conduct a comparative review of each unit’s promotion criteria to ensure consistency of school criteria with any campus-level published criteria and the UW Faculty Code. I would recommend that the EVCAA and a body of Faculty Assembly (whether APT or the Faculty Affairs Committee) do this work to norm criteria expectations across academic units and across ranks at a high level.
5. From the by-laws, 1.c: candidates are allowed right of response to APT review. While I agree with this in principle, I believe it is currently in contradiction to Faculty Code and I recommend waiting until Faculty Code revisions work their way through Faculty Senate legislation before bringing this element in. Either Code will be changed and we will all do this, or it won’t be changed and we cannot do it even if we want to.