Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes
October 7th, 2015   12:30-1:25pm   CP 206C

Present: *Julia Aguirre; Juliet Cao; Bill Kunz; Marcie Lazzari; Huatong Sun; Lauren Montgomery; Jim Gawel; Ellen Moore; Ji-Hyun Ahn; Jutta Heller; Mark Pendras; Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee; Alissa Ackerman; Denise Drevdahl; Gregory Rose; Chuck Costarella; Nita McKinley;*
Absent: *Mark Pagano; Matt Kelley.*

1) Consent Agenda
The September 21st, 2015 Executive Council meeting minutes were accepted.
2) VCAA Report
Presentation: Passed out a data sheet of daily student headcount by class. This is a discussion that we are going to have over the course of the quarter and the year that I want to make you aware of. It stems from a discussion recently, where, at that time our growth was 1.1%, not the 4% that we were expecting and budgeting on. Since then some increase, about 2.9-3%. Note: The T-core and freshman numbers are combined and therefore bigger. Graduate student numbers are slowly increasing. But the junior number, when we have many transfer students, is flat, no growth. This raises questions. At the Cabinet meeting, we discussed how we haven't planned for growth and enrollment. Chancellor Freidman previously laid out plan for 7,000 students in 7 years. We backed off from this plan. But that was also based on growing at the same rates. That might not be realistic. There may be opportunities for growth in different areas. The next step is to do a projection of growth in the different schools and programs. We haven't done that yet and we need to. We need to look at where we can grow and where will we not grow but stay at a particular level. This will involve faculty in a very real way, at this level in discussion, but also at program level. I wanted to get these new numbers before you as soon as possible. We want to lay out a strategy of how we can work on this moving forward. Clarification: T-core students are freshman entering with less than 45 credits; a freshman enters with 45+ credits; only the students taking T-core are freshman below certain number of credit hours.
3) EVCAA Search Update – Nita McKinley
Presentation/ Discussion: Reported out candidate schedule (also found on the meeting agenda).
- The questions for Faculty Forum and Executive Council Lunch have been conveyed to the candidates.
- The forums will be filmed and then posted on the EVCCA Search website page; CV's will be posted, though some candidates prefer to stay anonymous.
- There will be opportunity for feedback on each candidate via an anonymous catalyst survey.
- It will be open for 24 hours after the last candidate visits.
- Please encourage others to give their feedback.
- These are interesting candidates.
- Please question them closely and get them to want to come back to campus (i.e. be friendly and polite while questioning thoroughly).
- Committee thanked Nita commenting that everything is very organized and in place. Nita, in turn, gave kudos to Alina Solano in the Chancellor's Office for the organization of these visits.
4) Office of International Programs
Presentation/ Discussion: Committee had previously circulated and reviewed *OIP Restructure Proposal* (Appendix A).

- Two consultants are being brought to campus by the Chancellor in November. We want to keep moving forward during this interim period.
- The OIP Restructure Proposal came out of an small, independent group of faculty, not APCC, to clarify.
- The *OIP Restructure Proposal* was sent to the consultants as a draft and this draft is one of many considerations, i.e. study abroad issues, administrative efficiency, safety.
- Question: would it be valuable to have a group/committee on OIP? If so, we would need to considered their workload and see that they were properly compensated for their work.
- OIP has a representative on the Global Council – there is overlap.
- How will OIP be connected with the Institute of Global Engagement, International Student Services, and the Global Honor's Program?
- Does it make sense to have three areas or to consolidate?
- Communication hasn't been very good between the three groups.
- The groups serve different student populations.
- The Global Honors program is hoping to design a gateway course for freshman and sophomores in order to expand their enrollment in the program (which allows juniors and seniors to join.)

Action: What do we do moving forward? Don't really have an answer – that's why we have consultants. Many issues. More opportunity to discuss with consultants.

5) Chair's Report and Discussion Items

a) Brief Comments on EC Member's Roles /Responsibilities

Presentation/ Discussion: Communication to your units is key. Take from this meeting back to your program meetings and vice versa. Suggested to get yourself on the agenda for every meeting, even if there isn't always anything to report. That way, the opportunity to communicate from this body to the unit and from the unit to EC, is built in. Question: which level are we a voice to? Answer: to your unit, and then up. Schedules are challenging; many EC members teach before and after the Wednesday meetings.

Action: We will make a survey for better time slots.

b) Faculty Assembly Retreat Feedback

Presentation/ Discussion: Committee had previously circulated and reviewed *Faculty Assembly Retreat Feedback* (Appendix B).

- As an EC member, please attend all Faculty Assembly meetings.
- The feedback was a lot like course evaluations; different people liked and didn't like the same thing.
- A major theme: faculty need to have a place to discuss important issues in depth.
- Originally, not thinking about the new faculty that would attend. We need to consider the new faculty attending these meetings.
- We need to have meaningful discussions, but there is the issue of time.
- Wished to have more discussion about working together; relationships between different groups and bodies.
- Suggested to work in groups on issues to move forward. We could structure the January meeting that way.
- The "report-out" structure feels like a business meeting; not sure how to eliminate reports. How do we get the information out?
- Post information to a site. It's there for people to go and review. Though that may not always work for the first meeting of the year.
- Ask unit representatives from EC to make sure that units know what information is available and where to find it.
- Question: What did you come away with from Tony Perone's time?

- Answers: the improv session was too long and could have been done differently.
- It was more comic than actually getting into substantive issues.
- Things were touched on, but not grappled with.
- It made me, and the things important to me, feel discounted. Tony was not responsible for this; his charge was not clear enough.
- We could truly use theater to engage with tough issues; have it not be superficial, but taken seriously.
- During the call for improve "items" we should have been thinking about how to listen to all voices.

Action: Get feedback from EC at the end of the academic year to plan the first FA meeting of the next academic year. Also, discuss upcoming Winter FA meeting with EC members for agenda input.

a) **Diversity Conversations and the Black Student Union Demands**

Discussion: Committee had previously circulated and reviewed *Black Student Union Demands, 2015*(Appendix C).

- We have been silent as far as responding positively and substantively to the BSU demands.
- We should take these demands back to the units and ask: how can we address these?
- We need to ask ourselves and our colleagues: how can we respond and move forward?
- These demands were put out in February 2015 – they should have been on the EC agenda then. Now, requesting that EC does something.
- The demands were originally sent to Chancellor Keyon Chan. But then Chancellor Pagano met with the BSU.
- Question: how do we compare to peer-schools in diversity and retention?
- We need to have more data on each department's demographics and diversity in hiring.
- Sharon Parker, Assistant Chancellor of Equity and Diversity, has asked units to provide data on such, but has had trouble getting it. Why is it hard to find this data on campus?
- We need to also look at diversity across ranks.
- Students need and want faculty who they can identify with. They don't feel represented. The faculty should reflect the student body.
- Upper level students see their peers of color drop out early in college.
- The retention rate of African American students is far lower than the overall retention rate.
- Question: We ask for more information, but then what do we do with it?
- Let's respond. Why aren't we as diverse as we would like to be?
- A recent search in Education invited 13 candidates to interview and 12 of them were white.
- It's problematic when we don't identify our biases and assess our searches for bias.
- There was a hiring agency that claimed to be good at diversity hiring, but turned out to not be. Administration need to check agencies to evaluate how good they actually are at doing diverse hiring searches.
- EC should put into writing that we will commit to responding to the BSU demands by the end of the 2015-2016 academic year. EC should make it a charge for this year with action items for how we will respond to the BSU.
- Consideration of giving people time to respond and also considering the diverse needs of all students. Take a more inclusive approach.
- Do we need more time to just make a commitment that we will respond? EC needs to respond on behalf of the faculty.
- We should send them a response saying that we will take their demands seriously and will present actionable items for the year. A response is a way of being respectful.
- Inclusive approach ideas: new faculty orientation should have a 3 hour workshop on inclusive classrooms.

- Broader idea of diversity; even take proactive measures, for example, on behalf of the Queer community.

Action: The VCAA will work on getting requested data and Sharon Parker is meeting with departments. There is now mandatory bias training for all people involved in hiring searches. Marcie and Mark will draft a letter to the BSU and bring it to the next meeting for feedback. Chancellor Pagano will be at the next meeting and we can also ask him then about the response to the BSU demands. He will be with us for an hour so there will be time for a conversational dialogue. Next meeting EC can motion and vote on the drafted response to the BSU.

b) **Update on Faculty Affairs Chair and Charge**

Presentation: There is someone who has volunteered to chair FAC. The diversity issues can also come under the charge they take up this year.

6) Adjourn

Julia Aguirre motioned to adjourn. Mark Pendras seconded. Meeting adjourned.

Appendix A

To: Bill Kunz, VCAA & Marcie Lazzari, EC Chair
From: Kim Davenport, Tracey Norris, Lauren Montgomery
Re: Office of International Programs Re-Structuring
Date: 9/14/15

With the recent departure of director Buck Banks there is a need to find new leadership for the Office of International Programs (OIP) at UWT. Recognizing the opportunity for a re-structuring we have some ideas to share in the interest of beginning a conversation. Since the OIP delivers academic curricula it falls under faculty purview and we are directing these preliminary ideas to both EC and Academic Administration.

The OIP has been operating successfully for years and delivering excellent academic programs to students in contexts throughout the world. It has been structured with a director, one paid full time staff member, an informal advisory board, and recently some part time student workers. While this structure has functioned reasonably well in the past, there are ways it could be improved. There is also a need for the development of clear, written policies on a number of issues, the presence of which, would make the work of OIP much less challenging. We have some suggestions toward both of these, offered in the spirit of beginning a collaborative conversation.

Structure

While a single director has worked in some ways, that authority structure does not allow for voices from all the academic units on our campus. An alternative would be to structure OIP as a committee, (either of EC, or a VCAA committee for example) with a representative from each unit who chooses to send one. The committee responsibility might include things like: overseeing the general functioning of the OIP, reviewing new program proposals, creating policy documents, overseeing the budget and the reserve funds, developing, reviewing and awarding faculty grants and student study abroad scholarships, and mentoring faculty in the development of new programs. The committee might have a rotating chair, elected from the membership, whose responsibilities might include: coordinate the work with the staff, create agendas, lead meetings and draft the policy statements the committee creates, for approval by other campus curricular bodies. The

committee chair might receive a course release or stipend for their service, and the committee members might be able to use the work to fulfill their service obligations.

This structure achieves several objectives: 1) It brings the voices of all concerned units with equal voting rights to the oversight of OIP. 2) It brings the OIP in closer contact to the academic units and hopefully also to their curricular processes, as well as those at the campus level. 3) It reduces the operating cost to the university. Previously, the director was given 2 course releases and a stipend, but with the work shared by a committee, this could be reduced to a single course release for the chair or coordinator.

Policy

The OIP has operated somewhat informally in the past, and now that the university is larger and serving more students and faculty members it is important to formalize some of the policies with written documents. A few of these include: 1) a policy on faculty salaries and per diem in study abroad program budgets that aligns with established university salaries. (Currently there is no policy on salary which has been problematic at times) 2) a policy for changes to an approved program budget (currently there is no clear policy and bids for changes to approved budgets have to be handled individually). 3) a policy for student evaluations at the end of each program. 4) a policy for unit and/or campus level curricular review of new programs. There may be other policy needs but these are currently pressing.

We hope a fruitful conversation can begin this Fall and that the OIP will soon be well constituted to serve the adventurous students who partake of this wonderful educational and experiential opportunity.

Appendix B
POST FA RETREAT SURVEY FEEDBACK 2015
Please share any positive aspects of the retreat from your perspective.

Union information and invitation to talk with faculty was positive. I am glad we have representation on strategic planning.
Being with colleagues, open dialog, lots of new people! People liked the space. Tony's part was fun (although see below).
Meeting faculty
It was nice to talk with others to more formally kick off the new year. The meeting space was wonderful, too! I very much appreciated the bit of levity and interaction added that focused on us as teachers and our relationships with the university.
Everything was very well-organized & the updates were helpful. It was clear that a great deal of care went into planning the day. Thank you.
Got to meet faculty in other departments. Lunch was great.
Meeting others as I am new
Good to connect with some faculty I rarely see.
Stayed on topic and kept on time. Good to get updates. I was surprised that the Chancellor did not have more time. Perhaps because a lot is still in the process of being formulated?

In a new location.
Pace was good.
Food was good.
I like the improv method to summarize the work. Clever and gels the topics in my brain.
Nice accolades for Nita.

Networking with colleagues. Authenticity of all presenters. Participation.

Seeing all of the new faculty members is a real plus.

I enjoyed meeting new and old colleagues from different programs.

It was a good length (not too long!) with a positive and joyful attitude.

I enjoyed Tony Perone's session. Plus, lunch was superb!

Everything was kept on time! This was a great improvement over other faculty events this month.

Casual table discussions, especially with new colleagues. Tony's hour of skits, etc.
Presentations about what faculty assembly has worked on and plans to work on. I'm feeling that the faculty was heard clearly and fairly on the positives and negatives of the time matrix. This is an important issues.

I'm glad we addressed the fact that attendance is abysmal, especially when it comes to senior faculty. It's good to initiate that conversation. I found Tony's improv activity to be helpful, too.

Hearing from a variety of folks about initiatives across campus. Meeting new colleagues.

The retreat is a great way to begin the new year and introduce new faculty. The presentation on faculty organizing was instructive.

Nice welcome to new faculty. Ended an a serious yet humorous upbeat note.

I interacted with faculty from all around campus. I got to meet our executive council.

I really appreciated the session led by Tony Perone. I think we should schedule something like that again in the future, but maybe not for as long (maybe only 45 mins?)
Also: lunch was really good :)

Positive energy, good overview for new folks and a reminder for those who have been here a while. I liked the new activity to get us to express in non-verbal ways conditions at UWT. Perhaps we could devote 10 minutes at every Faculty Assembly meeting to something like this.

I liked meeting new people and trying the improv activities that Tony organized for us.

Creative. Moved quickly. good energy.

Meeting new faculty. :)
Hearing what was going on.

The final exercise coordinated by the improvisationalist was enjoyable. I think it loosened up the tension in the room.

It was helpful to hear about the work of the Faculty Assembly as a new Assistant Professor at UWT. Overall I found the information very useful. It was definitely helpful to get a general understanding of faculty concerns and involvement.

Please share any negative aspects of the retreat from your perspective.

Framing of Mark as the pessimist was problematic. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor reports did nothing to facilitate shared governance or vision. The improv session was a complete waste of time. While the intent might have been to discuss "new possibilities" there was no opportunities to actually discuss the "skits" and themes that were done.

We spend a lot of time fretting about the role of faculty governance at UW Tacoma, but less time talking about action to do something about it. It would have been great if we could have channeled the conversation into action. Maybe some sort of pledge?

I'm not sure what the take-away was from that session. I left feeling pretty positive, but it's hard when there's so little buy-in from faculty to attend.

Discussions about faculty governance were very abstract and could have been more informative and transparent. For example, was the objective to have people sign up to serve or just for us to know what was accomplished by the various committees this year? I think the latter objective was achieved, not sure about the former.

Not enough seasoned faculty

Limited interaction with faculty...and no way to get to know other faculty. Would have been nice to have a way to connect with faculty - particularly new faculty.

Also: what was the point of having the chancellor there? He didn't have anything to say. Or the vice chancellor - they just wasted time. We dont need them there.

I liked parts of the improvisation and parts I did not feel worked, like asking volunteers to speak using a language they made up on the spot. The last part with the chorus was good.

Acoustics in that room were very difficult. Even folks w/mic couldn't be heard if they didn't hold it up. Those without mic couldn't be heard at all.

Pole in the middle of the room not good.

None except not well attended by not new faculty.

I am not in favor of retreats that just become another kind of business meeting, with various people getting up and providing "information" (except for the FA chair providing a review of the last year, which is a good way to start).

See below for my comments on suggestions for future retreats.

None.

I know that you can never be sure who will attend, but a seating chart that makes sure different programs mix it up would be good. I felt like we remained siloed in our programs for the table discussions.

It seems that much of what was covered could have been covered more efficiently in another format/venue.

It was not at all clear what the point of the improv session was, other than building a sense of camaraderie.

Low attendance, especially for senior faculty. About half of the attendees were new faculty; what kind of message does this send them?

The timing and pacing was unfortunate. The key presentations felt rushed with little time for thoughtful engagement with campus leadership and little time to review major priorities and issues facing the campus.

As always, hard to get the continuing faculty out and engaged.

I wish he was gotten some work done while we were all there.

None, really.

Some possible suggestions: the group improv activity was good, but perhaps it took a little more time than it could/should have.

I would like to have seen a list of the important issues that Faculty Assembly will be tackling so that we can all be aware of them when they come up or when we need to vote on them.

There were no negatives for me.

Sad that so few "old" faculty came.

The inclusion activity that started off the diversity discussion was powerful and I wish it had been done in way that allowed people to feel safer. I know there was no intention to make people feel unsafe. In fact, I have done this activity before, so I knew the intention behind it. The unexpected consequence of the activity was that I realized how unsafe I feel to be completely open in a work environment about all of the facets of myself.

There were already suggestions in the discussion about clickers or other options to make this a safer activity.

As we go forward with more diversity (or inclusion work), I hope that we can find a way to give people a safe space to voice ideas. Our group discussion reminded me how hard it is to talk about these issues and we need to talk about them.

I appreciate thinking about different ways of processing and learning, and at the same time I hope it is recognized that not everyone enjoys volunteering for an activity. In some ways I felt there was some subtle pressure to volunteer and that was somewhat uncomfortable as someone who does not enjoy participating in that way. Also, as someone from a "diverse" community that often is subject to mocking regarding language, I wish that the one activity did not include making up a language. This is an activity I have seen used before and it often veers into territory in which languages that are "unfamiliar" to the dominant majority are presented as humorous or silly rather than as a viable form of communication. In the future I suggest not using that activity in case it inadvertently offends those who are not from communities where English is the home language.

Please share any concerns that you have regarding the retreat.

When will we ever move beyond reporting and start to discuss substantive issues related to growth, equity, institutional racism/sexism/ableism etc... How can we do things differently to make move the needle on the low morale and hostile climate that has been measured by the coach survey?

I want to make sure the new people are greeted with a positive message about how great this place is! When I started here, the lead of FA gave a rousing speech about the importance of governance, and my program chair gave a very clear talk about how participating in governance is part of my job. The expectation (and habit) was set early, and it has continued. The new people are excited and ready to go!

I understand having exec leadership there, but I think we should center faculty perspectives and have forums for interacting with admin later.

Not enough long time faculty attend.

None.

Retreats should be a time for faculty to voice their ideas and aspirations rather than a business meeting with an agenda. We need time to discuss a variety of subjects from the perspectives of the various members of faculty. That means faculty active participation (and I don't mean in structured exercises). The agenda of a retreat needs to be driven by faculty getting up and saying what is on their minds.

More in depth discussion about why so many faculty feel disenfranchised and how we can overcome burn out.

I remained concerned by the lack of engagement of seasoned faculty.

Low attendance.

It was distressing that new faculty represented such a high proportion of those in attendance. But given the composition of attendees it is unfortunate that there was no substantive discussion of issues of faculty engagement, more on shared governance, what it means to be an urban serving university, rising tensions related to the growing mismatch between our student demographic and our faculty demographic. Issues related to recruitment and retention or underrepresented minority students and faculty, the racially hostile campus culture and climate. The was an absence of substance to the retreat. It felt more like an attempt to sweep some inconvenient truths under the carpet.

None, but it would be good to get a higher level of attendance from returning faculty!

I agree that consistency on the EC members reporting out to programs on the activities of the EC and getting feedback to the EC from the programs is a problem. I think it is important that all EC members be aware that they are serving all faculty, and so informing the programs about an issue, regardless of how they personally stand on it, is important.

I had no concerns. It was done appropriately.

Please share any suggestions that you have for improvement of the Faculty Assembly retreat or future Faculty Assembly meetings.

We need to have some substantive discussions about racism on our campus. What is the faculty assembly's response to the Black Student Union demands? How can we collaboratively work to incorporate anti-racism pedagogy and other forms of inclusion excellence on our campus. The same issues keep coming up - persistence means we have yet to address key institutional issues that faculty have responsibility in perpetuating as well as changing. The problems persist, when are we going to collaborate to solve them?

Have at least one work session where we produce something together.

I suspect that you would increase attendance if you made sure that at each meeting there was something that interested a vast majority of the faculty, such as a great speaker, more improve, etc.

For me, faculty retreats represent a rare opportunity to leverage the collective brainpower in the room and to actually move on things. I would have liked to see more time for work - (just for example), we could spend 45 minutes at our tables or in small groups generating possible action items to address the question of how, as a campus, we can better recruit, support, and retain diverse faculty - action items which could then be immediately picked up following the retreat. Although the levity of the last hour was nice, the way that hour was spent represented a huge missed opportunity for me. I also think we could do updates much more quickly, or via email, to save time for work.

I also think we need to stop framing attendance at these events as low. We are becoming a big, diverse campus, and the fact that there were 100 or so people in that room is a major strength, not (to my way of thinking) a sign of "disengagement." I'm guessing that the Seattle campus would be THRILLED to get that proportion of faculty in one room. Any community mobilization initiative rests on the shoulders of a relatively small subset of stakeholders - let's leverage the commitment of the folks in the room, and recognize that even though a lot of "seasoned" folks were absent.... many were there.

Appreciated the interactive component. Also appreciated the information. Maybe mix it up a bit. I am a dialogue and deliberation guy so always appreciate more dialogic work in sessions.

More strategic use of our time together. Focus on getting to know each other and potentially how we might collaborate across disciplines. While I liked Tony's interactive session, that would have been a better intro. We basically raised heavy issues (such as how faculty felt their first day at work - which for some of us was deeply traumatic as we were verbally attacked by other colleagues) and then had

no space to actually talk about them.

Since a list of concerns from faculty was generated last year, have the chancellor and vice-chancellor go over those and give a response.

For retreats I would suggest a less organized (formal) format that allows many faculty to introduce ideas and concerns they have and then have open discussions. The format where different "officials" disseminate information (which could just as easily have been written up and distributed electronically!) causes faculty to become more passive listeners (not unlike students in lectures). Then when the speaker asks for questions only a few voices ever get heard. I would strongly urge the Chancellor and VCAA to approach faculty retreats (and possibly meetings) with a set of questions of their own directed at finding out what faculty are thinking rather than coming prepared to tell faculty how things are. It is strange that former academics in "leadership" positions rarely do this. I think they believe that they are the sources of information and it is their jobs to disburse it when, in fact, they should be looking for information coming from those being "led". In my opinion, real leaders use a more Socratic approach because they are truly interested in hearing what people are thinking about various topics. For example, the Chancellor might have asked people what they thought about the new title, executive VCAA, to elicit conversation. I believe that would have prompted a much broader discussion than just one person asking the question of him and him responding - end of conversation!

An important aspect of retreats is the space it creates for broader and deeper discussions and deliberations. The business meeting format does not allow this kind of space to develop.

I think it would do the faculty community a great deal of good if they can feel that they are participating in an open conversation about topics that are of interest to them. This can be done in both small groups and the larger group. There are several ways to handle the logistics. For example at the outset asking for suggested topic questions that might be of interest to others, then forming groups around those topics for discussion. I would suggest that the conversations should be allowed to take up most of the day (and go beyond lunch), with perhaps an afternoon summation presented to the whole group. The kinds of topics raised and the interest in participating in discussion would be useful information for the faculty leadership to formulate the year's agenda since it would reflect what faculty value more deeply.

IMHO!

Please feel free to share my comments with the Chancellor and VCAA and I am happy to have further conversations about these topics. George Mobus

More interactive, small discussions to offer support and recognition to faculty whose work has been invisible to others. A more intensive performance workshop that allows faculty to explore oppression & hierarchy (a la Theater of the Oppressed) as it plays in the classroom and in the university as a whole.

I appreciate what you do. I am amazed at what get accomplished by so few people. How do we get others involved in a real and engaged way?

It would have been useful to have an agenda before arriving, especially for new faculty members.

Help faculty to understand why shared governance is important and why they should participate.

Identify some of the real thorny issues our students and faculty face and be courageous enough to openly discuss them.

Using the time to get some collective sense-making or brainstorming in regards to key issues or problem we have to address done in smaller break out groups (e.g., use the time to collect some focus group data that might have been useful to the strategic planning group).

I would suggest assigning tables to attendees in order to mix up returning faculty with new faculty and various ranks of faculty from various programs. It is always nice to make new friends, but we are all creatures of habit and sit with those we know, unless forced to do otherwise.

I liked the updates about plans for the future, and the lunch was much appreciated too. thanks!

A stretch break every hour! Don't let the cats wonder, just encourage a stretch to help people stay focused, myself included. :)

Appendix C

University of Washington Tacoma: Demands of Black Students

Endorsed by: Black Student Union
#BlackLivesMatterUWT

The Black Student Union of the University of Washington Tacoma created this list in response to the Walkout on February 25th that was in accordance with the tri-campus effort to recognize #BlackLivesMatter. We as Black students on the University's campus are both underrepresented and underserved; we are concerned and frustrated with the community here on the University of Washington Tacoma's campus. This list of demands is being issued in solidarity with the recent efforts of the Race and Equity initiative by interim president Anna Marie Cauce on the Seattle campus. We request that the school begin to address our demands in order to show a true dedication to the recent Race and Equity Initiative and in support of the black student population on campus. We ask that by setting out terms for mutual cooperation by the administration, the effect brings about a positive impact on Black student's population growth and retention, and an increase in resources for supporting black students.

List of demands:

- We would like more representation of Black students on the campus. This can be done through greater emphasis on the retention of the present Black student population. Additional recruitment of black students is also necessary. The representation in student leadership would aid in the retention and fair representation of Black students because research shows that representation aids in the feeling of inclusion and equity for students.

- The lack of representation of Black faculty is evidently poor on campus as evidenced by the less than 2% black faculty at the University of Washington. If the campus were to increase representation of faculty it would affect classroom climate, having a greater ability to relate with students additional support who are underserved due to this inequity. The hiring practices of the UW Tacoma need adjustment and the search for Black, highly qualified candidates that can relate to the population of Black students is necessary. This can be further supported by the implementation of inclusion on hiring committees.

- The inconsistency and lack of programming that supports Black students is one of the reasons the UW Tacoma struggles to retain them, evidenced by the 58% retention rate of 2008 freshman and 28% retention rate of first generation black students the same year. The offices that set programming and provide support such as the DRC, academic advising, and the TLC fail to organize events, programs and/or practices that adequately address the needs of a diverse student population.

- Inclusion and Equity within the Diversity Resource Center. The student involvement over DRC staff hiring to reflect student population. This

includes increased student involvement on how DRC funds are spent including programs that support Black students.

- The Inclusion through coursework that treats every class as requiring a diverse element. Diversity requirement should not only persist within the credit requirement for select courses but within the class climate of every course. This means including readings and research from a diverse array of authors and academics.

- Diversity awareness and inclusion training for new faculty and staff. Black students on campus have experienced countless micro aggressions and unnecessary commentary from faculty and staff. The implementation of training would increase accountability for faculty and staff.

- Inclusive orientation that supports prospective black students. An example of this type of orientation is seen on UW Seattle's campus in the Office of Minority Affairs & Diversity. They host a purple and gold experience for African American, Asian American, Native American and Latino American students.

This list of demands is meant to provide clarity, vision and guidance for the requests of the Black students on the University of Washington Tacoma's campus. We recognize that the University has an obligation to the Black students and that we deserve equitable treatment in all matters of the university. The list of demands should be reviewed and taken action upon immediately. We the students expect administration to take concrete steps in acting upon these demands by the beginning of Autumn Quarter.