

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes**

April 23, 2018 12:30-1:25pm GWP 320

***Present:*** *Lauren Montgomery, Leighann Chaffee, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Nicole Blair, Ellen Moore, Mark Pendras, Sushil Oswal, , Justin Wadland, DC Grant, Menaka Abraham, Jie Sheng, Jutta Heller, Jill Purdy, Michelle Garner, Greg Rose, Denise Drevdahl.,*

***Zoom:*** *Charles Costarella, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Arindam Tripathy,*

***Guests:*** *Turan Kayaogly, Evelyn Shakus, Serin Anderson, Anthony Falit-Baiamonte, Robin Evans-Agnew*

***Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Eugene Sivadas, Ji-Hyun Ahn*

1. **Consent Agenda, Recording Permission, & Approval of Minutes**

* The agenda and the March 30, 2018 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved with the correction of some grammatical errors.
* Recording permission for the minutes was given.

1. **Announcements**
   * The Professional Development Funding Chart that was discussed last meeting has already made a positive impact: the SIAS dean was surprised at the low amount of funding for lecturers and has already agreed to double the professional development funds available to them.
   * Spring FA meeting: 5/25/18 – *please note the new date. Time: 1-3pm. Location: Carwein Auditorium.*
     + This meeting will be focused on the results of the Academic Planning Exercise and the feedback received from student panels.
2. **PI Policy – revised –** *Turan Kayaoglu, AVC for Research*
   * Turan Kayaoglu presented, EC gave feedback, a few small suggestions but largely supported the revised policy:
     + Q: Why is there a need for a campus-wide policy? (question applies to this and other proposed policies). UWS does not have many blanket policies across its schools
     + A: The EVCAA asked Turan, as AVC for Research, to look at UW Tacoma’s specific needs and structure and develop a policy for this. It is to provide guidance to academic units and give a sense of who is eligible to be a PI upfront so that those who are ineligible do not spend energy only to find out they cannot proceed.
     + Schools can have a more stringent policy if needed
     + Q: There was an instance where a proposed project would have been for a very small amount ($5,000) over a short time period (less than a year) and yet because the proposed PI was non-competitively hired on a shorter contract, the project was not approved. Can there be a waiver process with one’s dean/director for this kind of situation?
     + A: Indeed, deans/directors are in the best position to review the situation and make this decision.
     + This policy helps to ensure federal agencies of UW’s commitment and protect UW from risk; some federal agencies require an assurance of eligibility.
     + There has been an issue of some faculty applying for grants without their dean/director knowing; this is problematic because deans/directors need to be able to plan for teaching coverage, etc. in their units
       - This policies helps to inform faculty that they need to check in with their dean/director before applying for grants

* Turan thanked EC for their feedback and plans to finalize edits with the FA leadership and EVCAA.

1. **Proposed Policy on Teaching Evaluations -** *D.C. Grant, FAC Chair* **APPENDIX A** 
   * In 2014 EC and EVCAA commissioned a Campus Fellows group to look into teaching evaluations
   * This policy came out of their report
   * FAC worked to include best practices in consultation with the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows’ chair, Sushil Oswal, per EC’s request
   * Some grammatical edits were made in the meeting
   * It was clarified that FAC had been charged by EC in Fall 2017 with reading the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows’ report and writing a policy based on it
   * Sushil Oswal raised concerns that his feedback/suggestions were not included in the proposed policy and offered to have his version circulated to EC alongside the proposed version
   * NHCL asked for more time to review the proposed policy and gather feedback before voting. Some issues NHCL has already noted:
     + How to operationalize “weight” in sub-point number one?
     + What is meant by “just” in sub-point number two?
     + In sub-point number four there is the issue of having resources to back up the policy; reducing faculty teaching loads requires funding that is not currently available
     + Concerns about “best practices” – are they “gut-feeling” or evidence-based? Best practices vary by discipline
       - It was clarified that the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows researched best practices for all disciplines at UW Tacoma and there was very little literature about teaching evaluation best practices in the field of nursing
   * It was noted that EC’s role in policy is to craft guidelines for deans/directors and EVCAA to use as needed, but not to enforce policies
   * **ACTION:** Due to several significant concerns voiced, EC decided to circulate Sushil Oswal’s earlier version of the policy, and provide more time for reps. to consult with their respective faculty.
2. **Criteria for the Academic Plan**
   * EC discussed the feedback on the criteria (there were only a few suggestions or concerns voiced about the criteria (6 faculty and 2 deans)) and noted the theme of including interdisciplinary balance while considering the market demand
   * In the criteria, “community’ refers to influencers outside of faculty, staff, and students (i.e. legislature)
   * The Faculty Code and Faculty Assembly Bylaws indicate setting the academic program as the purview of the faculty; once the academic plan is set, other, non-academic units can use it to be a driver for their decisions and planning
   * The goal is to ensure that the academic program growth at UW Tacoma is faculty determined, financially informed, and coordinated across all units.
   * The working of one criterion was revised (see below) and otherwise the criteria were deemed acceptable.
     + *Balance of academic disciplines and programs, building on our existing expertise and interdisciplinary emphasis.*
   * The criteria for the evaluation of proposals in the academic plan were approved by the Executive Council on 4/23/18 as follows:
     + Alignment with strategic plan
     + Community/Student/Market demand and impact
     + Resource impact - plus or minus
     + Campus-wide balance of academic disciplines and programs, building on our existing expertise and interdisciplinary emphasis.
   * The next steps are:
     + 5/8/18 - Academic planning team creates draft of first plan.
     + 5/9/18 - Draft plan is presented to APCC for review and feedback
     + 5/10/18 - Semi-finalized plan is presented to Deans and Directors for review
     + 5/\_?\_/18 -Semi-finalized plan is reviewed by VCFA Tye Minckler and staff for financial impact assessment.
     + 5/14/18 - Draft plan is presented to EC (with APCC) for review, integration of feedback, and approval
     + 5/25/18 - Finalized plan is presented to Faculty Assembly in the Spring quarterly meeting.
     + Summer 2018 - Planning team reviews process and writes Academic Plan policy and process guidelines.
     + Autumn 2018 - Guidelines presented to APCC for review and feedback, then to EC for review, incorporation of feedback and approval.
     + Ongoing - academic plan is used as a guide to the creation of new programs at UW Tacoma, with a renewing planning cycle every three years.
3. **Adjourn**

**APPENDIX A**

**UW Tacoma**

**Principal Investigator Policy**

All permanent UW Tacoma full-time faculty are eligible to serve as Principal Investigators, co-Principal Investigators, and Principal Directors on externally supported projects. Participation in funded projects is permitted at the discretion of the faculty member’s Dean or Director (or designee). A Principal Investigator (PI) is an individual who has the primary responsibility for the design, execution, and management of a research project and who will be involved in the project in a significant manner. A Project Director (PD) is an individual who has the primary responsibility for the design, execution, and management of a training or public service project and who will be involved in the project in a significant manner.

The primary responsibility held by PIs and PDs may not be delegated explicitly or implicitly to individuals who are not eligible in their own right to serve as Principal Investigator or Project Director. The UW Tacoma eligibility requirements for Co-PIs and co-PDs are the same as those for PIs and PDs.

Affiliated Faculty, Temporary Faculty, and Research Scientists at grade 9 can request permission from their Deans or Directors (or designees) to serve as PIs or PDs, with approval limited to a specific project.

Non-competitively hired lecturers, Research Scientists grade 8 and below, and Post-Doctoral Research Associates (PDRA)are noteligible to serve as a PI or PD or to petition for an exemption.

UW Tacoma employees holding titles other than the ones specified in this policy should consult the Associate Vice Chancellor for Research to discuss their eligibility to serve as a PI or PD on funded projects.

**APPENDIX B**

**FAC Proposed Campus-Wide Policy for Teaching Evaluation**

*Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on 2.16.18*

In response to the 2016 Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, the Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the adoption of the following campus-wide policy:

According to the University of Washington’s “Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices (2016)” and supported by research by the Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, UWT units should rely on all three of the following methods of teaching evaluation: peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and student evaluation of teaching. Furthermore, each unit should:

* Define the terms Teaching Excellence, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Success in alignment with the UWT strategic plan.
* Provide guidelines and transparency about each component of teaching evaluation (peer evaluation, self-evaluation and student evaluation). These guidelines should clearly identify which kinds of teaching assessment will be used for which purposes, and how much weight they will be given in merit, contract renewal, and promotion and tenure decisions.
* Self-assessment of teaching should take place on an annual basis as part of faculty annual activities reports.
* Effective teaching should be supported with resources such as professional development funds, mentoring, workshops, fellowships, staff resources, etc.

**Addendum: Faculty Code Language**

[**Section 24-32 C**](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html)

The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or continuing education. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

* The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
* The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
* The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
* The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;
* The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
* The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and
* The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long- range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

**Section 24-7 A - Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**  
  
To implement the provision stipulated in [Section 24-32, Subsection C](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2432C), the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.  
  
The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under [Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html#2532D), or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the title of senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or professor of practice the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.