



Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 6, 2016 12:30-1:25pm CP 206C

**Present:** Lauren Montgomery; Jutta Heller; Mark Pendras; Marian Harris; Matt Kelley; Alissa Ackerman; Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee; Marcie Lazzari; Jim Gawel, Julia Aguirre; Nita McKinley; Rupinder Jindal; Ellen Moore; Gregory Rose; Ji-Hyun Ahn; Robin Evans-Agnew as sub for Denise Drevdahl.

**Absent:** Mark Pagano; Huatong Sun; Chuck Costarell; Melissa Lavitt.

**1) Consent Agenda**

The March 18, 2016 Executive Council meeting minutes were accepted.

Added to, and postponed from, the agenda:

- Postpone Faculty Assembly Budget Update as adequate information is still being gathered
- Add update on the Faculty Salary Policy (d)
- Add update on the Time Scheduling Matrix (e)
- EVCAA, Melissa Lavitt, is absent due to another meeting. Therefore, postpone EVCAA report.
  - On behalf of Academic Affairs, EC Chair asked EC members to encourage their colleagues to apply for the two new Academic Affairs leadership positions. It was clarified that these positions are seen as being full time, but also that if there are faculty who apply and either wish to, or need to, continue teaching in some capacity, it could be worked out.

The additions and postponements to the agenda were accepted.

**2) Chair's Report and Discussion Items**

a) Revised Bylaws Change for Faculty Affairs Committee

**Presentation/Discussion:** Marian Harris, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee, presented the committee's proposed Bylaws change: include within their charge to work on issues of race and diversity, ongoing (see appendix A).

Issues would also be taken by FAC to EC, thus making EC responsible as well and not putting it all on one group. As this is a Bylaws change, EC can vote to approve it, but then it requires a full faculty vote (voting slated for Spring 2016). EC discussed the term "issues" and noted that it can have connotations of both initiatives and problems (positive and negative). Some edits were made for more consistency with this term (i.e. removing the word "concerns" from "Issues/concerns"). See appendix A for EC edits.

**Vote:** It was motioned and seconded to approve the revised Faculty Affairs Committee Bylaws charge.

Approved: 16 in favor; 0 no; 0 abstain; 2 absent; 18 eligible; 16 present.

b) DL Review Policy

**Presentation/Discussion:** Lauren Montgomery, Chair of APCC, presented the DL Review Policy (see appendix B).

EC appreciated that this review policy gives faculty the credentials to teach DL courses and therefore aims to increase the quality of instruction for DL courses. Some concerns were: that the cost to take iTech Fellows might turn into a DL student course fee eventually; APCC is specifically endorsing iTech Fellows as the program to meet this requirement; that iTech Fellows not be only offered during a break when faculty are off contract. It was suggested to take out the entire third paragraph of the policy to allow flexibility for logistics (edits reflected in appendix B). EC members requested that iTech Fellows be offered in early September when faculty are on contract, but before classes start. Also, EC was reminded that when/if another suitable training program to meet the policy's requirements comes to campus, this policy can be amended by EC to include other qualified training programs. It would not have to go to a full faculty vote.

**Vote:** It was motioned and seconded to approve the DL Review Policy (with EC edit of removing the third paragraph). Approved: 16 in favor; 0 no; 0 abstain; 2 absent; 18 eligible; 16 present.

c) Update on Diversity, Race & Equity Recommendations

The collaborative meeting between Marcie Lazzari, the Chancellor, Sharon Parker, and Ricardo Ortega went well. They are moving forward with planning a professional training time/ conversation for Vice Chancellors and possibly others in campus leadership positions (like Deans and Directors; TBD). Dr. Robin DiAngelo has agreed to come and facilitate this race and diversity training/conversation. Currently, a date is set for a planning meeting via phone.

EC acknowledges that that everyone needs race and diversity training and is encouraging campus leadership to start the conversations for cultural and campus-climate shifts towards more inclusivity and equity. This

training/conversation is only one of multiple avenues to further build a professional knowledge base for leadership, faculty, staff, and students.

Additionally, there is support for an all campus climate survey, though this recommendation will take some time to get off the ground. Another main consideration is finding where UW Tacoma faculty, staff, and students can go to report acts of discrimination. There is a Task Force in Seattle that people can report to; still looking into a procedure for UWT specifically.

d) Update on the Faculty Salary Policy

There is movement to push for a two-way virtual communication process from Tacoma to Seattle campuses for Senate meetings. Senators on EC brought up the issue that they are not allowed to send a substitute to vote on their behalf or vote from a distance. More to come on this as it develops.

The FSP Class A legislation has been revised again and will be forwarded to the next Senate meeting. This policy's "opt-out" option means that the units who "opt-out" may develop a range of policies; therefore, it doesn't address the salary issues for the University as a whole, but only for those units who can afford the policy and choose to use it.

A UW Seattle faculty member put forth a Class C Resolution to the Faculty Salary Policy which offers an alternative policy with fewer far-reaching changes. With both pieces of legislation presented for discussion at the Senate Executive Committee, the discussion was new and more productive. President Cauce had a statement shared at the Senate Executive meeting that tactfully addressed the lack of honesty in advertising within the Class A legislation. The difference between Class A and Class C legislation was clarified: This Class A legislation requires a change to Faculty Code; Class C is a resolution or such, which can be moved forward into Class A legislation.

e) Update on the Time Scheduling Matrix

EC vice chair, Mark Pendras, and EC SIAS representative, Jutta Heller, are representing faculty in the endeavor to address the Time Schedule Matrix issues. There is already a Scheduling Committee that Mark will now co-chair with Registrar, Andrea Coker-Anderson. Jutta and a student representative will be joining to ensure adequate representation of all concerned parties. This committee, with its new membership, will be meeting this quarter.

The current sense is that some smaller changes need to be made in order to give more time for faculty and students to meet and have lunch on Tuesdays/Thursdays. As the Time Schedule Matrix underwent a comprehensive reconstruction a few years ago, it will not be comprehensively reconstructed at this point. But, the formal, annual review that was built into the new TSM was not undertaken last year. It needs to be done this year, along with addressing some of the main concerns of students and faculty.

There is concern that the anecdotal and qualitative data gathered in a 2015 faculty survey about the TSM does not match the quantitative data which shows that the TSM is working well. On the other hand, how can EC collect data on the experience of students and faculty in regards to the lack of transition time between classes, the lack of a lunch hour on Tuesday/Thursdays, and the overall reduced time to meet with students and colleagues? Qualitative data should still count even if it isn't easily measured. Some potential solutions are that being looked into:

- There is not a set policy stating requirements for class time length (nothing in the Faculty Code). Therefore, perhaps 5 minutes can be taken from each class and added into a lunch break for T/TH
- Potentially eliminating the last class block on T/TH could help add in time for a lunch break. Andrea is looking into enrollment during the late block to see if it is low enough to justify elimination
- Faculty needs to present data and a clear articulation of priorities; may have to choose between a longer lunch and longer passing periods
- Need for more student voice/data in this process, instead of only faculty anecdotes about students

Mark Pendras will update EC on the Scheduling Committee's meeting later this quarter.

f) Recruiting for 2016-2017 and Beyond

Due to lack of time at the end of the meeting, this report item will be tabled until further notice.

### 3) Adjourn

## Appendix A

### **ORIGINAL FACULTY AFFAIRS CHARGE IN BYLAWS**

#### Section 2. Standing Committees

##### A. Faculty Affairs Committee

1. Charge – The Faculty Affairs Committee shall investigate and respond to issues of widespread concern including, but not limited to, faculty governance, procedures regarding tenure and promotion, merit, and teaching assessment. Matters for investigation may be brought before the Faculty Affairs Committee by the Executive Council or any member of the University of Washington Tacoma faculty. Where warranted this committee shall formulate specific policy proposals and forward its recommendations to the Executive Council, which may bring proposals and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly for a vote or may adopt them as provided in Article V, Section C of these bylaws.

### **DRAFT OF REVISED CHARGE**

##### A. Faculty Affairs Committee

1. Charge – The Faculty Affairs Committee shall investigate and respond to issues of widespread concern including, but not limited to, faculty governance, procedure regarding tenure and promotion, merit, teaching assessment, and an ongoing focus upon race and equity issues. Issues/concerns about race and equity will be taken to the Executive Council in order to develop a proactive and collaborative response by members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Council. Matters for investigation may be brought before the Faculty Affairs Committee by the Executive Council or any member of the University of Washington Tacoma faculty. Where warranted this committee shall formulate specific policy proposals and forward its recommendations to the Executive Council, which may bring proposals and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly for a vote or may adopt them as provided in Article V, Section C of these bylaws.

### **EC EDITS 4.6.16**

“and an ongoing focus upon race and equity issues. Issues/concerns about race and equity will be taken to the Executive Council in order to develop a proactive and collaborative response by members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Council.”

### **APPROVED REVISED FACULTY AFFAIRS CHARGE:**

Approved by the Executive Council on 4.6.16  
To be voted on by UWT Faculty in Spring 2016

##### A. Faculty Affairs Committee

1. Charge – The Faculty Affairs Committee shall investigate and respond to issues of widespread concern including, but not limited to, faculty governance, procedures regarding tenure and promotion, merit, teaching assessment, and an ongoing focus upon race and equity. Issues about race and equity will be taken to the Executive Council in order to develop a proactive and collaborative response by members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Executive Council. Matters for investigation may be brought before the Faculty Affairs Committee by the Executive Council or any member of the University of Washington Tacoma faculty. Where warranted this committee shall formulate specific policy proposals and forward its recommendations to the Executive Council, which may bring proposals and recommendations to the Faculty Assembly for a vote or may adopt them as provided in Article V, Section C of these bylaws.

## Appendix B

**APCC recommendation to EC**

**ORIGINAL**

**re: DL & Hybrid course review, 3/29/16**

In the past at UW Tacoma, DL courses were reviewed using the Quality Matters tool through the Office of Academic Technology. Once a course was reviewed and approved as a DL course, it could be taught by any instructor. In the course of creating a new DL and Hybrid policy, it was decided that a better quality control policy would be one where the review was shifted from the course to the instructors.

Toward this, APCC recommends that every instructor who teaches a Distance Learning or Hybrid course be trained through iTech Fellows. Once trained, an instructor may then offer other DL or H courses without further review.

**In order for this recommendation to work, iTech Fellows must be offered on a regular basis. To facilitate this, we recommend that it occur as a two-three day training with a stipend of \$1000.**

Instructors who have taught DL courses under the old policy will need to complete iTech Fellows unless they have: A) already done so, or B) have passed a QM review with a course. Instructors falling into groups A & B will be considered credentialed to teach DL and Hybrid courses under the new policy. Instructors falling into Group A will continue to be qualified to peer review the online courses developed in iTech Fellows.

### **EC EDITS 4.6.16**

In the past at UW Tacoma, DL courses were reviewed using the Quality Matters tool through the Office of Academic Technology. Once a course was reviewed and approved as a DL course, it could be taught by any instructor. In the course of creating a new DL and Hybrid policy, it was decided that a better quality control policy would be one where the review was shifted from the course to the instructors.

Toward this, APCC recommends that every instructor who teaches a Distance Learning or Hybrid course be trained through iTech Fellows. Once trained, an instructor may then offer other DL or H courses without further review.

**In order for this recommendation to work, iTech Fellows must be offered on a regular basis. To facilitate this, we recommend that it occur as a two-three day training with a stipend of \$1000.**

Instructors who have taught DL courses under the old policy will need to complete iTech Fellows unless they have: A) already done so, or B) have passed a QM review with a course. Instructors falling into groups A & B will be considered credentialed to teach DL and Hybrid courses under the new policy. Instructors falling into Group A will continue to be qualified to peer review the online courses developed in iTech Fellows.

**UW Tacoma - Executive Council**

**APPROVED**

**Approved DL & Hybrid Review Policy, 4/6/16**

In the past at UW Tacoma, DL courses were reviewed using the Quality Matters tool through the Office of Academic Technology. Once a course was reviewed and approved as a DL course, it could be taught by any instructor. In the process of creating a new DL and Hybrid policy, it was decided that a better quality control policy would be one where the review was shifted from the course to the instructors.

Toward this, APCC recommends that every instructor who teaches a Distance Learning or Hybrid course be trained through iTech Fellows. Once trained, an instructor may then offer other DL or H courses without further review.

Instructors who have taught DL courses under the old policy will need to complete iTech Fellows unless they have: A) already done so, or B) have passed a QM review with a course. Instructors falling into groups A & B will be considered credentialed to teach DL and Hybrid courses under the new policy. Instructors falling into Group A will continue to be qualified to peer review the online courses developed in iTech Fellows.