****

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

March 10, 2017 1:00-3:00pm CP 206 C

***Present:*** *Marcie Lazzari****,*** *Jennifer Harris****,*** *Marian Harris****,*** *Greg Rose, Mark Pendras, Lauren Montgomery, Ji-Hyun Ahn, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Michelle Garner, Sushil Oswal, Loly Alcaide Ramirez,**Nicole Blair, Charles Costarella, Jeff Cohen, Leighann Chaffee, Katie Haerling, Julia Aguirre, Jutta Heller, Jim Gawle, Melissa Lavitt****. Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Ellen Moore, Marion Eberly. Matt Kelley.*

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

The agenda was approved with the addition of an update about the Time Schedule Matrix.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The February 17, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved

1. **Announcements:**
	* Time Schedule Matrix Update

The Chancellor’s Cabinet has approved the new Time Schedule Matrix! Thank you to all who worked on this. Students are excited about this positive change. There will be an email announcement going out about this next week.

* + Request for Recommendations for the Chancellor’s Medal - Appendix A
	+ Outlook Calendar Meeting Invitations for EC: Starting Fall 2017

EC members were in favor of adopting this scheduling practice; those who have a different calendar system agreed that they can disregard the outlook invite messages.

* + Academic Unit Liaisons to Student of Concern Team – Appendix B
	+ Faculty Assembly Vice Chair Nomination Call: 4/3/17 – 4/17/17; Voting will run 4/24/17 - 5/8/17

1. **EVCAA Report**
* **Memorandum of Understanding for CORE Faculty Fellows:** Deans and Directors have seen the latest draft of this MOU. It is an agreement to commit a certain portion of a faculty member’s teaching load to CORE for a 3-year term (to better facilitate scheduling, though the time-frame is negotiable). EVCAA Lavitt will be hosting informational sessions for faculty soon to answer questions about CORE Faculty Fellows and gauge who is interested. CORE is an important part of the first-year experience. It consists of 4 courses: 3 Areas of Knowledge and a writing course. Though CORE is required, the reputation of CORE among students is poor. Thus, many students figure out other ways to fulfill the requirements. One of the goals of having a CORE Faculty Fellows is to improve CORE for first year students, and as a by-product, improve its reputation so that students want to take it and benefit from CORE. Eventually, CORE could be structured so that students are in a meta-major and then can scaffold toward majors that are more specific. The current research on what works best for first year students is robust and asserts that if students declare a major/path earlier on, it is better for their retention in college.

The Office of Undergraduate Education has authority over the first-year experience and CORE classes, but not all 100/200 level courses. The Undergraduate Education Academic Council is the faculty body that had circular oversight of the first-year experience and CORE classes.

EC members asked if part-time lecturers could be eligible for CORE Faculty Fellows. They won’t be excluded, but there will be extra work (meetings, etc.) and EVCAA Lavitt doesn’t want them to be exploited to do extra work unless they are aware of it and willing to do it. CORE Faculty Fellows must have some experience teaching freshman and/or coming in equipped with some professional development like the SEED program. Until the info session and seeing how many faculty members are interested, it’s difficult to know how selective to be. The hope is to have a robust roster of well-equipped faculty members to teach CORE classes. CORE classes should be courses that include compelling experiences, which research shows, students benefit from sooner than later: conversations with professors outside of class, community engagement, undergraduate research, internships, etc. **Info Sessions for CORE Faculty Fellows are to be scheduled for post-Spring Break.**

Jan Rutledge, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance, went through years of data looking at TCORE classes (including writing) and calculated the academic units’ average contribution to CORE. Deans and Directors have been told that this amount has been prepaid for CORE instruction. This model is not meant to bankrupt units; Academic Affairs will backfill to help academic units cover course, as needed.

EC members suggested that the CORE Faculty Fellows also include a mentoring structure for faculty within the program. They also brought up that replacing a tenure-track faculty member with a part-time lecturer in one’s home unit may look bad to outside reviewers if it puts the ratio of part-time faculty higher than full-time faculty. Additionally, in some academic units, a faculty member in expected to mentor the instructor who fills in for their course. This means that a faculty member teaching in CORE and mentoring the instructor will have a double layer of service in joining CORE Faculty Fellows.

As this was a topic that elicited much discussion, EC chair asserted that the topic would be continued on a future agenda, potentially with UEAC members joining the conversation.

* **Budget:** Deans and Directors have been notified of the budget challenges faced by UW Tacoma. In regards to future (new) program approval, funding priority will go to hiring faculty and staff to support current and currently approved academic programs. For instance, Electrical Engineering and Biomedical Sciences were already approved as new programs, therefore, the faculty and staff needed for those programs will be funded. Lecturer conversions are required. EVCAA Lavitt is not calling a moratorium on future programs, but is prioritizing funding for current and currently approved academic programs.
* **New Program Approval Process Flowchart:** Deans and Directors have been reviewing drafts of a new program approval process flowchart. It’s almost ready to share; they’re adding the new 75 day review by UW’s accreditation body.
1. **Chair’s Report and Discussion Items**
* Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting: 4/21/17 1:30-3:30pm “The Erosion of Tenure”

The title, “Erosion of Tenure” was floated because it might appeal to more people. A potential topic/starting question for this Faculty Assembly meeting is, “What will we do to manage faculty composition moving forward?” Chair, Mark Pendras, asked EC to give feedback on this and also share ideas of how to talk about this topic.

**Suggestions and Discussion:**

* + The title “Erosion of Tenure” suggests that there is a problem and could be inflammatory; perhaps instead, “The Future of Tenure”
	+ Consider choosing a topic of wider concern that pertains to the issues facing our country/world (like the forums being hosted by the UW Senate)
		- Yes, there need to be multiple venues for those conversations, especially at the unit level. Perhaps the Faculty Assembly meeting is a time to take care of some issues faculty are facing at UW Tacoma
	+ There are rumors that academia is moving towards getting rid of the tenure-track
	+ Sometimes the ratio of part-time faculty to full-time faculty in an academic unit is used to judge a unit’s strength/weakness
	+ Frame it as a discussion about appointments; we need guidelines that say “when you hire [insert rank here] you get [insert great advantages here]”
	+ JW Harrington wrote up something like this when he was Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; perhaps faculty can use this as a starting place and write up guidelines together
	+ It is important to look at all of the dimensions/ depth of this topic; part of issue is the subtle move to try and privatize public institutions, i.e. looking for lowest cost labor possible and lecturers cost less
	+ Frame the conversation by sharing the numbers, then have a panel so that we can hear the experience of faculty in various ranks
	+ Bring in the economics of higher education; faculty are empowered to have a voice in the budget process and strategic plan; suggestion to title the meeting, “Economics of Higher Ed.”
	+ Tenure-track or lecturer hiring is not often a faculty decision; we don’t get to choose, but we should; that’s part of the issue
	+ Talk about issues surrounding tenure: people dropping out of participation once they reach tenure
	+ Creating competitive lecturer lines is a win-win because it cuts the economic incentive for hiring lecturers in half
	+ Part-time faculty are insecure in their jobs and are paid poorly; if we were to have part-time lecturers’ salaries pro-rated that also takes out the monetary incentive
	+ Suggestion to capture table discussions at the FA meeting
	+ Creating an open space to discuss this topic is good, but it may also open some wounds, so this needs to be framed carefully in a way that doesn’t set people against one another

Due to this number of ideas and concerns just in EC, it shows that there is room for discussion of this at a larger Faculty Assembly meeting. EC will continue this discussion at their following meeting on 3/31/17.

* Update on Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments – Appendix C - *Marian Harris*

Faculty Affairs Committee is still working on drafting the next version of this proposed policy. Marian met with Academic HR, Alison Hendricks. Alison shared the current UW-wide guidelines ([*Provost’s Lecturer Guidelines*](http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/policies/lecturer-guidelines/) .) These guidelines do not effectively address the issue they are trying to address with this proposed policy. FAC will review the Faculty Code on non-tenure track hires. Marian will bring to EC another draft of this policy before the end of academic year. She asked that any feedback or wording be sent to her via email. There was a suggestion to include part-time lectures in this policy. Faculty Affairs is working through how to fit proposed policies with existing UW policies; there is need to have a compelling reason for a new policy. EC asked that FAC members circulate the current draft of this proposed policy to their units for feedback.

* Campus Policy for Equity in Teaching Distribution Among Rank

EC considered the current SIAS policy on this ([SIAS Curriculum Scheduling Guidelines](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/attachment/assembly/41920/877eb4c19bd65ab55b3d57b144a46cb9?inline=1)  [Word Version](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/conversation/assembly/989335) ) . Having a campus-wide policy like this will be more important now because of the new Time Schedule Matrix, which includes a later time-slot. The guidelines within the SIAS policy are that all faculty have 1/3 of their teaching load in 100/200 level classes and teach at least one 8am or evening class annually.

**Discussion and Suggestions:**

* + A campus-wide policy should be couched as guidelines because there are some specialty classes that need to be covered by particular faculty members.
	+ Additionally, service-learning/field experience courses must often be during school hours.
	+ Perhaps consider that faculty members with small children should not be required to teach at night.
	+ Program Administrators have found it difficult to accommodate all faculty scheduling requests. This policy would hopefully ease that burden.
	+ Mathematically, if all full-time faculty were available for either one 8am or one evening course per year, then there would be more than enough people to fill in those time-slots.
	+ Faculty should not be expected to take on more than one of the “extreme” time-slots unless they decide they want more. Some people have been pressured into teaching both 8am and an evening course in the same day.
	+ Perhaps use the language “expected to make themselves available.”
	+ Also, consider that some service courses (courses needed by the whole campus) are not always 100/200 level; perhaps use the language, “lower division and/or service courses.”
	+ The assigning of courses is a disciplinary decision to be made by the academic unit faculty.
	+ Program Administrator’s work within the Time Schedule Matrix to schedule class times and spaces. This is very challenging because there is limited time and space.
	+ Perhaps include in policy guidelines that units should be having an annual conversation about scheduling.
	+ In some sub-sub units, a policy like the proposed is in place, but the issue is the process. Usually people asked to submit what they want to teach, but then process becomes mysterious, and faculty are told what to teach.
	+ Instead, units should put out a list of courses needed in coming year (create slots, curriculum needed) and then gather people in the room and say who can do what. This process would be smoother and more open about how decisions are made.
	+ That process sounds like a good one to consider. Perhaps bring it back to division chairs.
	+ In discussing this at EC with EVCAA Lavitt present, EC is showing her that this is important to faculty and that we would like her support in enforcing it.

After discussion, vice chair, Lauren Montgomery, asked EC if they thought they should create a policy about equitable distribution of teaching across times/levels. The majority of EC members were in favor (no official vote taken). Lauren Montgomery, Sushil Oswal, and Mark Pendras agreed to work on a draft for EC to review at the next meeting.

* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost

The Provost has asked that the Chancellor work with faculty groups on this exercise. This is connected to the [Faculty Salary Policy and Executive Order](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO64.html). Apparently, units have not yet talked about the three-year planning exercise around salaries that the Provost has charged UW Tacoma. It is supposed to be happening in collaboration with elected representatives of faculty councils, i.e. EC. Then EC reps would make sure this exercise is happening in their units. FA chair, Mark Pendras, will work with the Chancellor to know where UW Tacoma is in the process and formulate a plan.

Discussion:

* + EC reps asked for guidance in having these kind of difficult discussions within their units.
	+ The goal/expectation is that deans and directors care about issues of compression and are working to address them. If not, then they should be.
	+ Historically, salary decisions have been made without structure, though some units do have their faculty councils involved in looking at salary raises annually.
	+ The point of this exercise is to be making decisions responsibly; having a plan instead of making decisions in the moment.
	+ The exercise asks us to look at unit adjustments (promotion raises are set) with the priorities of addressing equity and compression. If nothing else, at least clarifying the picture of salaries over the next few years.
	+ Units won’t get extra funds for this, but they can decide how to distribute the money that is available within their unit.

Chair, Mark Pendras, will bring this back to EC.

* Campus-wide W-Course Policy & Review (Policy yet to come through APCC)
	+ Writing Advisory Committee in Governance Structure

The Writing Advisory Committee has proposed a campus-wide W-Course Policy. APCC has not yet voted to approve it, though they have been reviewing it. There has been much push-back from units. APCC is asking that EC empower them to bring WAC into the Faculty Assembly governance structure as an ad hoc committee that is representative of all academic units (though smaller units could share representation as long as a reporting structure is in place.)

WAC has done a lot of valuable work on the W-Course policy, yet without representation from all units. Therefore, it doesn’t take into account variables affecting some units.

**VOTE:** Vice chair, Lauren Montgomery, moved that WAC be an ad hoc committee of APCC with representation from all units, an elected chair, and Asao Inoue, the Director of the University Writing Program, as a voting exofficio member. The motion was seconded: 15 in favor, 0 abstain, 0 against, 5 absent, 20 eligible.

APCC chair, Jeff Cohen, will get in touch with WAC leadership to discuss moving this decision forward.

1. **Adjourn**

**Appendix A**

Dear Faculty, Staff and Students,

Each year a student receiving an undergraduate degree is recognized by the Chancellor at our commencement ceremony for his or her extraordinary achievement as a student at UW Tacoma.

Nominations are solicited from campus in early spring and are open for 1-3 weeks. Faculty, staff and students and those affiliated with UW Tacoma are eligible and encouraged to submit nominations for this prestigious award.

Nominees must have above a 3.0 cumulative grade point average or above and are earning a degree in autumn, winter, spring or summer of the respective academic year.  The award recognizes an individual who has been a consistent source of inspiration for faculty and fellow students, and has over overcome significant obstacles in order to complete a degree.

Please see the link below for the nomination guidelines and criteria.   Send your recommendations toalinau@uw.edu in the Office of the Chancellor no later than Wednesday, March 22.

<http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/commencement/chancellors-medal>

Thank you on behalf of the selection committee,

Alina

**Appendix B**

The following was compiled from the Faculty-Role-on-the-Student-of-Concern-Team Subcommittee proposal that was presented to EC on 2/1/17. See the 2/1/17 EC agenda for the full proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Each academic unit should identify a person for the Student of Concern team to contact, as needed, so that there can be greater communication between the Concern Team and any involved faculty when a Concern issues arises.

The following academic units have appointed these people to this role:

School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences: Chris Demaske, Associate Dean of Faculty and Student Affairs

Milgard, School of Business: Gregory Noronha, Associate Dean

Social Work & Criminal Justice: Tom Diehm, Interim Director (temporarily until SWCJ has further discussion)

School of Education: Jarek Sierschynski, Assistant Professor

Nursing & Healthcare Leadership: Sharon Fought, Director

The Institute of Technology: Charles Costarella (volunteered, pending confirmation at upcoming IT faculty meeting)

Urban Studies: Ali Modarres, Director

Responsibilities include:

> If notified when a Concern issue arises, check in with individual faculty members to make sure they are comfortable with the process and support them when and if needed

> Receive notifications (emails, phone calls) from Jeri Carter when a Mental Health concern is raised and resolved

> Receive notifications (emails, phone calls) from Susan Wagshul-Golden and Ed Mirecki when behavioral concerns are raised and resolved

> Receive notifications (emails, phone calls) from Ginger MacDonald as she reaches out periodically to make sure there are no outstanding concerns

> **When transitioning out of this role, this person should make sure that someone else in their unit will become the point of contact for the Student of Concern Team and facilitate the transition by connecting the Student of Concern Team with the academic unit's new point of contact**

> The workload will not be significant as the Student of Concern Team does the bulk of the work involved. This role is to be a communication liaison between the faculty in an academic unit and the Student of Concern Team

The Faculty Assembly Administrative Coordinator will forward this list of liaisons to the Student of Concern Team. As the people in this role change, it is the academic unit’s responsibility to contact the Student of Concern Team with the name of their new liaison. Student of Concern Team members include: Ed Mirecki, Ginger MacDonald, Susan Wagshul-Golden, Jeri Carter.

**Appendix C**

Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments

It is understandable and normal for some level of non-competitive hiring (and the use of temporary or adjunct faculty) to be customary. ~~to satisfy unanticipated circumstances and emergency situations.~~ To ensure equity, inclusiveness and diversity are incorporated in all aspects of the faculty hiring process, the Faculty Affairs Committee herewith proposes the following policy on non-competitive hiring process:

Non-competitive full-time faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of one year. ~~to satisfy unexpected shortcomings in faculty course coverage~~. Whenever a non-competitive full-time position is filled, the competitive hiring process must be immediately undertaken to fill the position through a diversity focused and inclusive process for the following year. Non-competitive hires are assumed\* to be included in the candidate pool for the competitively hired position, unless they opt out of the process, but are not afforded special treatment due to their incumbency.

\* eligible to apply / If non-comp hires are part of pool

-add part-time, or similar policy

-equity for race and rank (lecturers)

Draft Version 1.0 / 2016-11-30 ; edits added at EC 2.17.17