



FACULTY ASSEMBLY

UNIVERSITY of WASHINGTON | TACOMA

Final Report from Faculty Assembly 2011-2013

Contents:

Final Report from *Executive Council* (6 pages)

Final Report from *Academic Policy Committee* (3 pages)

Final Report from *Appointment, Promotion and Tenure* (5 pages)

Final Report from *Curriculum Committee* (13 pages)

Final Report from *Faculty Affairs* (8 pages)

Final Report from *Strategic Budget Committee* (4 pages)

Annual Report from *Paulsen Committee* (2 pages)



Executive Council Actions 2011 – 2012

The University of Washington Tacoma (UWT) Executive Council (EC) as a representative body of the University of Washington Tacoma Faculty Assembly (FA). The EC held meetings approximately twice per month, and the FA held three meetings during this academic year. The work of the EC is to (1) support the efforts of the four Standing Committees (see year-end reports), (2) maintain ongoing communication with campus administration, the academic programs, and academic support units as appropriate, (3) ensure that the full faculty has the opportunity to vote on issues that either require their vote (e.g., bylaws changes, election of faculty senators) or those that the EC determines appropriate for a full faculty vote (even though not required), (4) maintain communication with the University of Washington (UW) Faculty Senate and other university-wide bodies, and (5) address emerging issues that fall under the purview of faculty governance.

The following describes the specific foci and related activities of the EC during the 2011 – 2012 academic year as well as actions taken by the EC and the Faculty Assembly.

Enhancing Faculty Governance Mechanisms

For the last several years, the leadership of the Faculty Assembly has been engaged in an effort to strengthen faculty governance mechanisms and practices. These efforts have been and continue to be motivated by a desire to: (1) broaden and deepen the avenues for faculty voice, (2) facilitate faculty ability to execute effectively in its areas of primary responsibility under the shared governance model (e.g., development of the curriculum and academic policy), and (3) enhance our ability to partner more effectively with the administration in achieving our collective aspirations for UWT. These efforts began under Michael Forman (IAS) with a restructuring of the Faculty Assembly and Executive Council. As a consequence of this restructuring, authority for the day-to-day business operations of the Faculty Assembly was delegated to the Executive Council, an elected body that was made proportionally representative of the faculty across the academic units.

During the past two years, additional efforts have been made to strengthen faculty governance mechanisms and practices. Two of these initiatives were brought to fruition this year:

- **Appendix A of the UWT Handbook updated.** Appendix A outlines general guidelines for implementing policies and procedures regarding promotion and tenure reviews and decisions. The proposed changes to the Handbook were the result of a three year effort by the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure committee (APTC) to update our handbook, assure its consistency with the requirements of the broader UW Faculty Code and Academic HR, and enhance the integrity the tenure and promotion process for the benefit of candidates for promotion and tenure. These changes were approved by a vote of the full faculty in May, 2012.

- ***UWT Bylaws Changes.*** Suggested UWT Bylaws were successfully drafted, reviewed by the Secretary of the Faculty and UW “Code Cops” and approved for adoption by a vote of the full UWT faculty in May, 2012. These changes will go into effect for the 2012-2013 academic year. The proposed bylaw changes include the following:
 - Extending standing committee member terms from two to three years.
 - Clarifying the starting and ending terms for standing committee members, and all Faculty Assembly leadership positions to assure staffing of the standing committees and Faculty assembly during the full year.
 - Expanding membership of the Executive Committee to include the chairs of the Standing Committees as Ex-officio members with vote.
 - Establishing the position of Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Assembly.
 - Expanding membership of the Executive Committee to include the Immediate Past Chair as an Ex-officio member with vote.
 - Establishing the Strategic Budget Committee as a standing committee of the Faculty Assembly, chaired by the Immediate Past Chair of the Faculty Assembly, with representation from the administration, academic unit heads, Professional Staff Organization and Associated Students of UWT.

These changes are intended to: (1) increase the institutional memory of the Executive Committee and each of standing committees by reducing overall year-to-year turnover on each committee, (2) facilitate communication and coordination between the Executive Council and the standing committees as well as across the standing committees themselves, (3) strengthen faculty voice in the strategic budget process, and (4) establish a stronger developmental pipeline for faculty leadership.

- ***Academic Policy Committee (APC) and Curriculum Committee (CC) Reorganization.*** The EC sponsored a taskforce, representative of the APC and CC, to review the activities and responsibilities of the APC and CC and to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of our current governance structures. This task force was charged to develop recommendations for an appropriate governance structure going forward that would: (1) assure that UWT’s needs in regards to the current responsibilities and activities of the CC and APC are fully met, while (2) leveraging faculty time and expertise more effectively. The task force completed its work and presented a set of recommendations to the EC in June, 2012. The EC voted to adopt these recommendations. In order to redress significant areas of redundancy in the focus and activities of these two and also to reduce overall service demands on voting faculty in general and smaller programs in particular while freeing those faculty who are serving in these critical areas of primary responsibility to focus on those issues and concerns for which faculty are best suited to make substantive contributions (e.g., program and curriculum design, development of academic policy, enhancement of curriculum and its ability to support campus level learning objectives such as written and quantitative literacy), the APC and CC will be merged. Changes to the UWT Bylaws to implement this structural reorganization have been drafted and are currently under review by the Secretary of the Faculty and UW “Code Cops.” Once approved, they will be proposed for adoption by a catalyst vote of the full UWT faculty in Fall 2012. If adopted, the recommended changes in standing committee structures will be implemented following the faculty vote.
- ***Standing Committee Chairs Meetings.*** The FA Chair and Vice Chair met quarterly with the FA standing committee chairs to share information about ongoing initiatives across the

Faculty Assembly Standing committees and the Executive Council and to facilitate coordination on several of these initiatives across standing committees. These meetings were also established to facilitate long-range planning and to support ongoing Faculty Assembly taskforces (e.g., APC-CC Restructuring Task Force and the Lecturer Experience at UWT taskforce).

- ***Committee Reconstitution.*** At Chancellor Friedman's request, the EC reconstituted the Arthur R. and Anna Mae Paulsen Endowed Visiting Chair in Public Affairs Committee (FACPEC) as an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Assembly. We would like to thank Rob Crawford, IAS for his generous efforts in clarifying the purpose, procedures, and composition of this committee and then also agreeing to Chair it for 2011-2012. The EC approved the proposed FACPEC charge, procedures and composition on October 11, 2012.

Strengthening Shared Governance and Enhancing Faculty Engagement

- ***Collaboration with Campus Leadership.*** FA Chair, Zoe Barsness, and FA Vice Chair, Katie Baird, met monthly with Chancellor Friedman and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA) JW Harrington to share information about ongoing FA and administrative initiatives and to facilitate coordination on several of these initiatives and other campus issues. Both faculty and campus leadership worked to establish a constructive and productive collaborative partnership with each other.
- ***Recognition for Faculty Contributions to Shared Governance.*** FA leadership worked with Chancellor Friedman to secure recognition in the form of *either* one course release per academic year or \$5000 for research or summer support for each of the chairs of the Standing Committees. We greatly appreciate Chancellor Friedman's commitment to providing such tangible support for such faculty contributions to shared governance.
- ***Portland State University Visit.*** On December 2, 2012, FA Chair Zoe Barsness and Vice Chair Katie Baird accompanied a number of directors and other members of the administrative team on a visit to Portland State University that was organized by Chancellor Friedman. During this visit, they met with their faculty governance counterparts and other PSU administrators to share information about our respective practices and learn more about some of the specific challenges PSU have faced and solutions PSH has implemented to meet the demands of rapid enrollment growth and reduced public funding.
- ***Identification of Current Unit-level Shared Governance Practices.*** As part of our efforts to strengthen shared governance at UWT, the Executive Council initiated an on-going effort to identify current unit-level shared governance practices. By documenting current practices, the EC hopes to identify practices that are working well so they might be shared across units and identify areas where there are opportunities for clarification, improved communication or further development. Efforts to identify and clarify these practices in each unit are ongoing and will continue in 2012-2013.
- ***Shared Governance Workshop with and Presentation by Marcia Killien.*** Desire for a broader understanding of shared governance led to scheduling a workshop with Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty to precede the May 4 Faculty Assembly meeting. Marcia Killien presented on this same topic at the Faculty Assembly meeting that same day. Participants in the shared governance workshop include Faculty Assembly leaders, as well as

all members of the Executive Council, Faculty Assembly standing committees, and Academic Council.

- **Discussion with Full Professors.** Chancellor Friedman and VCAA Harrington co-sponsored with the Faculty Assembly leadership a discussion with full professors on shared governance in May 2012. June Lowenberg (Nursing) and Marcy Stein (Education) facilitated this discussion. This event was the first of a series of planned discussions with faculty of different rank regarding their aspirations for and expectations of shared governance at UWT. These discussions will continue into Fall 2012.
- **Advice and Consultation.** The EC provided feedback to Chancellor Friedman and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA), JW Harrington on the following administrative initiatives:
 - List of relevant peer institutions for UWT
 - Proposed guidelines for compensating faculty for extraordinary service;
 - Procedures for evaluation applications for the UWT Instructional Technology Fellows Initiative for Course Redesign and for the UWT Faculty Fellows Research Camp.

Faculty Development

- **Faculty Roundtable Retreat.** On October 21, 2012 the EC sponsored a half day Faculty Assembly Roundtable Retreat. The retreat offered faculty opportunities to participate in discussions about a) online teaching and learning, b) community engagement & partnership, c) opportunities and obstacles to scholarly productivity at UWT, d) quantitative literacy at UWT, and e) creating a more vibrant learning community at UWT. Attendance at the roundtable event was strong: 39 faculty attended the online teaching and learning session during the first hour of the retreat, 32 faculty participated in the second hour of roundtable discussions on research productivity and community engagement, and 25 faculty participated in the third hour of roundtable discussions on teaching related topics.
- **Faculty Presentations and Discussion Groups.** As an outgrowth of the October Roundtable Retreat, the EC identified ways to meet the expressed desires of faculty for more social and intellectual exchanges. To this end, we initiated two types of events:
 - *Presentations/discussions by faculty around teaching and research.* On February 8, Tracy Thompson facilitated a Critical Thinking Roundtable. Other panelists included Katie Adamson (Nursing), Ingrid Walker (IAS) and Matthew Weinstein (Education). Roundtable discussions focused on how we might better integrate critical thinking into the UWT curriculum and also facilitate the sharing of techniques and tools for teaching critical thinking in the classroom. On May 10th, Marcy Stein gave a well-attended presentation based on her work in schools in the region on evidence-based research in Education.
 - *Faculty-led discussions based on a common reading.* This year FA hosted two such “discussions”. The purpose was to provide the campus with a smaller, more intimate forum to debate/consider/discuss current topics and controversies in higher education. Each of these sessions was facilitated by a faculty member who selected a reading (or two) which formed as the basis for the group’s discussion. On February 24, David

Morris facilitated a discussion of “Patriotism in the Academy”. On April 27, Nicole Blair facilitated a discussion of “Form versus Content in Writing” and the challenge of teaching writing. Both events, held in the new Faculty Resource Center, attracted a small, enthusiastic group of faculty.

- ***Interdisciplinarity Discussion.*** In November, 2011, FA Chair Zoe Barsness, FA Vice Chair Katie Baird joined the Academic Council to meet with Gail Dubrow, University of Minnesota and engage in a discussion of Interdisciplinarity at UWT. This discussion helped to lay the groundwork for Professor Dubrow’s visit with the Faculty Assembly on January 27, 2012 during which the faculty as a whole participated in a lively discussion of interdisciplinarity and our goals and aspirations for supporting and promoting it on campus going forward. In mid-April, the Executive Council received the follow-up report from Gail Dubrow (University of Minnesota) with her findings and recommendations for how we might better support and strengthen interdisciplinarity at UWT. In 2012-2013, the Executive Council plans to review this report and identify ways in which we might contribute to this effort going forward.
- ***Lecturer Experience at UWT Task Force.*** The EC sponsored a task force led by Linda Dawson (IAS) and Katie Baird (IAS and Vice Chair FA) to examine the Lecturer experience at UWT. Their efforts were supplemented the efforts of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) and a group of faculty in IAS who have also been examining the issue. Erica Cline (IAS) reported on the IAS study group’s efforts to the Executive Council on April 26, 2012. Her study group’s investigation focused on identifying approaches to lecturer contracting that are currently utilized across the three UW campuses. New Class A legislation providing for the possibility of multi-year contracts for Part-time Lecturers was approved by the UW Faculty in May, 2012. The Lecturer Experience at UWT taskforce plans to provide a summary report of their investigations to the Executive Council by the end of 2012.
- ***Tenure and Promotion Discussions.*** The APTC and VCAA Harrington co-sponsored two events focused on faculty development and mentoring. The first targeted assistant professors and the second associates. Both events focused on providing faculty guidance and support regarding progression in their careers.
- ***Student Course Evaluations.*** In late spring, Michael Kucher (IAS) requested that the EC investigate the possibility of reporting adjusted means for Student Course Evaluations. The EC tasked the FAC with investigating the pros and cons associated with the use of adjusted means as well as the feasibility of adopting their use at UWT. The FAC conducted some initial research, but had insufficient time to complete its investigations. This summer, Vice Chair FA Katie Baird followed up by speaking with Nana Lowell of UW’s Office of Educational Assessment (OEA). At this time, evaluations can include either adjusted means or (as is current UWT practice) mean scores. For reasons of space they cannot report both. OEA, however, expects to have the ability to report both this coming spring. Michael Kucher and Donald Chinn (Chair of FAC) were provided this information.

FA Administrative Initiatives

- In October 2012, the FA hired a new administrative assistant, Nan Geier.
- The FA leadership and administrative team began a review of the content and layout of the FA website and plans to continue working to enhance its clarity, comprehensiveness and usability during 2012-2013.

Recommendations for 2012 – 2013

- Clarify the role of the SBC and EC in regards to the faculty's responsibility to provide the Chancellor with advice and consultation on the campus budget.
- Continue efforts to support the establishment of strong shared governance mechanisms and practices at the unit level.
- Continue discussions related to the challenges of engaging faculty in shared governance at both the campus and unit level.
- Sponsor a campus level task force on an important aspect of the curriculum of relevance or concern to academic units across campus (e.g., writing throughout the curriculum, promoting quantitative literacy, developing critical thinking among our students). This task force would identify specific recommendations to enhance the quality and rigor of our general education curriculum and the achievement of student learning objectives.
- Adopt a faculty oversight model for the OUE.
- Revisit the decision to have UWT senators represent the campus at large.
- Conduct an evaluation of the effectiveness of the FA EC representative model of faculty governance.
- Maintain relationships and communication with units across campus.
- Re-visit the effort to have an ASUWT and Staff Association representative serve as ex-officio members of the FA EC.

Annual Report
Academic Policy Committee
2011-2012

Committee members: Julia Aguirre, Linda Ishem, Janice Laakso, Nita McKinley (chair), George Mobus, Joane Mocerri, Doug Wills.

The Academic Policy Committee (APC) considered the **College Level Examination Program (CLEP)** to allow credit for CLEP exams. This program, sponsored by the College Board, includes 33 different exams for courses students would likely take in their first two years. After meetings within APC and with a representative of CLEP, APC voted to recommend allowing credit for CLEP to the Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC). This was later approved by the EC.

The APC reviewed data on the impact of **changes in English proficiency admission requirements** for International Students that were approved last year. Changes included reducing TOEFFL and ILS score requirements, matching SAT cutoff scores to match Seattle and Bothel; requirements, allowing admission prior to junior year, allowing an AA from a community college with two English composition courses to replace testing. Data shows that international students generally were doing well with 11 of 60 students on the dean's list and two students on probation in the Winter 2012 term. APC approved additional revisions this year reducing the transfer credits required for international students from 90 to 30 credit hours. This change was approved because the English Composition courses were considered more diagnostic of English proficiency than a particular number of credit hours and it would allow students to enter UWT sooner, which will help in programs with limited admission quarters and get student earlier advising for UWT majors.

The APC also considered the new **Policy on Satisfactory Academic Progress** approved by the Seattle Faculty Council on Academic Standards (FCAS). This policy is intended to facilitate a timely turnaround of students and applies only to undergraduates. The committee voted not to adopt a similar policy on the UWT campus because 1) transfer students who make up a large portion of our students often need additional hours to complete a degree, 2) we are not near capacity, 3) students do not appear to be taking exorbitant numbers of hours, and 4) (a distant fourth) we need the FTEs.

The APC considered and approved a number of **new programs and program changes**, including

- a new Doctoral Degree in Educational Leadership (EdD)
- a new BA degree in Law & Policy
- a new Master Degree in Cybersecurity and Leadership
- a change in the BS in Environmental Sciences that provided tracks to maintain interdisciplinarity while preparing students for the job market

- Changes to the admissions requirements for the BA in Social Work.
- Changes to the admissions and program requirements for the BA in Criminal Justice.
- Changes to the program requirements for the major in Ethnic, Gender, and Labor Studies in IAS.
- Changes to the admissions requirements for the major in Computer Science and Systems in CSS.
- Changes to program requirements for the major in Writing Studies in IAS.
- Changes to program requirements for the major in History in IAS.
- Changes to the program requirements for the major in Communication in IAS.
- Changes to the program requirements for the major in Environmental Studies in IAS.
- Changes to the program requirements for the major in Environmental Sciences in IAS.

The APC also discussed various issues including implementation of the **Statway path agreement** for math for social science majors, the implementation of **online instruction** on the UWT campus, and UW Medical School **MEDEX program** on being implemented on the UWT campus.

A major task for APC this year was clarifying the **role and procedures for getting APC approval on new programs and program changes**. We implemented deadlines for submission of forms and worked with the Curriculum Committee chair to ensure that programs were getting notification of the new procedures.

APC also ruled on several student petitions, as well as reviewing applications and making a recommendation to the Chancellor for the 2011-2012 Chancellor's Medal recipient.

Finally, APC has been active in the committee exploring and proposing a **restructure of the APC and Curriculum Committee (CC)**.

Major tasks for the coming year include

- Continue work on the restructure of APC and CC (assuming the faculty vote to approve this change) and ensuring the new committee fully covers the responsibilities of the current APC committee.
- Continue work to clarify procedures and process for program review and approval and to communicate these to programs.
- Develop guidelines to encourage new program proposals to address how diversity benefits the program and to be specific in how their programs will target underrepresented groups.
- Identify specific cross-program issues for that need addressing in the coming year (e.g., revisiting the "W" designation for courses).

In addition to dealing with a student petition for an exception to graduation requirements, APC has addressed the following issues.

- *Quantitative Literacy.* APC heard about the implementation of the STATWAY path agreement signed by the provost for a three-year trial. STATWAY allows an alternative pathway to university admissions that bypasses the intermediate algebra requirement and gives students credit for statistics courses. The idea is that this pathway would be more appropriate for students in areas such as the social sciences. APC expressed concern this agreement did not go through this committee. APC noted the need for additional conversations across campus about quantitative literacy requirements. APC member Julia Aguirre volunteered to stay in contact with Jenny Quinn and others to continue this discussion.
- *Program Proposals/Changes.* APC approved proposals for the following:
 - a new Doctoral Degree in Educational Leadership (EdD)
 - a change in the BS in Environmental Sciences that provided tracks to maintain interdisciplinarity while preparing students for the job market
 - a new BA degree in Law & Policy (contingent on the specification of the role of diversity in the program)
- *APC Process.* APC has engaged in conversations about APC process for dealing with new programs and program changes. There has been a lack of clarity in responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee (CC) versus APC as well as concerns about when the proposals come to APC and whether the approval must be considered by the whole committee. APC agreed that proposals must be reviewed by the entire committee prior to the chair signing. APC is posting meeting dates on their webpage along with deadlines for submission of proposals. This information was also sent to all programs.
- *APC/CC Reorganization.* APC is engaging in discussions with EC on the reorganization of the APC and CC and committee members are serving on that taskforce. Nita McKinley and Julia Aguirre will represent APC on this taskforce.

Submitted by Nita McKinley, Chair

FACULTY COUNCIL ON APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE

2011-12 Annual Report

Submitted by Yonn Dierwechter, Chair

The Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (FCAPT) “shall advise the Chancellor on promotion and tenure cases under review, and on appointments in cases where consultation is needed” (Article III, UWT Faculty Bylaws). The council also coordinates discussion of appointment, promotion, and tenure procedures and expectations across academic units. With the administration, the council recommends policies related to appointment, tenure and promotion to the Executive Council and may bring such policy recommendations to the Faculty Assembly for a vote or may adopt them as provided in Article II Section 2 of the UWT Faculty bylaws.

During the 2011-12 academic year, FCAPT held five meetings (September, December, January, February, March). Major tasks and issues undertaken this year by the Council included:

1) Four cases reviewed.

The FCAPT reviewed four mandatory cases for promotion and tenure and zero non-mandatory cases for promotion. As in the past, this review process constituted the core of the council’s work during the fall quarter.

2) Two informational workshops held.

The FCAPT also worked with the VCAA’s Office to prepare two informational workshops held in the Winter Quarter. The first workshop was for assistant professors. This was an exceptionally well-attended event and included the active participation by at least three members of the FCAPT. The second workshop was for associate professors. This event was also well-attended and includes active participation by three members of the FCAPT. Both events were held in a nearby coffee shop/wine bar and included early socializing over coffee and drinks. This venue was popular and should be repeated.

3) Final revisions to Appendix A made.

The bulk of the committee’s time was spent on finalizing substantive revisions to Appendix A of the UWT Handbook, a process actually started by the FCAPT two years earlier but only formally completed this past year. As far back on 2008-2009, a past chair noted that “members of the nursing program had identified a number of discrepancies between the list of required documentation and materials provided in Appendix A of the UWT Bylaws and the VCAA’s website. Further review by the FCAPT discovered additional inconsistencies between these two lists of required documentation and materials and those identified in Chapter 24 of the UW Faculty Code (i.e., the chapter that addresses the policies and procedures for the appointment and promotion of faculty members) and on the UW Human Resources website.” Work progressed

steadily by many committee members over the past few years, including the past academic year, resulting in a series of changes to the Handbook outlined momentarily.

According to our faculty bylaws, all amendments to the Handbook constitute “Class A legislation.” As such, “The Executive Council will forward ... proposed amendments to the faculty as specified in Article VI.” Again these changes were necessary to address legal concerns about current procedures as expressed by Academic Human Resources (AHR) and by Dr. Marcia Killien, Secretary of the Faculty.

These concerns nonetheless provided the FCAPT with an opportunity to strengthen the integrity of APT procedures by offering more detailed and precise information to the relevant actors. Members of the current APT committee voted unanimously in January, 2012 to adopt the proposed changes, and then requested that members of the Executive Council approve these changes. The Executive Council voted unanimously to do so in March, 2012. The adopted revisions were forwarded to all programs, where they were extensively discussed, during March and April, 2012. Following a PowerPoint presentation made by the FCAPT chair at the May 4, 2012 Faculty Assembly, a catalyst vote was taken by the full faculty. The proposed revisions to Appendix A were adopted as follows:

Out of 123 responses:		
Yes	95	77.24%
No	2	1.63%
Abstain	26	21.14%

The revised document therefore now includes eighteen changes in total.

- Many of the changes are minor and thus rather self-evident; they provide greater clarity or greater emphasis of particular points, or simply update antiquated conditions.
- Other changes add more extensive language in order to provide both clarity and procedural direction to the various actors in APT processes.
- One change addressed the details associated with content of the candidate’s file.
- Another change spelled out what should be included in the candidate’s curriculum vitae, including in particular better guidance on information on scholarly accomplishments.
- One change now places greater emphasis on the central importance of the narrative letter in communicating not only the overall record but especially the candidate’s effectiveness in teaching and scholarship.
- Still another change now highlights more detailed information relating to the documentation of teaching effectiveness, including the requirement that applicants for promotion must have completed students and peer evaluations of their teaching within the previous twelve months.

- Three changes expand the language of our current handbook in order to redress insufficient guidelines relating to the importance of including yearly activity reports and documentation of regular conferences with directors of dean. Specifically, the changes
 - stipulate that yearly evaluations are not “optional,” as stated in the current Appendix A version, but in fact are a required part of the candidate’s file.
 - Include more language and guidance from section 24-57 of the University Handbook regarding the purpose and role of yearly activity reports.
 - detail the requirement that candidates for promotion must include documentation of a conference with director or dean within the previous 12 months.
- Finally, three changes clarify procedures related to the section of and communication with external reviewers. Specifically, these changes
 - emphasize that externals not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or elsewhere.
 - clarify the roles of the committee chair and the director/dean in selecting the list of external examiners.
 - clarify the roles of the committee chair and the director/dean in communicating with the external examiners.

4). Chair problems/full professor participation discussed.

In past years, the FCAPT has sometimes struggled to maintain quorum, due to research leaves, sabbaticals, conflicts of interest, etc. Fortunately this was not a major problem this past year. In the main, all the meetings scheduled by the chair were attended by all serving members. A major effort was made to reduce the number of meetings needed, using electronic communication wherever possible. A few members were not able to participate in the informational workshops, but quorum was met for the crucial discussions and votes.

However, the FCAPT struggled in the fall quarter to find a chair, and, despite efforts to find a chair for next year, still has no volunteers for the 2012-13 academic year. Members concurred with the logical view that the committee should be populated almost entirely by full professors or, at a bare minimum, should at least be chaired by a full professor. Past chairs have noted the same problem:

“d) Schools and Programs should be encouraged, but not required (given the small size and composition of some programs), to staff the council with representatives at the Full rather than Associate rank so as to provide greater insight during the review of non-mandatory cases” (2009-2010 Report).

Yet we still struggled to meet these goals during 2011-12 – and will almost certainly struggle to do so in 2012-13 (some four years after this recommendation). As in most years, the chair of FCAPT was an associate professor. In practice, this mattered little over the 2011-12 academic year because there were no associates who applied for promotion. However, this remains far from ideal.

One new dimension of the problem that was discussed (in both FCAPT meetings and at meetings for the various chairs of FA standing committees) was the presumed paucity of full professors at UWT across all academic programs. The FCAPT chair asked the VCAA's office for data on this problem. According to an analysis of gleaned from IPEDS (<http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/>), only 22.5% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty at UWT were full professors in 2010 – the lowest percentage within a peer group that included 15 other urban-serving institutions.

This campus-wide issue is mentioned here because it directly impacts the ability of this committee to meet its important responsibilities; it also formed an important theme in a new dialogue with the VCAA's office on how more associates at UWT could be encouraged (and supported) to progress to full (a main theme of the second informational workshop). While this issue was hardly resolved, it is important to highlight as an ongoing concern in the years ahead.

Work agenda/recommendations for 2012-13

In addition to the case review responsibilities of this committee, the work agenda next year should take up the following two strategic issues:

- 1) Research, discuss implications, and perhaps begin to draft explicit guidelines that involve new language around the appointment and promotion of lecturers, who form an ever-larger percentage of the program faculties at UWT. This issue was addressed several times by the Executive Council and was also discussed in broad terms by the FCAPT. However, this issue needs to be taken up during 2012-13. This new effort should also be part of the process discussed at the May 4 Faculty Assembly, notably work done by the *Lecturer Experience at UWT Taskforce*, as well as the Faculty Affairs committee and a subgroup of faculty in IAS. In particular, the crucial issue of appointments may be influenced by New Class A legislation providing for the possibility of multi-year contracts for part-time lecturers in the UW Faculty Senate legislative process.
- 2) Research, discuss implications, and perhaps begin to draft explicit guidelines that involve new language (and values) that respond locally to the “diversity” proposals from the Class A Legislation-Diversity Committee of the Faculty Senate. These proposals will potentially impact Code Revisions to Chapters 24-31, 24-32 and 24-54 related to appointment and promotion of faculty.

Members of FCAPT:

June Lowenberg Nursing (Fall, Winter, Spring)
Greg Noronha, Milgard School of Business (Fall, Winter, Spring)
Josh Tenenberg, Institute of Technology (Fall, Winter, Spring)
Belinda Louie, Education (Fall, Winter, Spring)
Mary Hanneman, IAS (Fall, Winter, Spring)
Marian Harris, Social Work (Fall, Winter, Spring)

Faculty Assembly Staff:

Nan Geier

Respectfully submitted,
Yonn Dierwechter, FCAPT Chair, 2011-12

**Report to the Faculty Assembly
Curriculum Committee Activities 2011-2012
Katie Baird, Chair of Faculty Assembly Curriculum Committee**

The Curriculum Committee met once a month throughout the year. We primarily reviewed material new course proposals and changes to existing courses, proposals to allow courses to be taught on-line (distance learning), and changes to degree requirements.

This year we also solicited information from each academic unit on the internal process by which changes and additions to their curriculum come to the Curriculum Committee. We compiled this information (see attached), and two members of our committee have taken on the task of preparing a document that provides general guidelines for the submission of documents to the Curriculum Committee.

This year we instituted a process whereby DL courses can be converted from temporary to permanent status. Three DL courses have already made this conversion. We also pushed back submission deadlines so that all material is due roughly four days before we meet, instead of the ten days that has been typical in the past. This was done with the intent of helping to expedite the review process.

Over the entire year, the Curriculum Committee (CC) chair has been working with a Faculty Assembly Task Force to consider restructuring and altering the charge of Faculty Assembly's CC and Academic Policy Committee (APC) (see appendices). The Curriculum Committee has been in full agreement with the spirit of this reorganization, recognizing the shortcomings of role that this Committee currently plays. Many committee conversations over the year have distinguished between what we currently discuss in our meetings, and what ideally we would be discussing, and how a change from the actual to the ideal might take place.

This Task Force kept to its timetable, in June making recommendations to Faculty Assembly's Executive Council over the creation of a new standing committee that would replace APC and CC (see attached). Executive Council tentatively approved the recommendation, pending the final wording that will be worked out this summer.

Recommendations for next year: My main recommendations, stemming largely from our committee conversations over the year, are also now embodied in the APC/CC Task Force committee recommendations. Faculty review of new curriculum should not second-guess faculty at the unit level, but should involve a review of select issues (such as potential course duplication). We should develop a good website with detailed information for units. We recommend staff support in the VCAA's office. If the new APC/CC standing committee is created as planned, its purview might extend into possibly reviewing curriculum university wide and proposing new coverage areas for our curriculum.

ATTACHMENTS:

Internal Process Within Units for Curricular Changes/Additions Leading to Submissions to the Curriculum Committee

Fall 2011

Business

1. Authoring faculty member discusses new course proposal with other members of the pertinent concentration.
2. If supported by members of the concentration, authoring faculty member submits application materials (see "Guidelines" below) to Julia Smith via e-mail. She and Kent Nelson (campus curriculum committee rep.) review and suggest/make necessary changes.
3. Julia Smith posts application materials on Blackboard and notifies all faculty members. Faculty are given the opportunity to review and comment. Faculty should direct any feedback via email to the authoring faculty member, Julia Smith and Kent Nelson.
4. Once the application materials are finalized, they will be sent to the undergraduate or graduate committee (i.e., the respective committee) for review.
5. If approved, final application materials are submitted to UWT campus curriculum committee.

Education

1. Faculty are encouraged to use guidelines as set by the UW Curriculum Office.
2. Faculty are encouraged to develop/change courses in collaboration with others within in the same specialty.
3. Faculty are encouraged to seek assistance, as needed, from program representative to UWT Curriculum committee.
4. Completed course applications are sent to the Program Administrator for a course number.
5. The application is usually placed on the agenda of program meeting. If the timeline for submission to UWT curriculum committee is tight the Program Administrator posts an electronic copy of the application for faculty review for a set period of time.
6. Once the application materials are complete it is submitted for faculty vote.
7. If approved, the Program Administrator posts the application and syllabus to the UW Tacoma Curriculum Committee Catalyst page by the published deadline.

Global Honors

1. If the course pertains to study abroad, the proposal and syllabus may be submitted to the Director of International Programs who will initiate review as appropriate.
2. Intent to propose a new course is discussed with the Director
3. New course proposals and syllabi are submitted to the Director who follows the steps below to ensure peer review:
 - a. Circulate proposal and syllabus to Program faculty for review and feedback.
 - b. Circulate proposal and syllabus to Global Honors Advisory Board for review and feedback.
 - c. Revise and resubmit to groups above for final review.
 - d. Obtain vote of approval either in respective meetings, via email, or catalyst survey.
 - e. Submit proposal and syllabus to Curriculum Committee.

IAS

1. Talk with your colleagues, friends, the advisors, and Asst/Assoc. Directors about your new course idea(s). Once you are convinced there is a need, proceed.
2. Work with the Assistant Director overseeing your curricular area or Jim Gawel if your area is not clear. You will need to obtain peer reviews of proposal/change/syllabus; and make changes based on feedback. Peer reviews should include appropriate IAS faculty and a member of the advising staff.

We have the opportunity include the proposed course on elective lists for different majors. Think about where the new course should be added. Consult with affected faculty and Assistant Directors. Having this mapped out first can help strengthen the justification.

3. Send your fully vetted proposal to your Assistant Director or Jim Gawel, including a list of peers that have given feedback on your proposal. (S)He will post the proposal/change application and syllabus to the "[IAS Curriculum Proposals](#)" GoPost in Catalyst. You can visit the site to see what has been posted historically and the current status of your proposal.
4. Assistant Directors will discuss all proposals after the monthly deadline has passed. They will either recommend approval to the IAS Faculty Council or return to the proposer for further modification.
5. Faculty Council will vote on the recommendations from the Assistant Directors. A positive vote moves the proposal forward to the UWT Curriculum Committee. After completing the UWT process and all signatures are obtained, proposal is sent to Seattle for final stages of approval.

NOTE: General Education courses follow the same process within IAS.

Nursing

Nursing and Healthcare Leadership curriculum process is as follows:

1. The program has BSN, MN and HCL (healthcare leadership) faculty curriculum committees which are smaller "subsets" of the entire program faculty. They each meet 4-6 times a quarter. This committee reviews, edits, modifies and approves the course change or new course being proposed and recommends to the full faculty at a regular faculty meeting.
2. The full faculty discusses, votes and approves.
3. The course application and syllabus are finalized and the Director signs.
4. The Administrator uploads to the UWT curriculum catalyst site.
5. For BSN & MN courses, the School of Nursing BSN or MN curriculum committee also signs off on both major course changes and new courses. This process usually, depending on timing, takes place immediately following the course being reviewed by the UWT curriculum. This approval goes with the UWT approval to the UWS curriculum committee. For Health or Healthcare Leadership courses there is NOT this step.

Social Work

1. The instructor develops a course description and goals/objectives that are electronically presented to the Program Curriculum Committee as a whole for comment. The appropriate Chair of the Program Curriculum Committee will then notify the instructor regarding further course development.
2. If recommended for further development, the instructor fully develops the syllabus, which, per the Campus Curriculum Committee standards, must contain (at a minimum) the following items:
 - 1) Instructor & contact info
 - 2) Learning objectives
 - 3) Overview (what we call Course Description)
 - 4) Required reading and materials
 - 5) Course schedule (with readings and due dates)
 - 6) Evaluation methods (assignments and their weight in final grade)
 - 7) Grading template
3. After any revisions, the instructor presents the full syllabus to the Program Curriculum Committee where it will either be forwarded on to the full faculty for a vote or returned to the faculty developer for further revisions. If the course is forwarded for a vote the faculty must approve or disapprove the course by majority vote (of the voting faculty) as a part of the Social Work or Criminal Justice curriculum respectively. Voting will occur in monthly program meetings.

4. In cooperation with the Program Administrator, the instructor completes the New Course Application form. At a minimum, the instructor is solely responsible for the Course Justification, the Catalog Description, and the means by which students will be evaluated (section 4c). If the instructor is a part-time lecturer, then the appropriate Chair of the Program Curriculum Committee will complete these three sections.
5. The instructor submits the completed New Course Application Form and Syllabus to the Program Administrator for review and who in turn, has the UWT Campus Curriculum Committee representative from the Social Work Program review the materials for any changes that need to be made prior to the submission to UWT Campus Curriculum Committee.
6. Once the course is ready to submit, the Program Administrator will prepare any necessary paperwork and submit electronically to the UWT Campus Curriculum Committee by the appropriate deadline.

Technology Institute

Starting this quarter three committees have been created, one for each program. They are expected to work together on changes to courses, new courses, etc. Then, they bring the proposal to the whole faculty for approval. Our faculty complete the new course applications, an administrator submits them to catalyst,

Urban Studies

Program Coordinator notifies (via e-mail) the faculty member who is responsible for submitting the New Course Application, Course Change Application, and/or other documentation, and includes a link to the appropriate form on the curriculum website:

<http://depts.washington.edu/registra/curriculum/>.

Faculty member completes the form and returns it (electronically) to the Program Coordinator, at which time it is checked over for accuracy and consistency and saved on the Urban Studies S:drive. New Course Applications are circulated among faculty who “vote” either electronically or in a faculty meeting. Program Coordinator posts (submits) the application and documentation onto Catalyst for approval by the UWT Curriculum Committee. The committee Chair notifies the Program Coordinator if any changes need to be made to the application. Once corrected, PC re-submits the application/documentation.

January 11, 2012

To: Zoe Barsness, JW Harrington and Nita McKinley

From: Katie Baird

Re: Curriculum Committee

The intent of this memo is to clarify what role UWT faculty must play with respect to curriculum, curricular policy, and certain administrative procedures associated with curriculum and course content – in particular with new course proposals, changes to existing courses or their description, new programs, and so on.

A. New Programs

With respect to the process by which new undergraduate majors, minors, options and changes to these occur, all such requests must be accompanied by a 1503 form. The 1503 is the form needed for UW to begin its final review of these new majors/minors and changes to them.

A 1503 must first be signed by the department chair (the director in our case) approving of the change/addition. On the Seattle campus, it is then reviewed and signed by a faculty committee one level up (eg, College of Arts and Sciences) that reviews the proposal for its content, coherence with other curriculum, and so forth. It's then signed off by a Dean (in our case the VCAA), and finally it is signed by a representative of the faculty assembly (in our case APC). Then it is sent to UWS Curriculum Office.

Note that the purpose of having both a "curriculum review" and "academic policy" review process (two separate faculty oversight) is because that is what makes sense on the Seattle Campus. Thus if the English department is proposing a minor, not only does the chair sign off on it, but some faculty group representing a broader array of faculty (eg, Arts and Sciences) closer to the curriculum then has to sign off, presumably on its academic content/suitability. Finally, the FCAS signs off, with their role being reviewing it from the point of view of university-wide academic policy and standards.

We could have one faculty review process on our campus, rather than two, although I think since the form has 4 signatures, it would mean that the faculty approval would entail two different signatures (one for the curriculum review, and one for academic policy review). Until we become a multi-layered institution, this seems like what we should do.

Note: UWS's curriculum committee website is confusing on this point, because it talks about curriculum review, and academic policy review. Again the distinction is that at UWS there is a faculty curricular review at a level above the originating unit and below the FCAS. The FCAS then reviews it for academic policy.

B. New Course Proposals

New course proposals (which are by far the bulk of the Curriculum Committee's work) first require a signature by the department chair (director). The proposal then must go through some sort of representative faculty review at a higher level. The point of this review is to make sure the course is subject to academic review by faculty. It is then signed by the Dean (VCAA at UWT), and finally at the UWS point it is reviewed by the Registrar's office (UW Curriculum Committee) to make sure it meets university standards in terms of number of credits, catalog description, and so on. The UW Curriculum Office does not review proposals for academic content.

Note here that the review process by faculty at the UWT level (currently our Curriculum Committee) serves a different purpose than does the review process by the UW Curriculum Committee (UWCC). This explains why the review on our campus is done by a standing committee of faculty assembly, whereas the UWS review process is done by a standing committee of the Registrar's Office.

Also note that in the past, the problem we faced (I believe, or maybe this is now just urban legend!) was that UWCC often turned back proposals to us which caused a lot of problems. Our review process turned into one that simply assured that UWCC did not turn the proposal back to us. For that reason, UWTCC has evolved into (or has always been?) one that reviewed proposals to make sure that UWCC approved it – so rather than reviewing proposals from the point of view of academic policy, it reviewed them from the point of view of meeting university standards such as the number of letters in the abbreviated title.

C. Summing Up – Implications, Thoughts and Recommendations

- 1503s do not have to go through review by both a curriculum committee and an academic policy committee. I suggest that from now on we have these go through APC, with APC signing both “curriculum” review and “academic policy” review.
- I suggest we provide APC with some guidelines for what it should be looking for when it reviews 1503s; these guidelines should cover what 1503s are reviewed for at both levels of faculty review at the Seattle campus.
- Faculty need to review new course proposals. However, we currently are not undertaking the type of review that we are expected to undertake. In part this has to do with the volume of proposals that we get, the lack of expertise (I'm not sure how to evaluate most of the course proposals that I see!), and the lack of clarity about what we should be looking for when we review proposals. This seems to be our toughest problem.
- I think one clear implication is that the UWTCC should stop duplicating the review that takes place by the UWCC. UWTCC should establish a few things that proposals should be reviewed by faculty for (work load, assignments, rigor with respect to course numbering, curricular coherence, duplication are some things that come to my mind). Units should be given very clear instructions on what they need to do to meet the review process at the UWCC stage, but it should

not be the work of the UWTCC to make sure that units have complied with this. Units have gotten much better at this, and if they haven't learned yet, they'll learn when they find their proposals are turned back by UWCC.

- Given our growth projection and what we can assume is a continual stream of new course proposals, we should keep time constraints in mind with the last point above. Our current policy is to have one representative from each unit reviewing each new proposal. This is quite time consuming, and comes at a cost of a) the ability to more carefully review existing courses (rather than proposed ones), and b) the ability to look collectively at the curriculum, rather than individual courses.
- With this in mind, we might consider how we might streamline the process, perhaps by scaling back the size of the UWTCC; by giving units more explicit instructions about what standards new courses should meet (ie, to be a 400-level course, they must meet certain conditions, etc) so that the review process is quicker; or by getting units to have their own faculty review process and have them sign off on it (can faculty assembly devolve faculty oversight to the unit?).
- I can't see any good reason to separate out Curriculum from Academic Policy on our campus. In fact the current separation seems counterproductive.
- By combining CC and APC, faculty could undertake a more comprehensive and substantive role in overseeing the curriculum at the university level. For example, it might:
 - Review degree programs for the extent to which the curriculum (course offerings) are designed to meet the degree program's SLOs.
 - Review curriculum for writing coherence across programs, and for "compliance" with the W criteria.
 - Identify ways that quantitative literacy might be achieved across the curriculum.
 - Evaluate and make recommendations about meeting UWT's (and unit-level if they exist) SLOs.
 - Re-evaluate University-wide requirements.
 - Identify possible synergies and academic opportunities that span different programs.

January 15, 2012

Memo To: Various Participants at Thursday's Meeting, plus Curriculum Committee and Academic Policy Committee

From: Katie Baird

Re: Reorganization and Reinvigoration of Faculty Assembly Standing Committees on Curriculum (CC) and Academic Policy (APC)

Problems/Concerns Prompting this Discussion of How to Reorganize and Reinvigorate The CC and APC Subcommittees:

1. Some duplication of effort between the two standing committees
2. Confusion over the 1503 process
3. Separate committees typically respond to proposed changes to courses and to changes in academic policy, and this separation doesn't seem to facilitate higher-level discussions over these curriculum and academic policy on campus
4. Bureaucratic as opposed to substantive nature of faculty role in curriculum
5. Faculty review/oversight of core hasn't been as strong as it should be
6. Persistent concerns over writing and quantitative literacy, and concerns over the coherence of our UWT curriculum with respect to building these skills
7. Need for focus on UWT Student Learning Objectives (SLOs), and review of curriculum/programs for the extent to which these are met
8. Need for better link between first-year experience and upper-division coursework (neglect of sophomore year)
9. Growth pressures and need to assure that educational quality isn't lost (and knowing what that means)

Desired Outcomes:

1. Organizational and Institutional Structure (with necessary support) that better assures that faculty assembly standing committees prioritize issues above.
2. Requirements for course approvals, program changes and additions, and changes to academic policy are done expeditiously, with appropriate – but only appropriate – faculty oversight.
3. “Compliance” issues as opposed to overseeing and monitoring academic excellence do not overwhelm faculty attention and resources.
4. The process for moving new course proposals from UWT to UWS is done in an efficient manner that encourages rather than impedes the development of new courses.
5. Faculty assembly facilitates discussion among faculty about educational quality across campus and across units.
6. Establishment of a campus-wide culture among faculty, administration and staff that prioritizes academic excellence and educational quality.

Timeline:

Jan/Feb: Establish working group, meet about three times.

March: Develop working draft.

March/April: Meet with Academic Council (AC); committee members meet with other relevant groups.

May: Draft report/recommendations. Circulate Draft. Discuss AC, CC, APC and other venues.

June: Finalize Draft.

Summer: Revise bylaws

September/October: Faculty online vote to approve bylaw any changes

June 1, 2012

Memo to: Faculty Assembly Executive Council
From: Kent Nelson, Chair of APC/CC Task Force

Overview:

This memo summarizes the findings and recommendations of a task force that was formed to consider the roles and functions of two standing Faculty Assembly committees – the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Policy Committee. The overriding goal of the task force is to provide a structure for shared governance that would improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the faculty's role in UWT's curriculum and academic policy. Five key points have emerged from the task force's deliberations:

- (1) In its current form, the Curriculum Committee is not functioning very efficiently, primarily due to its focus on "micro-level" issues when reviewing new course/course change materials (such as word-smithing, and ensuring accuracy/completeness of applications and syllabi). Focusing on these issues is not a good use of faculty resources, and prevents the committee from considering more substantive curricular issues related to academic excellence.
- (2) There is some unnecessary duplication of effort between the CC and the APC, such as reviewing 1503's and new program proposals. Coordination of efforts between these two committees has not been effective in targeting and addressing substantive issues related to academic rigor and excellence.
- (3) The APC's role has become largely reactive rather than proactive. As a result, substantive issues of academic excellence are not actively addressed, such as writing and quantitative literacy across the curriculum, the lower-division core program and its relationship to upper-division courses in specific academic programs, curricular integrity and rigor, and new program development.
- (4) Individual units should review and vote on/approve their own submissions of course application materials for accuracy and completeness (including micro-level issues such as the abbreviated title and catalog description on the application). This will relieve the Faculty Assembly committee of the time-consuming task of ensuring compliance with university standards related to micro-level issues.
- (5) Merging the CC and APC into one committee would facilitate substantive discussions over curriculum and academic policy issues on campus, and would allow for a more proactive approach in identifying and addressing targets of academic excellence on campus.

Given our recommendation to merge these two committees into one and revise the Faculty Assembly By-laws, the task force proposes the following charge for the new committee, which we refer to here as the *Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee*.

Proposed Charge for New *Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee*:

The Faculty Assembly Committee on *Academic Policy and Curriculum* shall be responsible for matters of policy relating to the academic affairs of UW Tacoma, including proposals for new academic programs; majors, minors, concentrations, and undergraduate and graduate certificate programs; applications for new and revised courses; scholastic standards including admissions; and campus graduation requirements. It shall also provide guidance to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on policies regarding the interpretation and administration of academic regulations of the campus, as well as provide recommendations on initiatives requested by the Executive Council related to academic excellence and equity.

Committee Membership:

The membership of the APC shall consist of one elected representative for every 50 voting faculty members within each academic unit. It shall also include, as ex officio, non-voting members, one representative each from the UWT Library, Office of the Registrar, Academic Advising, Information Technology, Office of Undergraduate Education, and the UWT student body. The chair of the committee will be elected by its members and will serve for one academic year (September 16 through September 15), and can serve for up to three terms. The term of all other members shall begin September 16 in the year of their election and end June 15 three years later.

Recommended Support:

- (1) The task force recommends that a designated staff person be appointed to support the work of approving new courses campus-wide. This person would: (1) work with units on curriculum application materials to ensure their accuracy and completeness and (2) represent UWT at monthly UW curriculum committee meetings in Seattle; and (3) track curriculum application materials from submission to approval, and communicate with academic units. Because the new APC will have a larger scope of responsibility, staff support will ensure that members of the committee focus on areas of faculty expertise, such as academic rigor. Areas related to administrative detail would be outside Faculty Assembly purview.
- (2) The task force recommends that the campus maintain a website that provides information regarding curriculum development, guidelines for completing application materials, ongoing postings of new course proposals, and information and submission space for new program proposals and program changes.

(3) The task force recommends that in its first year (and possibly subsequent years, depending on work load), the committee be chaired by a faculty member who receives compensation equivalent to two course releases. Because the new APC will take a proactive role in identifying and addressing issues of academic excellence, the role of the chair will involve substantial committee leadership, as well as coordination/communication with the Executive Council and other Faculty Assembly bodies. We believe two course releases will free up the resources needed for the chair to be effective in facilitating shared governance.

Annual Report of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the UWT Faculty Assembly, Academic Year 2011-12

June 16, 2011

Committee members: Donald Chinn (chair), Erin Casey, Sergio Davalos, Denise Drevdahl, Johann Reusch, Matthew Weinstein

This report describes the accomplishments of the Faculty Affairs committee of the Faculty Assembly at UW Tacoma this past academic year. Following the Executive Summary, more details are provided on each work item. Committee minutes can be found on the committee's web page.

Executive Summary

Accomplishments of the Faculty Affairs committee in academic year 2011-12:

- **Development, implementation, and analysis of a set of interview questions for faculty who pursue or wish to pursue external funding to identify ways in which the university can support such faculty.**
- **Discussion of the reporting of adjusted median scores in student evaluations of teaching.**
- **Continuing discussion of daycare at UWT for faculty, staff, and students.**
- **Support for a Lecturer survey to address issues of workload and role in the faculty as a whole.**

Research Survey

As a continuation of the work the committee did last academic year to investigate ways in which the university can support research activities of faculty, the committee focused on ways in which the university can support faculty who pursue external funding.

Thirteen faculty were interviewed to discuss their experiences with seeking external funding and suggestions for improving the process. The committee analyzed the responses of the participants and summarized them in a report with recommendations. The report, which contains details of the committee's methodology, is attached to this one.

Reporting of Adjusted Medians in Student Evaluations of Teaching

At the request of a faculty member late in the academic year, the committee investigated the reporting of adjusted medians in student evaluations of teaching. Currently at UWT, the summary of student evaluations that faculty receive from the Office of Educational Assessment contains a "raw" median score for each item in the first two sections of the survey.

A description of the motivation and methodology behind the development of the adjusted median score can be found at

http://www.washington.edu/oeca/services/course_eval/uw_seattle/adjusted_medians.html.

The committee drafted a recommendation to have this information provided, and representatives on the committee asked their individual programs for feedback on the

recommendation. Not all of the units have reported yet, and so the discussion will resume next academic year.

Daycare at UWT

The committee has been kept up to date on the activities of the Day Care Task Force, led by Bonnie Becker (IAS). The various possibilities that the Task Force investigated last year yielded no concrete proposals. Chancellor Debra Friedman is generally supportive of day care support for UWT, but currently there is no viable partner for the university to work with. The Task Force will continue to find such a partner.

Throughout this process, the committee has served in an advisory role. The continuing understanding is that the task force is the primary body on this issue, but that our Committee is interested in the outcome, as it does affect faculty life.

Lecturer Survey

Katie Baird (IAS, Vice Chair of Faculty Assembly), Linda Dawson (IAS, Executive Council member), and Donald Chinn (Institute, Chair of Faculty Affairs) developed a survey for Lecturers to help understand the issues that they face, including workload and participation as part of the full faculty. The Faculty Affairs committee reviewed version of the survey. The survey was administered late in Spring 2012, and the results of the survey will be analyzed over the summer.

Agenda Items for Academic Year 2012-2013

In addition to finishing the unfinished business from this academic year (analysis of the lecturer survey, progress on day care for UWT, reporting of adjusted medians), one large item that the committee could address next academic year is support, improvement, and evaluation of teaching. This issue is especially important because of the large number of full-time and part-time lecturers that the university has hired in the face of recent budget cuts. Generally speaking, individual academic units do not have well-developed criteria for the evaluation of teaching. The issue of reporting of adjusted medians is a small part of this larger discussion.

UWT Faculty Affairs Committee Findings from Faculty Interviews Regarding Pursuit of External Funding

June 14, 2012

Committee members: Donald Chinn (chair), Erin Casey, Sergio Davalos, Denise Drevdahl, Johann Reusch, Matthew Weinstein

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of a set of interviews conducted by members of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) in the Winter and Spring of 2012. The interviews were conducted to extend prior work of the committee on research and scholarship by examining more closely UWT faculty's pursuit of external funding.

Research Survey Method

The FAC elected to gather data via individual interviews in order to elicit in-depth and nuanced information regarding faculty members' experiences applying for and administering external funding. An initial list of potential faculty to interview was created by identifying faculty who had been successful at obtaining external funding. In addition, faculty who had submitted applications for external funding recently were included in the list. Each faculty on the list (approximately 20 faculty) was contacted via email and invited to be interviewed. In addition, an email was sent to the uwtfac mailing list to solicit anyone who was interested in participating.

A total of 13 faculty were interviewed. All ranks are represented (including one Lecturer) and a wide range of years of experience at UWT (from 3 to over 20 years). Each were asked broad questions about their efforts to pursue external funding, including what went well in the process, what could have gone more smoothly, and recommendations for improving the process. They were also asked about what kind of mentoring they received and what their trajectory was to get to the point that they were successful in obtaining external funds. The list of basic questions used in the semi-structured interviews is attached as an Appendix.

Recommendations

Based on the feedback from the faculty interviewed, the FAC makes the following recommendations for how the university can support faculty who wish to pursue external funding.

- 1. Continue efforts to increase infrastructure for and to centralize the process for post-grant administration.**
- 2. Be more proactive in identifying and disseminating information about funding opportunity announcements and fostering relationships with foundations and other funding institutions so that faculty are earlier and better informed about opportunities (e.g. Gates Foundation).**

3. Consider creative ways to give time to faculty to develop, write, and submit proposals, including stacked course loads, or the opportunity to apply for a course release to develop a significant proposal.
4. Develop institutionalized mechanisms to foster collaborative and mentoring relationships. These could include centrally organized research forums on shared substantive areas of expertise, seed funding for research centers, interdisciplinary / community collaborations, or creative agreements with experienced principal investigators from other institutions to provide mentorship to faculty at UWT as our own pool of funded researchers begins to grow.
5. Although there have been efforts to have more financial resources at the program level, there is still a place for centralized (UWT) funds for collaborative research projects.

Thematic Content Analysis of the Interviews

What is working

Faculty who were interviewed identified several areas which they found worked well in submitting and obtaining external funding. Those areas included support from the UWT Office of Research, Collaborative Relationships with Peers, and "Other" UWT Resources. Each of these areas is explained more fully below.

UWT Office of Research. The UWT Office of Research was identified by several interviewees as being important in successfully obtaining external funding. Faculty specifically mentioned receiving useful feedback from Elise Ralph, who ran the Office of Research previously, and Kelly Fitzgerald, the current Director of Sponsored Research, on drafts of their grant proposals. Kelly Fitzgerald and Leo Aguilin (Grants Coordinator) were also helpful with the technical aspects of grant submission, including the budget. Additionally, faculty noted that having the eGC1 being approved locally was important in expediting the grant submission process. The Office of Research has also been helpful in locating funding sources, figuring out what is allowed in the budget proposal, and in drafting sub-contracts. There was a clear theme that the grant submission process has gradually improved over the past several years. There was a mixed review on whether the post-award process was "working," with one faculty noting that it seemed to work well, while another identified some specific post-award issues.

Collaborative Relationships. Several faculty mentioned that having colleagues to provide support, consultation, and/or to review grants-in-progress was quite important and useful. Some had affiliations with colleagues in various schools/departments at UW Seattle. Having these peers allowed for collaborative projects, such that they were able to be on grants that subsequently were awarded. The relationships were also a means to hear about various funding opportunities. Those who identified collaborations as important stated that these efforts occurred largely outside the UWT campus. Several people mentioned that they learned by making mistakes during previous funding attempts.

"Other" UWT Resources. There were additional resources offered on the UWT campus that interviewed faculty found beneficial including the research quarter provided to "junior" faculty, as well as access to small pots of grant funds, like the Chancellor's Research Fund. There was

concern that “loss” of this particular fund was going to hurt efforts to conduct research. One faculty identified the important of tapping into existing infrastructures and programs on the UWT campus (such as the study abroad program) which provides faculty the opportunity to meet with potential collaborators.

What is challenging: barriers to applying for and administering external funding

Interviewees identified eight challenges associated with pursuing and administering extramural funds. Primarily, these challenges were related to the time required to conceptualize and steward funding applications, difficulties with processes associated with grant submission and administration, and impediments to establishing effective collaborations. The challenges are described more fully below.

Collaboration and mentorship. Several participants (8) noted that the small nature of our campus renders finding productive internal collaborations in shared substantive areas of expertise very difficult. As noted above, many faculty report collaborating across the UW campuses or with colleagues at other institutions, but say they establish these relationships on their own. Participants identified a lack of concrete infrastructure for developing collaborations, a lack of a collaborative “culture,” and a lack of an internal pipeline of experienced researchers who could mentor and bolster the credibility of applications from new investigators as related impediments. One faculty member lamented, “we don’t have a critical mass” of faculty with external funding experience. Another faculty member commented that “Relationships are everything” and recommended building true supports for fostering intra and inter-campus collaborations, as well as community collaborations. Finally, some faculty noted that time and fiscal constraints make it difficult to attend trainings and conferences where collaborations could be fostered.

Time. Eight participants identified the considerable time required for grant development, writing, review, collaboration and submission as a substantial barrier to submitting applications. Some noted that the period during which faculty have time, summer, rarely corresponds with grant-related timelines, or the work required on proposals.

Locating funding mechanisms in a timely way. Eight participants identified difficulties with locating funding opportunities that are a good match with faculty expertise as a barrier. Some faculty noted that they have found funding announcements accidentally, purely serendipitously, or too late. Some participants felt that there was insufficient proactive attention to identifying and disseminating information about a range of funding mechanisms and opportunities. A few faculty suggested that more proactive efforts to build relationships with community foundations and with research centers on the Seattle campus would facilitate access to funding announcements and awards.

Post-grant administration. Several faculty (8) cited examples of past budget or billing inaccuracies or overly bureaucratic processes associated with administering awarded funds. A few faculty identified a lack of a centralized system for post-award administration as a problem, noting that individual programs do not have the capacity or the training to handle the unique budget and tracking requirements of each individual grant. One participant noted, “It is as hard to spend grant money as it is to actually get the money.”

Navigating complex grant submission processes. The logistics, paperwork and myriad unique details associated with each separate funding mechanism were cited by seven participants as barriers to grant submission. Faculty noted that trying to navigate these is burdensome, largely re-created by each individual faculty member, and sometimes results in failed submissions or mistakes. Some faculty noted that although available help with logistics has increased, it is still insufficient to manage the arduousness of each unique process. A few faculty suggested that this process, in combination with a lack of recognition of faculty who have tried diligently but have so far been unsuccessful in securing funding, leads some scholars to give up in frustration.

A constricting external environment. Five participants noted that declining federal and foundation dollars makes submitting grant applications less appealing and less likely to pay off. Several faculty described experiences of responding to funding announcements that were subsequently cancelled due to funding. Others noted that federal grants are becoming far more competitive, and that it is difficult for UWT faculty to compete given heavy teaching and service demands.

It's too hard to hire people. Four participants mentioned that the process for hiring on awarded grants is onerous or inordinately slow.

Lack of graduate students. Three respondents noted that research is often not feasible without graduate students or the ability to hire post-docs. These faculty also noted that grant proposals may not be competitive without graduate student personnel in budget, and that undergraduate involvement is often not feasible due to skill level and the amount of training time required.

Trajectory and mentoring

Participants were specifically asked to comment on their career trajectory and opportunities to be mentored.

Long term process and trajectory. The trajectory for individuals achieving external funding can be summarized as a gradual process of development consisting of setting a research agenda in small steps (rather than initially trying to find funding to pay for large projects). Initially they went after "low-hanging fruit" grants and after some time, established their reputation with multiple grants and collaboration. This enabled them to go after larger grants and national grants. In a few cases, internal funding provided an initial step. The Chancellor's fund has also been an important element of grant proposals. For instance, pilot study data were obtained through a small study funded by a Chancellor's grant.

Mentoring relationship. Faculty discussed several types of mentoring support. One type was as a graduate student learning how to write grants. Another type was working with a team of people/colleagues who share ideas, expertise, and credit for publishing their work. This collaboration provided greater access to collaborators with overlap in substantive expertise, and access to more experienced researchers on other campuses. Another type was from peers who provided feedback on grant proposals and ideas. A fourth type was an individual learning by

doing which consisted of getting to know the requirements for submission of different sponsors, by submitting several proposals and often getting rejected.

Other. One respondent was concerned about the possibility of developing a system of rewards that unfairly favors faculty who obtain external funding over those who are active scholars, who pursue external funds, but do not obtain them.

APPENDIX

Interview Questions for Researchers Pursuing External Funding

1. What is your history with UWT?
 - a. What was your rank when you came to UWT?
 - b. How many years have you been at UWT?
2. What is your experience with obtaining funding at UWT?
 - a. How many grants (internal and external) have you submitted since you have been at UWT?
 - b. How did external funding fit with your research program?
 - c. What sorts of things did external funding pay for (e.g., students, equipment, travel, course buyout)?
3. What worked well in the whole process?
 - a. Finding funding sources
 - b. Writing the proposal
 - c. Submitting the proposal
 - d. Post-grant administration
 - e. Hiring research assistants
4. What problems did you encounter?
 - a. Finding funding sources
 - b. Writing the proposal
 - c. Submitting the proposal
 - d. Post-grant administration (e.g., Program Administrator support, how the money is administered at the program level)
 - e. Hiring research assistants
5. How could the University help to facilitate your efforts to pursue external funding?

(Some suggestive questions)
6. What sorts of shared resources have you found useful in pursuing your research (e.g., library resources, UWT shared resources, UW Seattle resources)?
7. Describe your trajectory to get to the point where you were successful in obtaining external grants? What sort of mentoring (if any) did you have?

August 13, 2012

**2011 – 2012 Report of the Chair of the Strategic Budget Committee
Submitted by Marcie Lazzari, Social Work**

To recap, the Strategic Budget Committee (SBC) was formally announced on November 9, 2011 by Debra Friedman, Chancellor and Marcie Lazzari, Chair, and was given the following charge:

The Strategic Budget Committee shall advise the Chancellor on short-and-long range goals and budget issues. The Committee's primary focus shall be upon the development and articulation of strategies to sustain UW Tacoma's financial health.

The SBC's mission, structure and membership were discussed prior to its formation by the Chancellor, Debra Friedman; the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, JW Harrington; the then current Faculty Assembly Chair, Marcie Lazzari; and the incoming Faculty Assembly Chair, Zoe Barsness. Membership on the SBC reflects representation from the Chancellor's Management Team (as determined by the Chancellor), Academic Council (as determined by the Dean/Directors), faculty (as determined by the UWT Faculty Assembly By-laws), staff (as determined by the UWT Staff Association), and students (the current president and finance chair of the Associated Students of UWT). The SBC is chaired by the immediate past chair of the UWT Faculty Assembly (FA). Since this Committee serves an advisory function, its meetings do not fall under the open meetings requirement.

The SBC met bi-weekly beginning in November 2011. Given that this was the Committee's first year and that we were in the second year of the biennium (meaning that current expenditures were for the most part set prior to the Chancellor's arrival on July 1, 2012), we spent a considerable amount of time attempting to clarify the exact nature of our charge. Our primary focus was to identify the implications and consequences of enrollment growth as enrollment growth had been chosen as the primary response to the budget constraints resulting from legislative actions. An enrollment growth document (*Enrollment Growth: Positives, Negatives, Questions, Mitigating Strategies, and Data Needs*, 02-16-12) was developed by the Committee and given to the Chancellor to assist her in thinking through growth strategies. Additionally we were asked to consider strategies to sustain UW Tacoma's financial health.

Initially the SBC met as a large group and then in late January 2012 divided into two subcommittees: data and communications. The SBC felt that as a campus we needed to move from anecdotal story telling about budgets and growth to data-informed story telling with the goal of moving toward more effective problem solving. Additionally, we believed that the campus would benefit from developing a shared understanding of budget constraints and growth, as well as shared responsibility for addressing them.

As we continued to meet in our subcommittees, it became clear that we needed to sharpen our focus which shifted in late March to include the three broad categories about which we were asking specific questions and collecting targeted data. A message was sent to campus on April 2, 2012 outlining those categories: Access & Student Achievement, Research & Scholarship, and Economic & Community Health. Additionally, the UW Tacoma Strategic Budget Committee website was launched.

While there was a sense that the SBC was making progress, there was also uncertainty as we had not yet reviewed nor seen any specific budget information until the Chancellor met with us on May 22, 2012. Even at that point, the budget was not final as the Regents had not yet determined the percentage of tuition increase to off set the decrease in financial support from the state for the second year of the biennium.

I want to reinforce that the SBC was formed as a shared governance committee housed under Faculty Assembly. As such, faculty members serving on the SBC are particularly cognizant of the charge of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB), Section 22-91 of the University of Washington Faculty Code.

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting shall advise the administration and shall inform the Faculty Senate on long-range planning and *on preparation of budgets and distribution of funds with particular reference to faculty concerns* (emphasis added). The committee shall be guided by the advice of the Executive Committee and/or the Senate on matters of policy.

While the UW Tacoma's SBC is not identical to the SCPB, there was an attempt in forming our campus committee to institute a parallel process to that of the SCPB. In the course of their discussions, the Faculty Assembly leadership, Chancellor and Vice Chancellor agreed that such an organization and process might most appropriately facilitate execution of the UWT faculty's responsibility to advise the chancellor in regards to the budget, Section 23-45, Part B of the University of Washington Faculty Code.

The University of Washington Bothell and the University of Washington Tacoma shall each have an elected faculty council or councils that *shall advise their respective chancellors on matters affecting the general welfare of their respective campuses, matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets* (emphasis added). In accord with Subsection A, the faculty of each campus shall determine for itself the organization and structure of its council or councils and the procedure by which the members are elected.

Now that we are close to completing a one-year cycle, we are better able to identify and articulate areas for improvement. While faculty leadership appreciates the goodwill and intent of the Chancellor and her administrative team to work collaboratively, many issues have emerged as a result of this year's experience.

What the Chancellor presented to the SBC and subsequently to other units across campus was an incremental budget with no specific information on the allocation of existing funds. Further, the presentation was devoid of the priorities and strategies that guided resource allocation of the incremental budget or of the entire budget. This raised many questions for the faculty members serving on the SBC.

While it was helpful to hear an explanation of the current process of how the budget was built and how this differs from the past (a relatively more stable environment where the legislature allocated funds and programs competed for resources), the priorities represented in this budget seemed to be the result of many smaller conversations and decisions occurring in different venues. This left faculty wondering if the SBC is the appropriate venue to fulfill their responsibility to provide advice on the “preparation of budgets and distribution of funds with particular reference to faculty concerns” (from the SCPC) and “advise the Chancellor on short-and-long range goals and budget issues” (from the SBC). The information presented did not provide any real insight into actual budget allocations nor were the priorities informing these allocations clearly and succinctly articulated by the Chancellor to the SBC. Thus, it was impossible to determine or advise as to the strategic direction of the investments that had been made, or will be made in the future. If budget allocations that impact faculty are being made on an on-going basis (such as decisions to hire more lecturers), without knowledge and/or input from the SBC, how are we able to provide informed advice?

The following suggestions are made in the spirit of enhancing transparency and shared governance through the work of the Strategic Budget Committee.

- **Articulate the values and/or priorities that the Chancellor and her management team have adopted as either guidelines or criteria when making on-going allocations.** What is being prioritized and why? What was requested but wasn't funded and why? Without this information, members of the SBC are not able to understand how decisions may be impacting their particular constituency, i.e., students, staff, faculty, administrators, and to some extent our community partners.
- **Articulate the process for seeking funding.** On the faculty side, if requests are coming through the dean/directors, then what are the expectations at the unit level for faculty input?
- **Articulate the returns that have been realized on investments made so far.** Without this data, it is impossible to provide advice on where strategic investments are most needed in order to generate additional revenue or to suggest the abandonment of certain revenue generating tactics.
- **Assure that the SBC has access to updated strategic plans for each of the academic units and that a summary of the academic unit budgets is provided to the SBC on an annual basis.** This will enable the SBC to assess the areas of alignment and potential misalignment or anticipated demand on campus level resources so as to provide more informed advice and consultation to the Chancellor in regards to campus level short and long term strategic allocations, as

- well as the alignment of tactical budget decisions in regards to campus level allocations with those short and long term strategic goals and objectives.
- **Examine the impact of hiring so many lecturers, particularly those who are part-time and short-term.** This comment is in no way questioning the competencies and contributions of lecturers, but rather asking to be clear about how the increased number of lecturers impacts academic program faculty, staff, and students. For example, part-time and short-term lecturers in particular are not in a position to engage in curriculum work or provide service to the program or campus, nor are they required to advise students. They may not have adequate knowledge of the program's overall curriculum and course of study which could negatively impact how they deliver their specific course(s). These realities could place additional burdens upon tenure track faculty's ability to fulfill their responsibilities, as well as negatively impact academic and administrative support systems.
 - **Consult with the SBC prior to making budget allocations.** The SBC is collecting data to better inform strategic decision making related to growth. While it is true that key administrators serve on the SBC and it is hoped that some of the SBC discussions have informed their engagement in budget deliberations, this is an entirely idiosyncratic process that may or may not be helpful for the campus.

As I am close to completing my term as chair of this newly formed committee, I think it is critically important for faculty to determine if the SBC is the proper body in which to fulfill their responsibilities related to the Code as noted above. While I perceive that the SBC has provided an important venue for administration, members of the faculty and staff, and to some extent students, to share perspectives related to growth, it has not been the proper structure to allow faculty to give budgetary advice. I hope that this issue can be successfully resolved and that the SBC will remain intact as it has the potential to foster UW Tacoma's core values of excellence, community, diversity, and innovation.

To: Executive Council of the Faculty Assembly

From: Rob Crawford

Subject: Annual Report (2011-2012) Faculty Assembly Ad Hoc Committee for
The Arthur R. and Anna Mae Paulsen Endowed Visiting Chair in Public Affairs

Date: May 31, 2012

As chair of the FACPEC for 2011-2012, I am submitting the following report in compliance with Section IV of the procedures adopted for the FACPEC.

The most significant achievement this year was the establishment of the FACPEC.

An earlier committee had been established by Vice Chancellor Alan Wood in September 2006 as an advisory committee to the Chancellor. The task of the committee was to establish procedures and make recommendations for speakers for the Arthur Paulsen endowment to the University of Washington, Tacoma. The purpose of the endowment is to bring high quality, public affairs speakers to our campus. The original membership was composed of the Vice Chancellor, staff from Advancement, a representative of the Paulsen family, faculty and at one point a student representative. The primary tasks of the committee were to establish procedures, consult with the Paulsen family about Art's intentions and hopes for speakers, and to begin exploring possible speakers. After two years, this committee became moribund.

James Carville was chosen, without committee participation, to be the first Paulsen Endowed Visiting Chair in Public Affairs. He gave a talk and met with students in April, 2009.

The committee continued to languish through the spring of 2011. With the appointment of Debra Friedman as Chancellor, this process was reversed. In the summer of 2011, the Chancellor met with Rob Crawford to discuss the history and future of the committee. The agreed-upon recommendation was to establish the committee as an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Assembly.

Discussions occurred between Faculty Assembly leadership and Crawford to that end. Faculty Assembly leadership agreed to the ad hoc committee recommendation. Crawford wrote a draft set of procedures for the prospective committee. After discussion and alterations, the procedures were presented to the Faculty Council at its meeting on 10/11/2011. The procedures were amended and approved and posted to Faculty Assembly Website.

Crawford agreed to chair the committee for 2011-2012. Nominations were solicited for two additional faculty members to participate on the committee. Jill Purdy and Nicole Blair volunteered for the committee and were appointed for three year terms.

In October, 2011, the 2nd Paulson Endowed Visiting Chair in Public Affairs, Seymour Hersh, visited campus. Hersh had been chosen prior to the creation of the new committee. Mr. Hersh

gave a public presentation and gave a lecture in a class. Note that no formal evaluation of the success of the event took place.

It had also been determined prior to the establishment of the ad hoc committee that Mr. Hersh would be the only speaker for the period 2011 (autumn)-2013 (spring). This decision was based on funds available from the Endowment. The next speaker is tentatively scheduled for the autumn of 2013.

Given no pressing need to choose a speaker, the committee met only once (May 21, 2012) for the year. Jill Blair, Rob Crawford, Jill Purdy and Brianna Jaiteh from the Office of Advancement attended. (Thanks to Jill Purdy for taking minutes.)

Jill Purdy has agreed to become Chair for 2012-2013. The committee recommends her appointment by the Faculty Council. By informal agreement, Nicole Blair offered to chair the following year.

The Faculty Council will also need to solicit nominations to replace Rob Crawford, who served a one year term in order to help with the transition to the new ad hoc committee.

For the coming year, a Paulsen family member should be given the opportunity to participate in the committee; the Chancellor should consider appointing an additional community member; and the ASUWT president should appoint a student representative.

The committee had a lengthy discussion about available funds. Currently, funds are insufficient to fund a quality speaker on an annual basis. Jaiteh estimated that a minimum speaker's fee would amount to \$20,000 plus an additional \$5000 for related expenses. It was determined that such an amount would not be available for spring, 2013; thus, the agreement that fall, 2013, would be the best time for scheduling the next speaker.

Finally, the committee agreed that having an annual event would be preferable to one every two years. If sufficient funding from the Paulsen endowment is not available, alternatives should be considered. The committee noted the benefits of a fall speaker. The principal advantage would be to provide a "kick-off" event and theme that could be linked in various ways with students' intellectual life on campus.