Date: April 8, 2015  
Time: 9:30 – 10:00 am  
Location: JOY 201  
Note: Highlight – indicated actions taken/Decisions made

**Attendees/Invitees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Hanneman</td>
<td>Chair (PPPA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Forman</td>
<td>Chair-elect (PPPA)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Moore</td>
<td>Lecturer-at-Large</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loly Alcaide Ramirez</td>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos Nascimento</td>
<td>PPPA</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Masura</td>
<td>SAM</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Montgomery</td>
<td>SBHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Reusch</td>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Greengrove</td>
<td>Interim-Dean, IAS</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Becker</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Cline</td>
<td>Chair of Chairs</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Powers</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agenda**

I. Approval of Minutes  
   A. March 6, 2015 Meeting  
II. Reports: Division, Chairs, ELT (Kristina’s compilation)  
   A. Chairs: No updates  
   B. CAC: No updates  
   C. PPPA: No updates  
   D. SAM: No updates  
   E. SBHS: No updates  
   F. SHS: No updates  
III. Action Items  
   A. Areas of Knowledge (Heather Hucks, Arlyn Palomo)  
   B. Approval of Multi-Year Lecturer Review Process (Turan)  
IV. Discussion: Voting Procedures  
   A. Voting Procedures  
      i. Tenure Track Hires  
      ii. Voting on Tenure and Promotion  
      iii. Voting on Third Year Review
Looking Ahead:
I. “Breaking up is hard to do”: Ideas for CAC from CAC
II. IAS voting policy/procedure
III. Grade Inflation
IV. Honors
V. Lecturer Promotion Policy
VI. Reappointment policy for senior lecturers
VII. Grade Inflation

Discussion
I. Approval of Minutes
   A. March 6, 2015 Meeting
      i. Notes approved as amended
II. Reports: Division, Chairs, ELT (Kristina’s compilation)
   A. Chairs: No updates
   B. CAC: No updates
   C. PPPA: No updates
   D. SAM: No updates
   E. SBHS: No updates
      i. Low enrollment question
         1. Work load issue and administration issue
      ii. Conversation process of 80+ people
   F. SHS: No updates
III. Action Items
   A. Areas of Knowledge (Heather Hucks, Arlyn Palomo)
      i. Background was provided to the advisors
      ii. There was a question about common core. Does the common core address any of the areas of knowledge?
         1. This is being addressed by the lower division committees.
      iii. SAM and PPPA discussed
     iv. Question for the advisors:
        1. What are the implications of each of the models? How does it affect students going through?
           a. Response from advisors:
              i. UWT needs to consider undergrad population of transfer students. Most require a minimum of 15 credits into the areas for an AA from community colleges. 15 credits in each area would help make a smoother transition from community college to UWT.
              ii. Option C would be limiting for what students can take to count towards general education. There shouldn’t be too many restrictions and limitations in IAS.
              iii. Option c is the most restrictive.
iv. Transfer students are put off as they have to take more courses in addition before starting the major. Students feel they are back sliding and being a freshman again.

v. UW is the only school that does not recognize the direct transfer agreement. AA, general education requirements are accepted. UW picks apart the transcript and the credits do not transfer like the students expect the credits to transfer, thus opting to go to a different university.

2. How do the advisors view adding more credits to the area?
   a. Response: Advisors agreed to let majors set requirements but a baseline needs to be set.
   b. Students should be encouraged to take courses outside of the area. Encouraging them to develop interdisciplinary perspective.

3. When developing new majors, B. Becker is recommending to include courses outside the major.

4. Encouraging majors to incorporate and make suggestions will help the divisions to be intentional with scheduling.

5. Assessment of the options:
   a. Option a is not an option
   b. Option c is not practical
   c. Option b is favored

6. Next steps:
   a. E. Cline will bring to next chair meeting
   b. B. Becker will amend paperwork and language

7. There was a move to adopt option b
   a. Vote: unanimously approved

B. Approval of Multi-Year Lecturer Review Process (Turan)
   i. There were questions about how the process interfaces with going up for promotion
      1. There is an issue in Seattle and it is being held up. The concern is that a lot of mentors are chairing and reviewing of a tenure committee and there is a conflict of interest. Faculty Assembly needs to separate the process.
         a. In another institution, junior faculty members had a mentors outside of the department
         b.
      2. For lecturers who are going for promotion, guidelines will be addressed by TK and CG
   ii. The following points were made:
      1. Reappointment is voted upon by those senior in rank
      2. The process will be implemented as soon as possible if approved
      3. Slight language amendments (“in consultation”) were made.
a.

iii. Committee concerns:
   1. It was asked if a lecturer can suggest 3 people for their review committee however this is a decision of a chair in consultation with the dean as the dean appoints the committee.
   2. There was a suggestion for the candidate to have ability to veto who is on the committee. It was noted that there isn’t anything written to address a veto at the assistant professor level when forming the committee.

iv. Next steps: T. Kayaoglu will arrange lunch with lecturers to address questions

v. Motion to approve; seconded
   1. Unanimously approved

IV. Discussion: Voting Procedures
   A. Voting Procedures
      i. Tenure Track Hires
         1. The following points were made:
            a. There was a feeling there should be an in room discussion
            b. There is difficulty given the size of the group
               i. It was noted that larger legislative bodies than ours who have discussion
               ii. Options:
                  1. The meetings should stick with Robert’s Rules of Order during discussions.
                  2. Create specific rules of discussion
            c. It is the only opportunity for full body to speak
            d. It was suggested to shorten the window of vote period
            e. There is a need for the following:
               i. How to structure the in room discussion
               ii. Consider more frequent meeting during hiring season
         2. It was recommend to add more meetings:
            a. Weekly meetings in winter quarter
            b. 12:30-1:30 to only address searches
         3. The following suggestions were made:
            a. Recommendation of search report template
            b. Lock down catalyst so that a vote cannot be changed
            c. Have catalyst remind those who have not voted to vote more frequently
         4. Next steps:
            a. Divisions to discuss time limit time of voting
            b. C. Howson and M. Forman to provide recommendation of guidelines for rules of discussion
         5. There was a move to accept document for tenure track faculty search process. It was seconded and unanimously approved. Changes to be sent to N. Demmings.
ii. Voting on Tenure and Promotion
iii. Voting on Third Year Review

Next mtg:
Requirements for job ads

CAC (who gets to decide)