IAS Faculty Meeting
March 14, 2014

Date: Friday, March 14, 2014
Time: 12:30 – 1:30 pm
Location: JOY 215
NOTE: Highlights indicate actions taken/decisions made

Agenda

1. Announcements & Approval of Minutes
   a. 1/31/14 Minutes
   b. 2/14/14 Minutes
   c. Scheduling
   d. Web page
2. For Discussion: Salary Increases
4. For Discussion & Action: Portfolios
5. For Discussion & Action: Search Waivers

Discussion

1. Announcements & Approval of Minutes
   a. 1/31/14 Minutes –
      i. There was a request to incorporate the attendance into the minutes.
      ii. There was a request for more detail in the minutes (i.e., noting who said what during the discussions).
      iii. Minutes were approved.
   b. 2/14/14 Minutes
      i. Minutes were approved.
   c. Announcements:
      i. Introduction of Faisal Hossain.
      1. Spring and Summer 2013, Dr. Hossain is jointly appointed as an Associate Professor with IAS and the Department of Civil Environmental Engineering, College of Engineering.
      ii. Office of Provost announcements:
         1. Tenure & Promotion granted the following:
            a. David Coon: effective September 2014 rank of Associate Professor
            b. Joyce Dinglasan-Panlilio: effective September 2014 rank of Associate Professor
            c. Riki Thompson: effective September 2014 rank of Associate Professor
         2. Effective 9/15/2014, IAS will officially be a school
   d. Web page
      i. Staff and faculty have been working diligently updating and enhancing IAS web pages.
      ii. IAS web page:
         1. Faculty & Staff resource page has been updated.
         2. IAS faculty governance page is live.
         3. Send an email to your Division Chair or Bonnie Becker if you notice errors or experience any problems.
         4. Division web pages will be reviewed next quarter.
         5. Faculty guidelines
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1. The low enrollment policy that are written within the curriculum scheduling guidelines were finalized.

2. Faculty Council took suggestions, reviewed and posted it online

3. Directory:
   a. The faculty directory is almost complete.
   b. A “last” plea for completion was made to faculty.

2. For Discussion: Salary Increases
   a. Salary increases:
      i. 4% has been allocated for increases with 2% across the board for merit
      ii. IAS is waiting for Faculty Assembly Council for broader guidance
      iii. There will be discussion with Faculty Council on how to distribute with or without the Faculty Assembly Council’s guidance
      iv. How to adjust accordingly will be discussed based on the following:
          1. Merit
          2. Comprehension
          3. Equity

   a. The document was sent around earlier this week for review.
   b. Faculty Council and Bonnie Becker worked on a streamlined process to make it clear to establish new majors, new minors and changes to the curriculum.
   c. Bonnie worked with Faculty Council and Ginger MacDonald on a process how new majors are established. The goal was to make it clear so that feedback is also incorporated at various levels (see document). The following points were noted:
      i. There are many opportunities during the process to provide feedback.
      ii. Allow about a year for the process to go through.
   d. Where will the final vote come from for the approval of the majors and minors?
      i. It was proposed that Faculty Council (which is represented by IAS Faculty) be delegated to provide the final vote. The Faculty Council approved this move therefore the IAS Faculty is being asked to vote on the Faculty Council’s recommendation and vote.
      ii. Discussion:
          1. There are lots of opportunities for faculty to provide feedback as long as the process is followed.
          2. Allowing Faculty Council to provide the final vote of approval for a new major or minor can be revisited in the future if it appears the process does not appear to be working.
          3. It was suggested that faculty can request the change or request for a new major/minor to be discussed at an IAS faculty meeting. This will be incorporated into the process document and voted upon again in Faculty Council.
   4. Faculty voted.
   5. Vote results:
      a. Yes: 60
      b. No: 1
      c. Abstain: 1

4. For Discussion & Action: Portfolios
   a. IAS is the only program on campus that requires a portfolio and it is an obstacle for students.
   b. There was a conversation with Ginger MacDonald and JW. The question came up, should IAS eliminate the across the program portfolio “requirement” and allow majors to assess student learning outcomes in the most appropriate manner?
      i. IAS still needs to assess students.
      ii. Doing nothing is not an option.
iii. Questions/discussion:

1. Would this happen at the major level?
   a. Yes. Each major has different student outcomes
   b. Each major needs to figure out what is appropriate for the major
      i. When will this happen?
      ii. Next fall

2. It was suggested to consider grandfathering in students who have been enrolled in IAS before new policy is implemented.

3. Eventually new policy would go through campus assessment.

4. Are there any standards or guidelines?
   a. It is being looked into.

5. Should majors have final say in what is expected from the students?
   a. Right now it goes to a central place and then grad office to check if students have done the requirement. This would streamline the process and assessment.

6. Why IAS is doing this?
   a. No one is reading portfolios

7. There is a concern if “31 students haven’t completed portfolios” should not be an excuse for eliminating portfolios.
   a. In some cases the portfolios are missing something very minor and this is where it becomes problematic.
   b. Rethinking assessment is an important discussion.
   c. The intent is assessment. It is designed right now to punish students.
   d. The task is to come up with a process that does not punish students.
   e. Writing consultants thought it was great to require portfolios however the problem is that the portfolios are not being used or evaluated.

8. The faculty was asked to do away with the requirement of portfolios for graduation. Not completing a portfolio would not stop a student from graduating. The student still has to do assessment.
   a. There was a call to questions.
   b. A move to second.
   c. Faculty voted:
      i. Abstain: 2
      ii. No: 0
      iii. Yes: remainder of those presented voted yes.

5. For Discussion & Action: Search Waivers
   a. There is an opportunity for 2 appointments at the assistant professor level.
      i. The appointments do not impact hiring priorities.
      ii. Spouse/partner accommodation is common for IAS. The assistant professors will still go through the requirement tenure & promotion process.
      iii. Search waver was obtained from the Office of the Provost and now there is a need of a faculty vote. The two faculty up for a vote are:
         1. Ed chamberlain
         2. Natalie jolly
   b. Questions/discussion:
      i. Were these requests?
         1. No. It has been an on-going discussion with Matt Kelly and JW. There was further discussion about who else would qualify.
         2. This is not target of opportunity hire as it does not involved new money or an allocation of new resources.
         3. It is about retention.
The following concerns were voiced and addressed:

1. There is no recollection of this happening before. There is a feeling of being uncomfortable about immediately moving a faculty member to a tenure track position without an interview process based on the hours of faculty and staff have put into competitive hires.
   a. This is not a precedent. It has happened before.

2. This should be done more as a recruiting tool. The faculty are qualified for jobs and still need to go through tenure review. It should be doing during the hiring process if positions are available and it would be good to see more lecturers move into tenure track positions.

3. There is currently no policy on partner/spouse retention and a policy should be established.

4. It is a developmental and labor issue. Universities do not have mechanisms to hire a spouse which means the partner has to sacrifice career (historically women.

5. It is not clear about the lecturers who would like to go to be approved to rank of assistant professor. The criteria appears to be “luck”.
   a. These are people who were recruited and invested to stay at UWT. They are tied to campus and there is a desire to keep them. There is an effort to move lecturers into stable positions but these are people who want to be in a tenure line position. Both cases want to. there is a concern if we do not, then there is a possibility to losing people.
   b. This is less about lecturer issues and more about retention.

6. A lecturer supports and agrees that this is about retention. The last time discussion about an opportunity hire and the faculty member spoke out against it but noted that the Provost did provided 3 ways for non-competitive hires
   a. Spousal hire
   b. Opportunity hire
   c. ?

7. It is important to get as many faculty into stable positions as possible and this is about retaining 4 people, not 2.

8. It was voiced that one of the difficulties is that this is not a hypothetical situation however IAS needs to think about the policy.
   a. IAS does not need an ad hoc process
   b. Is it retention offer?
   c. When funds are available?
   d. There is a larger policy issue at hand and Faculty Council needs to address this.

9. It was voiced that there is an economic and logistical issue of faculty hiring in general:
   a. The pool is small and ability to find a job in same city of spouse is minimal.
   b. The spouse/partner who follows forgoes earnings for years.

10. It was voiced that there is a need to offer more of these. There should be support of the idea when there is need and if IAS can do it.

11. Question: Have the divisions voted?
   a. No. They have not been asked to vote.

12. It was voiced again that it is a policy issue that needs to be addressed however it was added that the director/dean needs as much flexibility as possible to recruit faculty.

13. Voting concerns:
a. There was a request from the Faculty Parliamentarian that David Coon not vote.

b. Who can vote?
   i. This is a new appointment so everyone (tenure track and lecturers) can vote.

iii. Live Faculty vote results:
1. Ed Chamberlain
   a. Yes: 43
   b. No: 11
   c. Abstain: 10

2. Natalie Jolly
   a. Yes: 45
   b. No: 10
   c. Abstain: 10

iv. Catalyst Faculty vote results:
1. Ed Chamberlain
   a. Yes: 50
   b. No: 13
   c. Abstain: 5

2. Natalie Jolly
   a. Yes: 52
   b. No: 12
   c. Abstain: 4