IAS Faculty Meeting
April 4, 2014

Date:     Friday, April 4, 2014
Time:    12:30 – 1:30 pm
Location: KEY 102
NOTE: Highlights indicate actions taken/decisions made

Agenda

1. Announcements & Approval of Minutes
   a. Announcement:
      1. CAC placed 1st for submitting bio info for the IAS site
      2. QuESSt placed 2nd for submitting bio info for the IAS site
   b. Key dates announced
   c. Faculty needs to send syllabi and office hours to iasgen@uw.edu
   d. Minutes discussed for approval
      1. Voting for catalyst but not live vote results; both sets are now there
      2. Discussion spousal hires – note is was discussed
   e. Lori Lynn Furlong
      1. First Distinguished Endowed Undergraduate Scholarship at UW Tacoma
      2. Financial assistance to undergraduate student studying in IAS. First preference be given to students who attended school in the Franklin Pierce School District
      3. In memory of Lori Furling, a graduate of Franklin Pierce High School and UW Bothell.

2. For Discussion & Possible Action: Voting Process
   1. There are multiple questions about
      a. Policy about spousal retention hires
      b. Vote for Natalie Jolly and Ed Chamberlain
         i. Context – March 14 live vote
            1. Voting policy: If 2/3 of faculty are not present or if the live vote produces less than the required 50%+1 of the entire eligible faculty support of the committee's recommendation, an electronic vote of all faculty will be conducted.
            2. The vote was short of 50% +1 that was needed to forward
         ii. There is nothing written in policy that you have to be in the meeting in order to vote or not. There were faculty members who were teaching who wanted to vote.
         iii. Bill Kunz spoke with Cheryl Greengrove of Faculty Council
      iv. Catalyst vote 50% +1 was conducted and passed. Results:
         1. Ed Chamberlain: 50 yes, 15 no, 5 abstain
         2. Natalie Jolly: 52 yes, 12 no, 4 abstain
         3. Eligible Faculty: 91 . . . 46 needed for a majority
v. There are questions about the voting policy and if it is compliant with the faculty vote that took place. There are inconsistencies with voting policy and by laws and concerns about info that was available to the faculty.

vi. There is no search report as there is a waiver of the search however the following will be required if there is a positive vote:
   1. Packet: letters of interest from candidate
   2. Letters of reference
   3. Waiver of search report

vii. Bill met with various faculty members who voiced their concerns. He also met w Marcia Killien, secretary of faculty senate. There have been several conversations and it has gone to Parliamentarian of the Senate. The code cops have not provided input yet on the 2007 policy written by Michael Forman and Cheryl Greengrove.

viii. The following are options:
   1. Nullify vote and vote again
   2. 24-52 code c1: procedure it can go to Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs and VCAA can send it back to faculty for a vote with or without additional information as the “vote is advisory”
   3. The soonest for action will be at the May meeting so that all information is provided to the faculty

ix. Per the faculty code, the director can make the final recommendation and counter the faculty vote. The VCAA can still forward to Provost w the recommendation.

x. Is the 2nd vote (Catalyst vote) compliant?

xi. If the voting policy is not code compliant, it is the major issue
   1. Faculty Council is developing and proposing a modification of the voting policy noting and considering the following:
      a. Hiring votes to be done on Catalyst.
      b. Recording the meeting
         i. Legal case, those can be retrieved
         ii. Recommendation have a summary not a recording.
         iii. There was voiced support of the idea of not having a recording. The summary should be posted and then faculty can vote from there. Notes need to be distributed that afternoon to make sure consistent to what was discussed
      iv. There was a voiced support for recording and for documentation however the following was also noted:
         1. Meetings are closed
         2. Anything (notes etc.) could be subpoenaed
         3. There is a need to create an accurate document of what was discussed. It can be retrieved and archived and used to protect IAS so that IAS is code compliant
      c. Discussion board
      d. Divisional vote is in question and recommended for each candidate as a tenure line, there is no divisional vote; but we do have a divisional vote for lecturers
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i. Recommended that the Chair of member’s division should write letters of support

ii. Tenure track has a committee report and a summary of the discussion. This could be available and distributed for the voting faculty

2. Memo on voting procedure which would refer back to bylaws need to be added as an appendix

xii. Next steps

a. Forman is working with Greengrove and Kunz to make consistent with current bylaws

b. It will be adjust at next Faculty Council meeting and will be distributed to faculty for review and a vote at the May 4th, 2014 faculty meeting.

c. Faculty Council representatives will note any feedback from faculty

IV. For Discussion & Action: Native American Studies

1. The Native American Studies search committee reported to the faculty in February. It was approved and Michelle Montgomery has been hired.

2. The committee recommended a 2nd hire however there were concerns on how it would impact hiring

3. Bill spoke with JW and all requests for hires for next year have been approved (7 tenure track and lecturer hires) The second Native American hire does not impact next years' hires

4. It was recommended to hire 2 people to build curriculum.

5. Danica Miller connected to Puyallup tribe and she would be instrumental to build the community and make connections with UWT.

6. Having 2 people to build together has value versus 1 person

7. Discussion about additional hire:

   a. Danica Miller and Michelle Montgomery are in different fields so contributes to diversity of the program

   b. A second hire would address student demand that is anticipated

   c. There is a desire to create closer links with tribes in region

   d. There is a large hole in curriculum

   e. Environment Studies program would collaborate with tribes and fisheries and this would add to the current courses

   f. It was a priority for many years and never addressed

   g. It is a great idea and good way to jump start the program

   h. Environmental engineering to incorporate Native American traditions due to demand as tribal communities want to see people who can interact with the tribal community in a technical way.

   i. UWT is an urban serving campus surrounded by native land. It is appropriate for the campus and program. development and build the student demands

   j. There is a concern that the Native American program will draw from EGL studies

      i. It was voiced that the NA program is seen as competing w EGL. It will bring students into the program as a whole.

      ii. EGL can help develop minor in NA studies; plan to develop minors to support the curriculum
iii. Faculty from diverse groups are more likely to retain when hiring from diversity will help with retention

k. All 3 candidates are viable

i. Faculty voted:
   i. YES: 60
   ii. NO: 4
   iii. ABSTAIN: 1

V. For Discussion & Action: Adjunct & Affiliate Appointment Process

1. In past, adjunct, affiliate and research associates were voted by all faculty
2. The question is, should this be delegated to Faculty Council and be treated the same way part-time hires are approved?
3. The appointments do not have voting rights
4. The divisional vote will be an advisory vote. If the vote within the division is close, then Faculty Council will question to move forward
5. Definitions for each appointment to be provide
6. Faculty voted to delegate to Faculty Council.
   a. It was a positive unanimous vote.
   b. Faculty Council will approve adjunct, affiliate and research associates.

VI. For Discussion: Range of Faculty Appointments (Research Professor, Artist in Residence, etc.)

1. List of faculty appointments
   a. Research Professor, Associate, Assistant
   b. Professor without Tenure
   c. Artist in Resident
   d. Professor of Practice
2. Voting rights
   a. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles: Senior artist in residence
   b. Senior lecturer, Principal Lecturer, Associate professor, Professor, Associate professor WOT, Professor WOT.
3. Tenure and funding
   a. Research professors, etc. are without tenure
   b. Some or all funding can come from external sources
4. Discussion
   a. Research prof for science is advantageous; focus on research; 2 tracks tt and research track
   b. Need to start discussion so not to lose good faculty
   c. What is the difference between professor of practice and lecturer?
      i. Outline of job classification not developed yet
      ii. The idea of teaching in a field based on their professional experience vs. academic background
   d. There is a need to careful of the language for the categories
   e. It would be helpful to have all details of what the candidate can and cannot do
   f. Need to check code and provide examples
   g. Try to integrate this with the hiring process
   h. It should be part of strategic hiring