

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Minutes
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)
Thursday, February 18, 2010
MAT 352

Attendees: Johann Reusch, Chair; Marcie Lazzari, Vice Chair; Greg Benner, Marjorie Dobratz, Steve Hanks, APT; Mark Pendras, Ehsan Feroz, Emily N. Ignacio, Tracy Thompson, Jose Rios, Curriculum Committee; Deirdre Raynor, APC; Peter Selkin, Larry Wear; Beth Rushing, Vice-Chancellor on Academic Affairs, *ex-officio*

1. The minutes from February 4, 2010 were approved.
2. Vote on International Admissions Requirements.

The EC voted in favor of the following language:
International transfer students who have an AA degree from a Washington State community college, a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.75, and a minimum grade of 3.0 in two English composition courses are considered to have met the English proficiency requirement. These students are not required to submit TOEFL, IELTS, or MLT test score results.

Beth Rushing suggested that a formal recommendation go to Derek Levy.

Action: The FA EC voted and unanimously approved the International Admission Requirements.

3. Academic Affairs updates: Beth Rushing, VCAA
Rushing noted that on Tuesday the HECB has a proposal for Criminal Justice. A state hiring freeze will come into effect my mid-March. Academic Affairs is looking for two faculty for the Criminal Justice program. If a hiring freeze goes into affect the program will not be implemented. This freeze could also include personal service contracts, gift cards, and out of state travel.

Reusch asked if the CJP implementation should be frozen, whether the market demand will be reassessed before the program is implemented. Lazzari confirmed that since the proposal/idea was initiated approximately five years ago there might be concern over reestablishing demand for new programs such as this at the implementation stage.

Rushing noted that a BA in Criminal Justice has many future options, for example in Law, even though this program is not a professional degree. Academic Affairs will monitor how big this program grows.

Steve Hanks asked about the body responsible for market analysis on demand for new programs and whether there is a budget committee that establishes demand. Rushing

noted that the Budget Committee takes requests for new resources and has identified there are not new resources. José Ríos suggested that the proposal writer might follow up on current demand.

Rushing noted that the Higher Education Coordinating Board follows up by asking how many students are in the program, but does not ask for job market demands. Tracy Thompson wanted clarification about the process regarding a group responsible for following up about the demand and the allocation of resources. Documentation can help make the process explicit, regarding organizational memory and access to the information. Rushing noted that for Criminal Just there are no extra resources being allocated. Academic Affairs is responsible for choosing to implement this program. Rushing asked how the FA EC would you like to have this process more transparent. Thompson noted that faculty are just becoming aware of processes such as these and are trying to articulate the best way to ask for information.

Academic Affairs has proposed an Undergraduate Advisory Council (please see attachment A). This is not a policy making body. Faculty, students, and staff will make recommendations coming from Foundations of Excellence and will look at undergraduate graduation.

Tracy Thompson asked for clarification on the meaning of “co-curricular.” Rushing noted that this refers to student advising. General Education does not refer to the office of General Education; it is focused on student learning outcomes and applies to all students.

Thompson asked how this council relates to individual programs, like in the Business School. The Milgard School of Business established particular outcomes. Thompson also asked about the implications for programs that have students in their junior and senior years. Deirdre Raynor added that the FoE report includes nine dimensions. In the first year this also impacts the student’s first and second year. Thompson noted that the business program has been working on assessment for the past ten years.

Rushing noted that the campus wide assessment of university-wide student learning outcomes would be done with the CLA exam. Larry Wear noted that the assessment will take place in the CLA, so the program will not be affected. Rushing noted that the when we get results the FA EC will get the results and provide feedback.

When the Undergraduate Advisory Council makes a policy recommendation this will come to FAEC and this is where it will reach programs.

Rushing noted that six programs relate to the Undergraduate Advisory Council and this should not be a programmatic body. Rushing noted that it is the responsibility of the FA EC to communicate to their programs.

Reusch noted that faculty have to teach in the Core. The core is 20 credits. Rushing noted that students take 180 credits. Emily Ignacio asked if this relates to lower level classes or specifically the Core. Rushing replied that programs make these decisions.

Reusch asked if for the faculty's Annual Review, the General Education/Core program director will be involved in the review. Rushing said she would follow up on this, because she is unaware of this process. Raynor added that for untenured faculty this has been seen as a concern. Rushing responded that she has not noticed individuals expressing concerns about the impact of teaching in the core on their APT file. Rushing noted that she will speak with Ingrid Walker about this concern.

Reusch asked whether it would be appropriate for Student Affairs staff to get involved in shaping policy concerning academic standards and quality as part of the Undergraduate Advisory Council. Rushing noted that the Undergraduate Advisory council is a chance for students, student affairs, and faculty to start a discussion.

Rushing discussed the *Academic Plan*. All programs have provided feedback and Rushing will talk with APC about how to move forward. This is an administrative council, but Academic Affairs welcomes feedback about faculty representation.

4. Update on Standing Committees

Raynor noted that APC is meeting to discuss the Academic Plan and the Undergraduate Advisory Council.

Hanks noted that APT is waiting on the promotion to full cases. APT is working on what specifically constitutes a peer review of teaching and a lack of consistency at the program level. APT might discuss uniformity in the review process.

5. 2Y2D: The discussion was postponed due to lack of time

6. Set the date for the full Faculty Assembly meeting: discussion postponed.

7. A request to extend FA EC meetings time to 1.5 hours was made. There are many agenda item to handle in the current time frame. Pendras suggested that if the FA EC extends the meetings, we should start with voting items. Faculty have teaching obligations.

Action: There was a general consensus to extend the meetings.

8. Procedure for disciplinary action against UWT faculty members: discussion postponed.

9. Formalize the Emeriti/ae Cabinet Committee: discussion postponed.

10. Faculty representation on the **Budget Committee**. Reusch and Lazzari recommended that the FA EC Vice-Chair sit on this committee.

Greg Benner asked if someone can take his position. Benner suggested that the faculty representative should see a budget and the frequency of meetings should be increased.

Action: There was vote to appoint FA EC Vice-Chair and Chair to serve as faculty representative on the Budget Committee. The committee unanimously approved this vote. The FA EC will make a recommendation to Chancellor Patricia Spakes. Reusch suggested that this recommendation should go to the FA as a whole, since there is a possibility that it can be viewed as consolidation of power.

11. The meeting adjourned at 1: 35 p.m.

Attachment A:

Proposed Undergraduate Advisory Council for the University of Washington Tacoma

Background

The recommendation for an Undergraduate Advisory Council follows directly from recommendations made by the Foundations of Excellence report, which called for a body that provides an institutional perspective on the various elements of the undergraduate experience at UWT.

While all academic programs attend to the undergraduate experience of their majors and minors, and other campus offices meet different student needs, the Undergraduate Advisory Council is needed to provide a formal communication and coordination mechanism for these disparate groups.

This is not a policy-making body, though there may be recommendations for policy that are generated from the work of the Undergraduate Advisory Council and then directed to appropriate councils, committees, or groups.

Purpose

The Undergraduate Advisory Council provides holistic coordination of the undergraduate experience at the University of Washington Tacoma. Its scope includes the formal academic curriculum and the co-curriculum, as well as student support services. This Council will forward policy recommendations to the appropriate governance bodies (Faculty Assembly and ASUWT). Representatives from Faculty Assembly and ASUWT will provide the necessary communication channels to and from this group.

The Undergraduate Advisory Council serves as a clearinghouse through which the work of various campus units and committees are linked, and will help prevent duplication of effort or the potential for working at cross purposes. It makes recommendations, as appropriate, to other units or offices on campus (e.g., Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, ASUWT, Faculty Assembly, or General Education), but is not a policymaking body itself.

The goals of this Council are to encourage academic excellence and enhance student life. The Council will seek to achieve these goals through the following objectives:

1. Review, modify, and coordinate the implementation of the recommendations of the Foundations of Excellence committee
2. Review and make recommendations on the development of a vibrant co-curriculum, integrated with the academic curriculum
3. Review and make recommendations about the nature and extent of support services for students
4. Review and make recommendations regarding the general education curriculum at UWT
5. Review results of the assessment of general education, and make recommendations for changes where necessary.

Structure (to be finalized in conversation with Exec Committee and Student Affairs)

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or designate)

Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (or designate)

Faculty members (3 to 5, appointed by Faculty Assembly Executive Committee)

Director of General Education

Librarian representative

TLC representative

Academic adviser representative

Representative from the Student Success Mentoring Program

Student Affairs staff representative(s)

Students (number? How selected?)

ASUWT representative

Faculty Assembly Executive Committee representative

Academic Policy Council representative

Curriculum Committee representative

Members serve 3 year staggered terms. Chair to be elected from members. Committee staffing to be coordinated in alternate years by Academic Affairs and Student Affairs.