

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)
Agenda

Thursday, November 4, 2010
CP 206
12:30-2:00 p.m.

Attendance: Marcie Lazzari, Chair; Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair; Donald Chinn, Marjorie Dobratz, Linda Dawson, Charles Emlet, Ehsan Feroz, Emily N. Ignacio, Diane Kinder, Mark Pendras, Jose Rios, Tracy Thompson, Peter Selkin, Larry Wear, Charles Williams, Chancellor Patricia Spakes, Beth Rushing, ex-officio

- 1. Review and approve the EC minutes from October 21, 2010.**
- 2. Reflection on October 29th meeting**

Marcie Lazzari, Chair, Faculty Assembly thanked all EC members for attending the special budget principles meeting. The next budget principles strategy meeting is November 19, 2010. A subcommittee of Zoe Barness, Marcie Lazzari, and Shahrokh Saudagaran (Beth Rushing was out of town) met this morning to review the subcommittee's work from the last meeting to develop the guiding principles. These guiding principles will go out to the attendees. From that meeting a document is coming with suggestions about the type of data to be collected.

George Mobus attends group meetings on sustainability in Pierce County. At his meetings they are discussing budget cuts that are very similar to UW Tacoma, regarding the budget shortfall. The choice UWT makes may have structural impact, so it is a good idea to consider this in the special EC meetings on budget principles. Chancellor Patricia Spakes and Lazzari both confirmed that short and long term questions have been discussed in the Executive Planning Committee. Chancellor Spakes reminded EC about Wolfgang's visit and that the budget cuts are at least a five year problem. Chancellor Spakes announced that the EPC will meet on November 16, 2010 to discuss long term changes for UWT. Lazzari noted that the special meeting of the EC, Directors, and Academic Affairs leaders is scheduled for November 19, 2010.

Mobus provided an example about re-engineering programs based on the program's principles.

Chancellor Spakes agreed that UWT should look for efficiencies. UW Seattle is conducting Program Evaluations. In those evaluations, every school or college will gather data about what they are doing, how they are doing it, and what programs can be eliminated, along with what programs can grow. Mary Lindstrom asked Chancellor Spakes how UWT can use the UW Seattle program evaluation criteria at UWT. Chancellor Spakes acknowledged that at this point

UWT is not looking at eliminating any program. However, UWT will look at departmental data to expand programs. UWT will look at **non academic programs** to critically self evaluate our work. These evaluations will be discussed at UWT in the next month or so.

Chancellor Spakes acknowledged that all UWT departmental evaluations will consider the uniqueness of the program. At UW Seattle their evaluation is covering 11 aspects. Much of their data in Seattle will be provided centrally. For example, in each Seattle program they can say whether there is something of high importance in their program. UW Tacoma will look at UW Seattle to develop our own model for the critical self evaluation. Before February **UWT will have their own evaluations to consider efficiencies, opportunities, along with the values and tradeoffs for cuts on this campus.**

Charles Williams was concerned about UWT response in the guiding principles as primarily reactive. While it is important to develop principles to address budget cuts, there should be space to address larger issues of cuts to higher education. Chancellor Spakes said EPC is addressing the \$4 million in Washington state cuts, plus increased utility costs (up \$500,000) by looking at the alternatives, one of which is to take more students.

UWT is looking at what Bothell has done. At UW Bothell they have grown by taking more students. The EPC is asking: Does it make sense to grow? What would it take to grow? EPC is looking at a combination of new revenues: summer session, and new FTE. EPC will look at a strategy beyond the next biennium.

Mark Pendras wanted to know how long UWT will grow and was concerned to know the limits of this strategy. Chancellor Spakes replied that the growth model will probably depend on the tuition increase that happens in the upcoming (**2011-13**) biennium. UWT might want to look at a two and five year model of student growth.

Marjorie Dobratz asked if there are two and three hundred new students interested in attending UWT. Chancellor Spakes assured that there are and that Academic Affairs is looking at the types of new students possible to target for growth: transfer, freshmen, international.

Chancellor Spakes discussed moving from a nine to a twelve month year. Some questions are: Should summer session revenues go to fund the Summer Bridge Program? Or should UWT find another way to fund it? Some assumptions to consider are expanding summer session and knowing that this might negatively impact autumn and other quarter enrollments. There are indications that there are students for both sessions.

3. Updates from Standing Committees

- a. Donald Chinn, Faculty Affairs. FA is revising the Research Survey. They will be continuing talks on faculty workload.
- b. Emily Noelle Ignacio, Appointment Promotion Tenure. APT committee reviewed the UW Faculty Code, UWT Handbook and Checklists. After APT reviewed the checklists, they unanimously voted that the UWT Handbook and checklists pertaining to Tenure and Promotion should follow the UW Faculty Code. In section 24-57 of the University Handbook Assessment there are procedural guidelines to insure informed decision making. These procedural safeguards are Teaching Effectiveness, Yearly Activity Reports, the Regular Conference with Faculty (the frequency of which depends on the rank of the faculty member), and Documentation.

Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair of Faculty Assembly, noted the UW Academic Human Resources page does not explicitly state that faculty should include (1) each program/departments' tenure and promotion guidelines or (2) Documentation regarding our Yearly Activity Report, Regular Conferences, and/or Third Year Reviews. Emily Ignacio, Chair of APT stated APT communicated to the EC that the inclusion of these materials could only help the ATP committee, the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, and the Provost fully understand the recommendation from the Program regarding the candidate.

Ignacio reported that after meeting with Shelby Fritz, Fritz offered to meet with the Chairs/Dean of the various programs/school to ask them to document the specific procedures that their program follows to "review" the performance of faculty at all levels and/or for the third-year review, promotions, and even merit.

Barsness suggested that APT should draft a document about requirements in the Code (24-57) and communicate this to Programs. This will aid in the faculty in each program in their efforts to review their Program's process and review procedures for junior faculty and also assure that each program generates the required documentation for each case. Charles Emlet suggested, after the UWT Handbook is brought inline with the UW Code, APT and EC needs to individually go to programs to communicate the changes. Ignacio and Marjorie Dobratz both pointed out the weighting of these four requirements, as stipulated by 24-57 is a Program question. Ignacio was hesitant, because of the feedback from APT, to stipulate what constitutes the content, stipulated in the UW Code, back to Programs.

Chancellor Spakes suggested that Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs be included in these discussions, regarding the UW Code, because addressing the content required by the UW Code is a shared responsibility.

George Mobus suggested the EC consult Jim Posey to look at what constitutes teaching effectiveness and how to measure the content. Tracy Thompson suggested that APT reviews will potentially show patterns of the content in those requirements and that they can bring this to the attention of the relevant Program. Ignacio thought this should come from the EC.

Action: Lazzari asked Ignacio to develop a list of what APT wants to see in each file according to the UW Code. Marcie Lazzari and Zoe Barsness will meet with Beth Rushing, Marcia Killien, and Emily Ignacio to discuss addressing the Human Resource checklist inconsistencies with the UW Code and to discuss further how best to communicate case-by case content in these requirements.

- c. George Mobus, Academic Policy Committee. APC reviewed a new Student Credit Proposal. At UW Seattle they are looking to limit students to 180 credits. Currently Tacoma allows undergraduates to take 210 before they have a hold put on their registration. APT voted to keep the existing 210 credit policy because of the number of transfer students at UWT.

Chancellor Spakes responded to a question raised by the EC about why Seattle is choosing to limit undergraduate credits to 180. Chancellor Spakes noted that Tacoma might limit credits to allow for the entrance of new students. The faculty will need to look at their values, for example with respect to average class size. Jim Posey has looked at this on the UWT campus and very few students stay around after they have met all of their requirements for a degree simply to delay graduating.

Action: EC voted and approved APC's review of the student credit proposals to keep credit hours at 210.

Mobus also updated the EC about APC's oversight on General Education. Mobus is working on the draft resolution to bring to EC.

4. Continuation of discussion regarding academic integrity, teaching evaluations, etc.

- a. Ehsan Feroz wanted to clarify that he is not interested in discontinuing student evaluations. Rather, he finds that some programs might be using student evaluations as the only assessment on teaching effectiveness.
- b. Feroz would like some committee like APT to examine how the teaching evaluations are weighted in programs. Pendras asked if EC members should go back to their programs, but it doesn't seem as pressing as the other things EC is working on. Emlet agreed that it would be helpful to bring something uniform back to the program.
- c. Zoe Barsness suggested the HR website also has suggestions for evaluating teaching effectiveness. Barsness worked with Marcia last year to ask her what constitutes peer versus student evaluations. Barsness said the UW Code language is broad enough to leave it to the programs' discretion how best to

evaluate teaching effectiveness in that domain. There is no specific set of criteria are mandated by the code in terms of how teaching effectiveness is determined. The code only requires that teaching effectiveness be assessed. Suggestions as to possible criteria to use are provided, but it is left to the discretion of the unit to determine how best to assess teaching effectiveness in its own domain.

- d. Teaching Effectiveness: 24-57 George had a question about Student Evaluations versus Teaching Effectiveness. George Mobus – suggested that Jim Posey provide data from other institutions on best practices.
- e. Ignacio noted that at least for the peer evaluations, we could look at what is not “peer” then we can send it back to the program for the evaluation.
- g. Diane Kinder noted that programs are not necessarily opposed and would appreciate this discussion.

Action: Feroz will talk with Jim Posey.

- 5. Update on bylaws changes - terms of service for Chair and Vice Chair and voting status for immediate past Chair.** Barsness is still working on the language for the bylaws change.
- 6. Set meetings for the remainder of the academic year** - alternating Wednesdays and Thursdays has been suggested. The EC committee agreed to stagger the meeting for the rest of the academic year.
- 7. Husky Principles:** EPC adopted these in support of students who wrote them. The Executive Planning Council voted to adopt them. EC voted to adopt them as well.
- 8. Confirmation of volunteer to serve on the Services and Activities Fee Committee (SAFC)**
Vanessa Tucker, a full time lecturer in Education volunteered to serve. EC voted to confirm her appointment to SAFC.
- 9. The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.**

**All meetings are held Thursdays, in CP 206 from 12:30 - 2:00 p.m. The next meetings are November 18, 2010, December 9, 2010 and, January 6, 2010.