

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes**

March 30, 2018 1:00-3:00pm GWP 320

***Present:*** *Lauren Montgomery, Leighann Chaffee, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, Nicole Blair, Ellen Moore, Mark Pendras, Sushil Oswal, Ji-Hyun Ahn, Justin Wadland, DC Grant, Menaka Abraham, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Jie Sheng*

***Zoom:*** *Michelle Garner, Greg Rose, Denise Drevdahl. Eugene Sivadas*

***Guests:*** *Jeremy Davis, Rob MacGregor (sub for Laura Feuerborn), Karl Smith*

***Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Jutta Heller, Arindam Tripathy, Jill Purdy*

***Absent:*** *Charles Costarella*

1. **Consent Agenda, Recording Permission, & Approval of Minutes**

* The agenda and the March 5, 2018 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved.
* Recording permission for the minutes was given.

1. **Announcements**
   * The Office of Undergraduate Education is bringing a guest speaker on May 15th, Dr. Terrell Strayhorn, who is a scholar and leader in the area of inclusive universities. Please spread the word to your colleagues.
   * April 4th is the 50th anniversary of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s death. UW Tacoma will memorialize him with a bell toll at 4:01pm out on UW steps.
   * There have been concerns about logging in with UWNetIDs onto the EVCAA feedback form on catalyst. Thus, there are paper copies to fill out and the search committee will send the feedback form as word file via email so people can type and turn it in anonymously. Feedback will be received until next Tuesday, 5pm.
   * The Vice Chair of Faculty Assembly nominations will open on April 2nd. The message to faculty will include a summary of time commitments and list of monthly meetings
   * Follow up on dogs on campus policy question: Susan Wagshul-Golden, campus safety director confirmed that if you have a student who wants to bring dog to campus, the student can apply for an emotional support animal (different from service animal). An argument would have to be made that the student would be able to better function in class with that animal.
     1. EC members asked: What happens for students who have anxiety about animals or are allergic? Answer: This will have to be on a case by case basis. If those issues arise, it will be discussed by the appropriate parties
     2. The emotional support animal designation is just campus level (service animal rights are within and protected by the ADA).
        + How do we know if animal is approved? Lauren will find website that lists questions you can ask a person who brings animal and will circulate to EC.
   * Follow up on elevator-use after-hours: individual students can apply to get a card to access any floor and the DRS can help with accommodations for students.
   * Spring quarter unit reports: EC members were asked to gather teaching load data by rank across their units and include the context of course caps.
     1. EC members discussed potentially trying to gather information on service loads. EC decided to look into that further next academic year since it is a challenging thing to quantify and compare across units and disciplines.
        + how to measure it and set expectations
        + some service information is captured in annual faculty report – every faculty member does an activity report – but those are written differently by each person
        + it would be good for the whole campus to have a service template – all faculty could fill out annually – could we do this this year, or next year?
          1. IT has a service template, but it is not detailed or required, just suggested. The template could be different for each unit. It should be at unit level since there are different expectations across units
        + Why do we want to gather this information? What’s the purpose?
        + We have discussed the idea of needing to protect faculty members from their units? But if a service-report template and service expectations are a unit level decision, there is no purpose in trying to protect faculty from their units. In this case, we need campus guidelines or at least the suggestive power of a common template to collect data. Deans/Directors can look at it and compare. As an example: Deans/Directors are feeling pressure from the Equitable Teaching Policy Guidelines that EC passed.
        + Paying attention to service is important.
     2. Ka Yee will send around template and EC will look into this further next year.
   * Ellen and Nicole have taken on the project of student focus groups.
     1. Would it be possible for us for us to do larger scale, across campus– wouldn’t it be better to look broader?
        + It is better to be more inclusive, but we at least need a place to start. Next year the campus climate survey will involve students and capture important data.
        + Idea for Faculty Assembly to offer listening sessions to campus in order to hear from students. Many want to hear the student perspective. We can get better at this as we go.
   * Academic planning stage three: alert units that we are asking for feedback on the criteria that will be used to create the Academic Plan from all faculty via catalyst. APCC and EC will also provide feedback and will review the faculty feedback. Then the draft plan will come to EC. These are the mechanisms for faculty to have input on the plan.
   * Spring FA meeting: 5/25/18 – *please note the new date. Time: 1-3pm. Location: Carwein Auditorium.*
     1. This meeting will be focused on the results of the Academic Planning Exercise.
2. **Professional Development Chart: Dean and Director Feedback & Final Dispensation**
   * 1. The Lecturer Affairs Committee organized the collection of this professional development information. It was meant to inform lecturers, but they realized that others might be interested in seeing it too. They wanted to be intentional about how they shared it (not just on a website) and thus brought it to EC. Both percent and dollar amount charts were shared with EC so that EC reps would have context to talk to your units about it.
     2. Deans and Directors were surprised by this chart when it was shared with them. If EC publicizes it, deans/directors would like it to be without money amounts.
     3. EC members talked about the need for context and mechanisms for dispensation:
        + Some academic units generate summer funds that go toward faculty professional development
          1. SWCJ and SOE each have mandatory summer programs that generate more revenue for those units
        + The information could be announced at unit meetings; put on unit agendas to display the table
        + Some members expressed nervousness about showing the numbers, even though they tell an important story
        + Who is the information for? Faculty.
        + What’s the purpose of showing it? To see how faculty members are treated relative to each other
          1. If we’re worried about the actual amount of money, then that’s a different motive.
        + The numbers show that SIAS lecturers are the only ones who cannot pay for a conference
        + Independent unit summer budgets will not be used moving forward and summer revenue will be held centrally (according to Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration)
        + There is an important difference among faculty ranks in terms of which are afforded one conference or two and a half conferences without having to apply for other funding
          1. SIAS has a teaching fund that accepts applications for attending conferences. Assistant professors get first priority; lecturers do not get priority; this fund always receives more applications than there is funding for
          2. SWCJ has an application process for research funds, but there are no other back up funds for other professional development
     4. EC took a “straw poll” to determine direct the discussion:
        + Release only percent amounts – seven in favor
        + Release dollar amounts – seven in favor
     5. EC members agreed that both require context, that transparency is important, and that the information will spark conversations about important issues
     6. EC agreed to attach an addendum to the dollar amounts chart and ask deans/directors to write a paragraph of context to add to the addendum before release

**VOTE:** 11 in favor, 6 opposed/abstain, 3 absent, 20 eligible.

1. **Revisions to Diversity Designation REVIEW Process** - *Menaka Abraham, APCC Chair* **APPENDIX B**
   * There were no questions/comments/concerns.

**VOTE:** DC Grant moved; Loly Alcaide Rameriz seconded; 16 in favor; 1 abstain, 0 opposed, 3 absent, 20 eligible.

1. **Admissions: Report and Review Current Practices**  *- Karl Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor & Chief Admissions Officer*
   * College academic distribution requirements (CADR’s): from the State
   * Presented a table of enrollment summary with admission deficiencies in Autumn 2017. World language contributes to most of the deficiencies.
   * Admission process: initial assessment (different for high school vs. transfer students), threshold review (eg. GPA, SAT etc.), holistic reviews (e.g. background, AP classes, etc.)
   * New students admitted with an admissions deficiency in Autumn 2017: most deficiencies in world language and lab science.
   * Demographics of newly admitted deficient students in Autumn 2017.
   * The Admissions Department would like to know from faculty how they should be reviewing the writing sample submitted by prospective students
     1. EC directed Karl to talk with the University Writing Director, Dr. Asao Inoue
2. **Proposed Policy on Teaching Evaluations - D.C. Grant, FAC Chair APPENDIX A** 
   * In 2014 EC and EVCAA commissioned a Campus Fellows group to look into teaching evaluations
   * This policy came out of their report
   * EC discussed the proposed policy and decided to ask FAC to elaborate on best practices in consultation with the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows (potentially as an addendum) and submit it again for the following EC meeting on 4.23.18
3. **Inclusive Pedagogy Readings - identify reading to share with faculty in your unit** 
   * Each unit has been asked to choose a reading and have a conversation; this is challenging but important.
   * SIAS
     1. SIAS reps were concerned that perhaps one or two individual faculty members will select anecdotes to discuss and derail the larger conversation
     2. SIAS reps were encouraged to set up ground rules for the conversation
     3. Who will lead? SAIS has a Diversity Council who is putting together a policy guidelines document which will start more conversations. The SIAS reps have taken the idea of the inclusive pedagogy reading to the Diversity Council which meets monthly. SIAS reps will work through/with their Diversity Council.
   * IT
     1. IT reps have been working on this initiative via email communication. Chuck Costarella has sent his colleagues some of the videos and news articles that he has been using in his classroom. Chuck will help lead the conversation in IT.
     2. EC members asked if this will this be effective in IT to start conversation and IT reps confirmed it would be
   * SOE
     1. SOE reps chose the DiAngelo piece
     2. They had also previously read a chapter on Safe Spaces to Braves Spaces
     3. The two readings will be bridged by an activity
   * US
     1. US reps also chose the DiAngelo piece
     2. They expressed a concern about the potential attitude of busy people feeling patronized by homework; same reaction that comes from suggesting trainings workshops on same subject
   * NHCL
     1. NHCL reps also selected the DiAngelo paper
     2. They also sent their unit all of the suggested readings
     3. NHCL has core diversity courses and they anticipate faculty being interested
   * Milgard
     1. Will select article and then have discussion
     2. Similar concern about folks having “homework” attitude
     3. Will work with faculty council chair to get the conversation on their faculty meeting agenda
   * SWCJ
     1. They are also thinking about using the DiAngelo article, maybe Williams et. al
     2. Concern about push back and the attitude of “we know this already”; faculty have expressed that this needs to be done on more of an institutional level, though, units also need to discuss these issues on their own level
     3. Strategy: request to be on agenda and asked feedback from the SWCJ Diversity and Inclusion Committee; they are trying to build buy-in
   * Library
     1. Library rep. would like to have this conversation with the Library and the TLC
     2. Librarians are interested in what faculty are doing
   * EC members brought up hearing of anecdotes of racist things faculty have done and said even just this year
     1. It has also been happening to faculty of color by other faculty
   * Though these readings are important, there is not a magic reading, not a perfect one; the reading is more of a device to have the conversation; conversations that will be triggered by the reading
   * What are the goals of the conversation other than to start the conversation?
     1. Raising awareness
     2. Create a format where everyone has to grapple with race and inclusion
4. **Adjourn**

**APPENDIX A**

**FAC Proposed Campus-Wide Policy for Teaching Evaluation**

*Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on 2.16.18*

In response to the 2016 Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, the Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the adoption of the following campus-wide policy:

According to the University of Washington’s “Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices (2016)” and supported by research by the Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, UWT units should rely on all three of the following methods of teaching evaluation: peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and student evaluation of teaching. Furthermore, each unit should:

* Define the terms Teaching Excellence, Teaching Effectiveness, and Student Success in alignment with the UWT strategic plan.
* Provide guidelines and transparency about each component of teaching evaluation (peer evaluation, self-evaluation and student evaluation). These guidelines should clearly identify which kinds of teaching assessment will be used for which purposes, and how much weight they will be given in merit, contract renewal, and promotion and tenure decisions.
* Self-assessment of teaching should take place on an annual basis as part of faculty annual activities reports.
* Effective teaching should be supported with resources such as professional development funds, mentoring, workshops, fellowships, staff resources, etc.

**Addendum: Faculty Code Language**

[**Section 24-32 C**](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html)

The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or continuing education. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include:

* The ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter;
* The consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline;
* The ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments;
* The extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring;
* The degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized;
* The availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and
* The regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods.

A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long- range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

**Section 24-7 A - Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness**  
  
To implement the provision stipulated in [Section 24-32, Subsection C](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#2432C), the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.  
  
The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under [Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html#2532D), or with the instructional title of lecturer the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the title of senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or professor of practice the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with the faculty member.

**APPENDIX B**

**Proposed changes to the Diversity Designation Review Process**

*Approved by APCC on 2/14/18*

The original diversity designation policy approved by Executive Committee on 6/3/2015 will be amended to add the review process recommendations of the Academic Policy Curriculum Committee’s (APCC) Diversity Designation Review Committee 2016-17. Changes are highlighted below.

***APCC recommendations:*** (from APCC Minutes June 7, 2017 *and the Diversity Designation Review Committee Report, 5/25/17*).

1. Members suggested that future review committees contact faculty who have recently taught the course to ask them to describe how the learning objectives are put into practice and what explicit concepts are covered.

2. Members suggested that future APCC Diversity Designation reviews consider addressing gaps identified in tables 2 and 3, most notably the relatively few courses that address age, disability, or indigenous identities.

3. Members noted the variations in approaches to diversity in the courses and recommended that a future review committee could consider how well students are able to access diversity courses that would provide them this variety.

4. Members recommended that the review only include courses taught in the last year

***UW Tacoma Diversity Designation Policy (changes highlighted)***

***Processes to ensure ongoing quality of Diversity Courses:***

i. Academic units are expected to assess continuity of Student Learning Objectives (SLO) and course descriptions on an ongoing basis.

ii. All D designated courses have at least one diversity related question in course assessments and/or their course evaluations (<http://iasystem.org/help-main/faculty-user-guide/add-questions-to-an-evaluation/>) assessing students’ self perception of learning about diversity. Faculty may use questions that measure outcomes related to specific disciplinary epistemologies and pedagogies. Additionally, here are some sample questions that correlate with the existing criteria for the diversity designation:

i. How is the value of diversity related to socially constructed group identities?

ii. Did this course change your outlook on the meaning of diversity? If so, explain how.

iii. How does what you learned about diversity address concepts of power, privilege, marginality and activism?

iv. Will you incorporate what you learned about diversity into your everyday life? If so, explain how.

iii. Every three years, APCC will select a random sample of twelve D courses to review that were taught in the last year.

a. Programs will be asked to:

i. submit the most recent syllabus

ii. submit the diversity related question responses portion of the course assessments and/or the course evaluations, and

iii. the contact information of the faculty that taught this course most recently.

b. The faculty member who taught the class most recently will be asked by the APCC to describe how

i. the diversity-related learning objectives were put into practice, and

ii. what explicit concepts were covered.

***Criteria for the Diversity Designation\****

To have the D (Diversity Designation) courses must

1. have at least 60% content focused on diversity,

2. provide students with understanding of human diversity with a primary focus on the United States

3. focus on one or more socially constructed identities such as race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, age, ethnicity, and nationality, and

4. have two or more of the following goals and they must be reflected in the course learning objectives:

● To provide an in-depth analysis of at least one socially constructed identity

● To teach about the intersections of socially constructed categories, perspectives and experiences

● To teach students to think critically about power, inequality, marginality and activism

● To explore the customs, traditions, and cultural expressions (art, dance, music, literature, etc.) as they relate to experiences of power, privilege, oppression and activism

● To explore the historical precursors of contemporary power relationships and the interconnected histories of various people as they relate to power, privilege and oppression

● To investigate contemporary society and how institutions like education, law, government, religion, science, health, military, and others contribute to the inequitable distribution of power and privilege in society.

Courses must meet these requirements every time they are taught to have a D designation. Courses that are taught differently at different times, such as TCORE courses, Special Topics courses, Independent Studies, or Internships, cannot not be given a D designation.

***The definition of “Diversity Requirement”, as defined in the UW Policy Directory, Chapter 114, Section 2, Subsection B.1.d is:***

“No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural, political, and economic diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.”

Note that while the above is part of the UW Seattle diversity policy, UW Tacoma added the requirement that diversity in the US be a primary focus of any course with a D designation. This was instituted because it was deemed important to ensure an understanding of diversity issues in the country where students are studying and will most likely live and work after graduation.