****

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

May 31, 2017 12:30-1:25pm CP 206 C

***Present:*** *Marcie Lazzari****,*** *Mark Pendras, Lauren Montgomery, Sushil Oswal, Katie Haerling, Julia Aguirre, Marion Eberly. Matt Kelley, Ji-Hyun Ahn, Marian Harris****,*** *Michelle Garner, Nicole Blair, Marion Eberly. Jennifer Harris****,*** *Jeff Cohen, Greg Rose, Charles Costarella, Jim Gawel, Leighann Chaffee.* ***Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Melissa Lavitt, Jutta Heller, Lauren Pressley, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Ellen Moore, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee.*

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

The agenda was approved and permission was given to record for the minutes.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The May 19, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved.

1. **Service Recognition** *Appendix A*

The service of members who were ending their terms was recognized, as well as, those who were continuing and a note about who would be joining EC in fall 2017.

1. **Salary Planning Priorities: VOTE** *Appendix B*

The EC chair shared about the extra EC meeting that was called for 5.26.17 in order to make a plan for giving salary planning priorities to the Chancellor. He explained that the ballot asked EC members to rank priorities 1-4 and vote on including 3 pieces of language. EC members requested that, “using deviation within rank or by rank or corrected for rank” be added to the third piece of language. See appendix B for vote results.

1. **EVCAA Report & RCEP Discussion** *– Melissa Lavitt*

EVCAA Lavitt requested EC’s support for UW Tacoma to engage in a RCEP process to deal with the abnormal UW Tacoma structuring. For example, a current issue is that the job description for a program director and a school dean is the same. The difference is in the title and compensation. Thus, there are inequalities in expectation and compensation. Also, there is no policy or language about when a program is ready to be a school (what’s the measure?) Thus, undergoing a limited RCEP process can guide UW Tacoma in looking closely at its structure. The Limited RCEP wouldn’t be to eliminate anything, just to help guide restructuring. Overall, this is an unscripted opportunity for a creative solution. EC members noted that it is necessary to consider this from a campus perspective because whatever is decided will affect everyone. EC requested that there would be campus and unit level (deans/directors and their faculty councils) discussions before UW Tacoma started a RCEP process. EC agreed to continue this discussion in Fall 2017.

1. **Chair’s Report & Discussion Items**
   * **Equity & Inclusion Component in Promotion & Tenure Documents -** *Appendix C*

APT was charged by EC to respond to equity and inclusion in Promotion and Tenure. They researched what other institutions have in place. The goal is to give recognition within the P&T process to those who do equity and inclusion work and not penalize those who don’t. Also, as a way to encourage everyone to participate in equity and inclusion work at various levels and document it in their P&T files; give space for it and increase the expectation that everyone should incorporate equity and inclusion in some way. As for implementation, there would be a period of time to let people know this is being added so that those who are part way through their P&T process don’t have the requirements change on them. APT cannot put forth a mandate (“must”) but can create room in the process (“may”). EC members proposed that APT and EC work together on recommendations to the units on how to identify, prioritize, and encourage equity and inclusion work as part of the P&T process, and thus, work on the culture in this way. At the unit level, there should be a systematic evaluation, i.e. units should have an articulated process. This effort will need to be an intentional, multi-pronged approach because unit level practices vary. EC members thanked APT and agreed to continue this discussion in Fall 2017.

1. **Adjourn**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Executive Council Service 2016-2017** | | | |
| Marcie Lazzari | Past Chair | 2016 | 2017 |
| Mark Pendras | Chair | 2016 | 2017 |
| Lauren Montgomery | Vice Chair | 2016 | 2017 |
| Jeff Cohen | APCC Chair | 2016 | 2017 |
| Jim Gawel | APT Chair | 2015 | 2017 |
| Marian Harris | FAC Chair | 2015 | 2017 |
| Nicole Blair | SIAS | 2016 | 2019 |
| Ellen Moore | SIAS | 2015 | 2018 |
| Ji-Hyan Ahn | SIAS | 2015 | 2018 |
| Jutta Heller | SIAS | 2015 | 2018 |
| Loly Alcaide Ramirez | SIAS | 2016 | 2019 |
| Jennifer Harris | SIAS | 2016 | 2017 |
| Sushil Oswal | SIAS | 2016 | 2019 |
| Leighann Chaffee | SIAS – long term sub | 2017 | 2017 |
| Charles Costarella | IT | 2014 | 2017 |
| KaYee Yeung-Rhee | IT | 2015 | 2018 |
| Katie Haerling | NHCL | 2016 | 2019 |
| Michelle Garner | SW&CJ | 2016 | 2019 |
| Matt Kelley | Urban Studies | 2015 | 2018 |
| Marion Eberly | Milgard | 2016 | 2019 |
| Greg Rose | Milgard | 2015 | 2018 |
| Julia Aguirre | SOE | 2014 | 2017 |
| Mark Pagano | Chancellor | 2015 |  |
| Melissa Lavitt | EVCAA | 2016 |  |

**Appendix A**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Newly Serving 2017-2018** | | | |
| D.C. Grant | FAC Chair | 2017 | 2018 |
| Menaka Abraham | APCC Chair | 2017 | 2018 |
| Eugene Sivadas | APT Chair | 2017 | 2018 |
| Kayee Yueng | As Vice Chair | 2017 | 2018 |
| Leighann Chaffee | SIAS | 2017 | 2020 |
| Laura Feuerborn | SOE | 2017 | 2018 |
| TBD | IT | 2017 | 2020 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Terms of Service Ending** | | | |
| Marcie Lazzari | Past Chair | 2016 | 2017 |
| Marian Harris | FAC Chair | 2015 | 2017 |
| Julia Aguirre | SOE | 2014 | 2017 |
| Jennifer Harris | SIAS | 2016 | 2017 |
| Jim Gawel | APT chair | 2015 | 2017 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Serving Again 2017-2018** | | | |
| Mark Pendras | Past Chair | 2017 | 2018 |
| Lauren Montgomery | Chair | 2017 | 2018 |
| Jeff Cohen - TBD | APCC Chair | 2016 | 2018 |
| Ellen Moore | SIAS | 2015 | 2018 |
| Ji-Hyan Ahn | SIAS | 2015 | 2018 |
| Jutta Heller | SIAS | 2015 | 2018 |
| Nicole Blair | SIAS | 2016 | 2019 |
| Loly Alcaide Ramirez | SIAS | 2016 | 2019 |
| Sushil Oswal | SIAS | 2016 | 2019 |
| Leighann Chaffee | SIAS | 2017 | 2020 |
| Charles Costarella | IT | 2014 | 2020 |
| Matt Kelley | Urban Studies | 2012 | 2018 |
| Greg Rose | Milgard | 2015 | 2018 |
| Marion Eberly | Milgard | 2016 | 2019 |
| Katie Haerling | NHCL | 2016 | 2019 |
| Michelle Garner | SW&CJ | 2016 | 2019 |
| Mark Pagano | Chancellor | 2015 |  |
| Melissa Lavitt | EVCAA | 2016 |  |

**Appendix B**

UW Tacoma Executive Council

Faculty Salary Planning Priorities

VOTE Tally: 5.31.17, *RW*

The Executive Council of the Faculty Assembly of the University of Washington Tacoma has the opportunity to provide guidance to our campus administration regarding campus salary planning. Individual units are engaging in long-term salary planning for their units, but Chancellor Pagano and EVCAA Lavitt are also making available centrally 1% of salary from this year's pool to address campus level salary concerns, and they want guidance from the EC about how to prioritize use of those funds (equity, compression, inversion, starting salaries, etc.).

Below is a list of priorities for EC members to vote on. Please place a rank number (1 being the highest priority, four being the lowest priority) in front of each of the below priority groupings:

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty who have been the most compressed for the longest period of time.

**As priority # 1** = 11 votes

As priority # 2 = 5 votes

As priority # 3 = 0 votes

As priority # 4 = 1 vote

Abstain: 1

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty who face the most pronounced compression, regardless of years in rank.

As priority # 1 = 6 votes

**As priority # 2** = 10 votes

As priority # 3 = 1 vote

As priority # 4 = 0 votes

Abstain: 1

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty who have spent the most time in their rank, though their levels of compression may be less pronounced.

As priority # 1 = 1 vote

As priority # 2 = 0 votes

**As priority # 3** = 15 votes

As priority # 4 = 1 vote

Abstain: 1

\_\_\_\_\_\_ Faculty who have spent the least amount of time in rank, facing the lowest levels of compression.

As priority # 1 = 0 votes

As priority # 2 = 1 vote

As priority # 3 = 1 vote

**As priority # 4** = 13 votes

Abstain: 3

Recognizing that making salary decisions according quantitative factors alone, while relying on limited data criteria, may be undesirable, please also indicate whether you would like to see the following language included in the guidelines provided by the EC to the campus administration (write ‘yes’ or ‘no’ in the space provided):

­­­\_\_\_\_\_\_ The recommendations provided here are based on set of criteria limited by the availability of data. While we appreciate this opportunity to offer guidance, the EC would also like express a desire to expand the criteria in the future to include additional demographic categories, specifically data on race and gender, so as to assess and correct any additional patterns of inequity.

Yes: 15

No: 1

Abstain: 2

\_\_\_\_\_\_ In providing this guidance regarding faculty salary priorities, the EC would like to emphasize the importance of simultaneous qualitative review of the salary data to ensure that the salary decisions made will effectively target the identified salary concerns.

Yes: 13

No: 2

Abstain: 3

\_\_\_\_\_\_ The EC advises that salary compression be calculated by academic unit, and that in addressing the priorities determined by the EC the administration begin with the unit that has the lowest median salary. [add: using deviation within rank or by rank or corrected for rank]

Yes: 10

No: 5

Abstain: 3

20 eligible to vote; 18 ballots cast

**Appendix C**

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure at UW Tacoma**

**APT Approved 04-17-2017**

UWT’s vision:

*The University of Washington Tacoma fosters a thriving and equitable society by educating diverse learners and expanding knowledge through partnership and collaboration with all our communities.*

UWT’s mission includes:

*As an urban-serving university, we:*

* *Expand access to higher education in an environment where every student has the opportunity to succeed;*
* *We foster scholarship, research and creativity to address the challenging problems of our time and place*

Scholarship

UWT champions community engaged scholarship. Publicly engaged scholarship builds on mutually beneficial partnerships and creates positive impacts beyond the campus and academy, connecting the South Sound with the world at large. Therefore, UWT values scholarship that includes aspects of diversity, equity and inclusion in its scope or impact as a vital means of addressing relevant community issues.

Teaching

UWT is grounded in social justice and embraces the assets of our diverse communities. UW Tacoma prides itself on the diversity of our students, and the enriching campus life and learning such diversity brings. Intellectual leadership at UWT includes good teaching that is attentive to diversity in the student body. This means fostering an inclusive classroom where all students see themselves reflected in and are encouraged to participate in discussions, activities and other course exercises. Academic mentoring of students is another important element. UWT values mentorship for all students, including first- and second-year students, first generation students, and underrepresented groups.

Service

UWT also recognizes the importance of service that enhances inclusion, access, and equity for underrepresented students. Examples may include: curricular design that fosters inclusivity; mentoring student cohort and other support groups for underrepresented students; and participation in professional development programs on and off campus that are designed to improve individual and collective capacities for supporting a diverse student body. UWT also values representation in the community, such as work in support of outreach to diverse communities and underrepresented groups.

Intent

This policy is intended to encourage all faculty to play a proactive role in fulfilling UWT’s institutional goals of diversity, equity and inclusion. Faculty across every unit on the UWT campus are already engaged in this work, and this policy is intended to recognize these contributions at the campus level.

**Policy**

**Candidates for reappointment, promotion or tenure must include in their self-assessment narrative a discussion of contributions to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion.**

**AND**

**School/Program review committees and the campus-wide Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, when preparing reviews of candidate files must include a specific discussion of the candidate’s contributions to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion in their reports. This discussion should summarize how the candidate has integrated this UWT diversity mission in their teaching, research and service, and offer a systematic evaluation of the impact of this contribution.**

The rubric below offers examples of faculty contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion. The column and row headings offer a rubric that *could* be used to evaluate and situate a faculty member’s contributions. All academic units are strongly recommended to explicitly incorporate a candidate’s contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion into their reappointment, promotion and tenure criteria so that the candidates understand that the criteria included in this rubric will be employed in the assessment of their work along with the other P&T criteria used by their respective unit.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Individual impact:**Diversity, equity or inclusion work with individual students, faculty, community members or organizations | **Programmatic impact**: Diversity, equity or inclusion work establishing or providing significant leadership to a formalized program | **Institutional impact:**Diversity, equity or inclusion work contributing to efforts that strengthen UWT policy and practice |
| **SCHOLARSHIP** | \*Scholarship incorporates equity and inclusion issues and/or diversity in objects of study (e.g. Social Welfare and Criminal Justice faculty incorporate diverse individuals within their subject pool)  \* Faculty examine their methodology from the perspective of Critical Disability Studies and makes adjustments in their research approaches. | \*Leading or participating in a research group that addresses equity and inclusion (e.g. Urban Studies faculty lead a research group on gender and labor)  \* Faculty work with diverse graduate students and faculty on research projects leading to a special issue of a journal on a diversity topic. | \*Establishing or supporting the creation of new academic initiatives (e.g. SIAS, Education, or IT faculty establish a Disability Studies-focused research initiative) |
| **TEACHING** | \*Efforts toward equity, diversity and inclusion in undergraduate and graduate teaching and mentoring (e.g. the candidate examines their pedagogy for ableist tendencies and racial biases; Writing faculty incorporate themes of equity and inclusion within introductory course assignments.) | \*Participating in a disciplinary mentorship or pipeline program (e.g. faculty attend mentorship conference for underrepresented graduate students) | \*Faculty organizes diversity-related teaching pedagogy symposium or conference at UWT, which brings together diverse U.S. faculty, graduate students, and independent scholars.  \*Creating a new academic program, courses or graduate specialization focused on equity in areas that currently do not exist on this campus (e.g. Ethnomusicologist leads development of a new MA program in music of the African diaspora) |
| **SERVICE** | \*Engage diverse groups of individual students and/or organizations on and off campus (e.g. Business faculty advise undergraduate Women in Business group)  \* An Associate Professor actively mentors faculty-of-color or disabled junior faculty through collaboration, institutional support, and advice. | \*Participating in program building efforts (e.g. Environmental studies faculty collaborate with indigenous groups to produce environmental impact studies) | \*Creation or leadership role in new UWT program serving community constituencies (e.g. Economist establishes summer pipeline program for low income high school students) |

*Suggested changes to Appendix A:*

**Appointment, Composition and Function of the Review Committee:**

The candidate and the program director/dean will work collaboratively in selecting the members of the review committee. Members of the review committee may be chosen from all campuses of the University of Washington. At least two of the members of the committee must be members of the University of Washington Tacoma faculty. Each committee will have no fewer than three and no more than five members, all senior in rank to the candidate. The candidate and the program director/dean must jointly endorse the composition of the review committee. The program director/dean will appoint the committee and will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership.

The review committee will confer with Academic Human Resources to make sure that the candidate’s file includes all required items as detailed below. After all materials have been assembled and the external evaluation letters have been added to the candidate’s file, the review committee will evaluate the candidate’s file and vote. The committee chair in collaboration with the rest of the members of the review committee, will write a letter summarizing and evaluating the candidate’s qualifications for promotion and/or tenure. Review committees, when preparing reviews of candidate files must include a specific discussion of the candidate’s contributions to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion in their reports. This discussion should summarize the candidate’s contributions and offer any evaluation of the impact this contribution has had with respect to teaching, research and service. The letter will be placed in the candidate’s file, and the full contents of the candidate’s file will be made available to eligible voting faculty (as defined in Section 24-54 A or 25-41 of the University Handbook) from the candidate’s program. The review committee does not have the authority to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

***Self-Assessment Narrative***

The self-assessment narrative is an integrated discussion of an individual’s scholarship, service, and teaching. Candidates for promotion or tenure must also include in their self-assessment narrative a discussion of contributions to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion. The purpose of the narrative is to illuminate the contents of the cumulative record and the documentation of teaching effectiveness and scholarship. Particular attention should be paid to accomplishments since the candidate’s last promotion.The letter is addressed to the committee. It is the most important item included in an individual’s file.

**Voting on Promotion and Tenure:**

Procedures for voting on promotion and tenure shall be as prescribed in Sections 24-54 and 25-41 of the *Faculty Code*. The program director or dean will write a letter to the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (EVCAA) summarizing the content of the decision leading up to the vote, the number of faculty participating in the discussion and vote, the number of eligible voting faculty, and the number of positive and negative votes and abstentions. The program director or dean, who does not vote with the faculty, will write an independent letter of recommendation.

Upon receiving the recommendation from the program director, the EVCAA will seek the

advice of the Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure to make sure that current procedures have been followed and to ensure that the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and service are similar in quality to that of current tenured faculty at the University of Washington Tacoma (as detailed in 24-54 C of the Faculty Code). The Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure, when preparing reviews of candidate files must include a specific discussion of the candidate’s contributions to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion in their reports. This discussion should summarize the candidate’s contributions and offer any evaluation of the impact this contribution has had with respect to teaching, research and service. The EVCAA will forward his/her recommendation with concurrence from the Chancellor to the Provost who makes the decision on behalf of the President.

**Search Committee Report Template**

**DRAFT 04-17-2017**

*In order to ensure consistent practices in the documentation of faculty hiring across the UWT campus, the Faculty Council on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure proposes the following template be used by all faculty search committees. All items below must be addressed directly in the narrative.*

[Include A3 form in documents for faculty review.]

Search Committee Members and Justification (including attention to assessing DEI contributions):

Additional Feedback from:

Overview of Search Process not Covered in A3:

Overall Recommendation:

Candidate Discussions (discuss each separately):

* Scholarship (if applicable)
* Teaching
* Service
* Contribution to Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

Summary and Justification: