

# UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA

## Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC)

### Agenda

Wednesday, February 22, 2012

Mattress 352

12:30 – 2:00 p.m.

1. Approval of February 9, 2012 meeting minutes.
2. Standing Committee Updates (*Chairs APC, APT, CC, FA, SBC*).
3. Final review UWT Handbook Appendix A changes (*Yonn Dierwechter*)
4. Promoting a Vibrant and Collegial Intellectual Community at UWT
  - *Reflection on February 8<sup>th</sup>, Critical Thinking Workshop*
5. Assessment Faculty Governance Communication and Engagement
6. Promoting Stronger Shared Governance at the Unit Level.
  - *Curriculum development and faculty review (e.g., course proposals, online courses).*
  - *Support for faculty development, teaching & research (e.g., proposals formerly eligible for Chancellor's Endowment grants)*
  - *Budget consultation*
  - *Hiring processes*
  - *Service transparency and equity*
7. Other items
  - *At-large faculty representative UWT Safety Committee needed.*
  - *Upcoming Faculty Assembly Sponsored Events*
8. Adjournment.

<b>Upcoming Executive Council Meetings</b>	<b>Faculty Assembly Meetings 2011-2012</b>
• Wednesday, March 7, 2012 MAT 352	• Friday, May 4, 2012 WPH
• Thursday, March 29, 2012 MAT 352	• Friday, May 11, 2012 Longshoreman's Hall [Tentative/Continuation Meeting]
• Wednesday, April 11, 2012 MAT 352	
• Thursday, April 26, 2012 MAT 352	
• Wednesday, May 9, 2012 MAT 352	
<b>Upcoming Events Faculty Assembly Sponsored Events</b>	
• Faculty Discussion: "Patriotism in the Academy" (David Morris, Facilitator), 4:00 – 5:30pm, Friday, February 24, 2012 FACULTY RESOURCE CTR	
• Faculty Discussion: The Challenge of Teaching Writing (Nicole Blair, Facilitator), 4:00 – 5:30pm, Friday, April 27 FACULTY RESOURCE CTR	
• Faculty Lecture & Discussion: Community Engagement (Marcy Stein), 5:00 – 7:00pm, Thursday, May 10, ROOM TBD	

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA**  
**Faculty Assembly (FA) Executive Council (EC)**  
**Wednesday, February 22, 2012**  
**12:30 – 2:00 p.m.**  
**Minutes**

**Attended:** Zoe Barsness, Chair, Katie Baird, Vice Chair, Donald Chinn, Linda Dawson, Marjorie Dobratz, Charlie Emler, Ehsan Feroz, Diane Kinder, Marcie Lazzari, Nita McKinley, Mark Pendas, Peter Selkin, , Yonn Dierwechter, Larry Wear, Charles Williams

**Excused:** Beverly Naidus, Tracy Thompson

**Guest:** Michael Forman

**1. Approval of minutes from February 9, 2012**

- Move to approve, seconded, and approved with noted changes.

**2. Standing Committee Updates (APC, APT, CC, FA, SBC)**

**APC (N. McKinley)**

- No update

**CC (K. Baird)**

- Possible start of discussion over online classes. Having discussion with Colleen Carmean regarding role of faculty in review of these:
  - What exactly has been faculty review at the unit level?
  - What should we be looking for as faculty on the CC as we review online course proposals
  - Y. Dierwechter indicated that our campus technology committee has also taken this up.
  - L. Wear raised the question of how faculty are compensated for teaching an exclusively online course that might extend over multiple quarters and in which there might not be a fixed enrollment. He indicated that at his previous school faculty for such courses were paid a fixed dollar amount per student enrolled, but payments were made only when such students completed the course.
- Led to more general discussion over issues such as prevention of cheating and ownership of intellectual property.
- Also brief update on APC/CC restructuring task force.

**SBC (M. Lazzari)**

- Discussion of progress. Also discussion of role of EC/Faculty Assembly in budget, and process by which input is gathered.

**APT (Y. Dierwechter)**

- Workshop for assistants was well attended. Another for associates will be held March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 3:30 at Anthem Coffee Shop

### **FA (D. Chinn)**

- Continuing interviews with those getting external funding, will be getting more detail over next few weeks.
- Discussion about teaching evaluations, which turned to discussion of differences in practices across units in terms of frequency with which courses are evaluated.
- Short discussion of progress of investigation into lecturers by L. Dawson and K Baird. Linda agreed to attend upcoming FA Committee meeting to give update.

### **3. Final review UWT Handbook Appendix A changes (Yonn Dierwechter)**

- Discussion of history of document, and proposed changes resulting from a review process that was initiated in 2009. The review was and currently proposed changes are motivated by concern over legal vulnerability of handbook language and lack of clarity in procedures for candidates and review committees. Changes developed in spirit of making promotion process clearer, less ambiguous, and to strengthen ability of candidate to present their strongest case. Y. Dierwechter outlined changes that occur in revised process.
- Discussion ensued about process to be followed once EC votes. Not clear if only EC vote is required for a change to Handbook, or if entire faculty must vote. Z. Barsness to investigate and report back.
- L. Dawson suggested similar need to have clear process for lecturers to be promoted to senior lecturers. Suggested this might be a future endeavor.
- C. Emlet asked about whether EC members should take back to faculty. Discussion about timing of broader faculty discussion. Decision to postpone EC vote and directions to unit reps until clarification of process.

### **4. Promoting a Vibrant and Collegial Intellectual Community at UWT**

- General discussion of February 8th, Critical Thinking Workshop, purpose of workshops, and encouragement of appropriate ways for faculty to disagree with one another.

### **5. Assessment Faculty Governance Communication and Engagement**

- Z. Barsness raised issue of how well we communicate with faculty in units, and uniformity of that communication. Discussion also about communication of members of standing committee with their respective unit faculty. Discussion indicates that it is clear there are wide differences in practices across units, and that we're not as successful as we'd hope to be. Discussion around what standing committees and Senators report.

- Z Barsness suggested that Senators might take turns writing summary emails to faculty after meetings.
- C. Williams raised problem of “information overload” and the need to be somewhat selective of what we report so that we do it in a way that gets attention around issues where faculty attention is needed. Discussion of need to frame communication in way that makes clear why it matters.
- M. Forman described some of the important issues Senate has discussed in recent meetings, including changes to pension, and revision to the code to make explicit University value in diversity. Discussion of possibility of a Senator coming to EC after Senate meeting for briefing.

## **6. Promoting Stronger Shared Governance at the Unit Level**

- Z. Barsness discussed the fact that authority and decision making is being devolved to units, but mechanisms for communication from units to faculty are sometimes not in place, and are at least uneven across campus. So while units have more responsibility, it isn’t clear that faculty are being included in each unit’s new decision-making authority. Perhaps a need to describe processes across units for shared governance at the unit level.

## **7. Other items**

- At-large faculty representative UWT Safety Committee needed.
- Z. Barsness announced that the IAS and Business programs at UWB would be formally transitioning to schools in March, pending a Regents’ vote at their upcoming meeting in early March. These will be the first schools on the UWB campus.
- Upcoming Faculty Assembly Sponsored Events: Friday 4PM David Morris in Faculty Resource Center.

## **Adjournment at 2PM**

Minutes Prepared by Katie Baird.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Promotion and Tenure: CAMPUS GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PROVISIONS OF THE HANDBOOK OF POLICIES FOR UWT**

*Note:* In cases where there is a discrepancy between these guidelines and the UW Faculty Code, the UW Faculty Code takes precedence.

This document outlines general guidelines for implementing the Handbook of Policies, University of Washington Tacoma, regarding promotion and tenure reviews and decisions. Additional guidelines may be required by individual programs. Included are procedures for external review of scholarship, as defined in Section 24-32 of the University Handbook.

#### **Requesting a Review Committee:**

At any time, professors of less than full rank may ask their program director to form a committee to help guide the candidate in preparing for the review for tenure and/or promotion. For an Assistant Professor to be promoted and granted tenure, a committee must be formed by the end of the fifth contract year. Associate Professors without tenure and Professors without tenure may request a review to change to a tenure track position at any point in their career; the review must take place during the promotion/tenure cycle and, if granted, the change to the tenure-track position is effective only at the beginning of the next academic year.

In requesting that a review committee be formed, a candidate shall submit a brief letter to the candidate's program director or dean summarizing the candidate's record in all areas of professional accomplishments (scholarship, teaching, and service) and identifying the fields and/or traditions to which their scholarship relates most closely. This letter is to be used as a resource in identifying potential members of the review committee and will be placed in the candidate's file.

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

The candidate and the program director 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 must jointly endorse the composition of the review committee. The program director will appoint the committee and will inform the candidate in writing of the committee membership.

The review committee will advise the candidate, guide the candidate in applying for promotion and tenure, and assist in the assembling of appropriate documentation. The review committee will make sure that the candidate's file includes all items listed in the University of Washington Tacoma Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Checklist. 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. The letter will be submitted to eligible voting faculty from the candidate's program and placed in the candidate's file. The full contents of the candidate's file will be made

available to eligible voting faculty (as defined in Section 24-54 A of the University Handbook) from the candidate's program. Throughout this process, candidates will have access to the file, excluding external evaluations, and will have the right to add comments to the material. The review committee does not have the authority to prevent a candidate from proceeding with the review process.

### **The Candidate's File:**

The candidate's file must include a curriculum vitae or cumulative record, a narrative letter, documentation of teaching effectiveness, documentation of scholarship for review, yearly activity reports, documentation of regular conferences with the director or dean, and external review letters. Faculty who are being considered for promotion from the rank of Assistant to Associate should also include documentation from their third-year review. Please see the UWT Promotion and Tenure Recommendation Checklist for complete details.

#### ***Curriculum Vitae or Cumulative Record***

The candidate's vitae should contain a cumulative record of scholarship, teaching, and service. Precise contents will differ according to discipline. The following items should be included:

1. Education: list institutions, degrees granted, dates
2. Dissertation title
3. Employment
4. Research projects/grants/contracts: list funding agencies, dates, amounts of funding, and individual's role (PI, CO-PI, other)
6. Honors and awards
7. Service: university, professional, community
8. Curriculum development
9. Areas of teaching expertise
10. Scholarly accomplishments (if applicable, include: bibliography - including page numbers and length, types of publications, whether publication was peer-reviewed before acceptance, and whether candidate was the principal author).

#### ***Narrative Letter***

The narrative letter is an integrated discussion of an individual's scholarship, service, and teaching. The purpose of the narrative is to illuminate the contents of the cumulative record and the documentation of teaching effectiveness and scholarship. Research contributions should demonstrate consistent scholarly progress after appointment as Assistant Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to Associate Professor, or after appointment to Associate Professor when the candidate is seeking promotion to Professor. The letter is addressed to the committee. It is the most important item included in an individual's file.

#### ***Documentation of Teaching Effectiveness***

This documentation should include the following items:

- A list of all courses taught at the UW, with dates;
- A list of all graduate students supervised, each entry specifying student name, thesis/scholarly project topic, degree, dates, and the faculty member's committee role (chair or member)

- Peer evaluations of teaching effectiveness - Assistant Professors should be evaluated at least once a year; Associate Professors should be evaluated at least once every three years.
- Student course evaluations – all student teaching evaluations since date of last promotion should be included.

Evaluations should show a pattern of effective and competent teaching. Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure must provide student and collegial evaluations of their teaching that have been conducted within 12 months of their application for promotion and/or tenure. Candidates should include all student and peer teaching evaluations since their initial employment (for Assistant Professors) or last promotion (for Associate Professors).

### ***Documentation of Scholarship For Review***

Precise contents will differ according to the candidate's program/school. The candidate should consult their program/school's tenure and promotion guidelines.

### ***Yearly Activity Report, Third Year Reviews, and Documentation of Regular Conferences with the Director or Dean***

The candidate must include yearly activity reports, documentation of his/her regular conference with the director or dean, and documentation of his/her third-year review.

#### **Yearly Activity Reports**

Section 24-57 of the University Handbook states, "Yearly activity reports shall be used as a reference and as a course of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year." Should the candidate need to update their yearly activity report and/or add additional materials to his/her file, the candidate shall follow the procedures outlined in Appendix C, Ch. 2. Sec.1A below.

#### **Documentation of Regular Conference with the Director or Dean**

Candidates who intend to apply for promotion and/or tenure must include documentation of the regular conference with his/her director or dean within 12 months of their application for promotion and/or tenure.

#### ***External Review Letters***

Evaluation by external reviewers who are experts in the candidate's field(s) must be included in the file. Acceptable forms are reviews and/or letters from external reviewers who have evaluated the candidate's demonstrations of scholarship (as defined in Section 24-32 of the University Handbook). The external review is based on scholarship or artistic creativity; tenure and promotion depend on more than these factors. The external reviewer should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted here or would be elsewhere.

The chair of the review committee will solicit from the candidate a list of names of scholars qualified to review the candidate's demonstration of scholarship. The review committee will select up to five names

from this list and may substitute up to two others not named by the candidate. The external evaluators should be chosen by the program director or dean and faculty review committee.

The review committee must solicit reviews from a minimum of three external reviewers. No more than one external reviewer may be from the candidate's doctoral committee, and no more than two may be from the candidate's degree-granting institution during the candidate's tenure. The external reviewers will be provided with relevant demonstrations of scholarship and a summary of the candidate's teaching and service record. All letters received from external reviewers will become part of the candidate's file but will not be made available to the candidate.

The committee chair will compose the solicitation letter in consultation with the program director or dean. The solicitation letter should be signed by, and should request return to, the program director or dean.

The letter should state that the unit is considering the candidate for possible promotion and request the following information:

- How and for how long the referee has known the candidate
- The significance, independence, influence, and promise of the candidate's scholarship or creative work and the degree of national/international recognition
- A comparison of the candidate's accomplishments with leading scholars or artists at a similar career stage in the same or related fields

Each evaluator should be provided with the same representative set of the candidate's scholarly or artistic materials.

### **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 VCAA summarizing the content of the decision leading up to the vote, the number and names 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 VCAA 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. The VCAA will forward his/her recommendation with concurrence from the Chancellor to the Provost who makes the decision on behalf of the President.

## Disagreements on Procedures

Candidates who believe that procedures relative to their review have not been properly adhered to have the right to utilize established grievance procedures as set forth in the *Faculty Code* to appeal for redress. A faculty member whose tenure is denied may engage in the administrative and conciliatory proceedings described in Chapter 27, and may file a petition for review as provided in Section 25-64.

## APPENDIX B

### ORIGINAL INSTITUTIONAL OBJECTIVES AND ROLES FOR UWT, 1990

Role and Mission of the Tacoma and Bothell Campuses of the University The branch campuses of the University of Washington have been established for the purpose of providing needed educational services for the central Puget Sound region. Appropriately located in this major urban area, the branch campuses make bachelor's and master's degree programs accessible to people throughout a four-county region -- one campus serving primarily Snohomish and North King Counties, the other campus serving primarily Pierce, Kitsap and South King Counties. In accordance with the traditions of the University of Washington, the branch campuses are dedicated to the goals of providing educational programs that meet high academic standards and of fostering student success in these programs. This requires that the members of the branch campus community should be of the highest quality and should maintain the highest standards in all phases of the branch campuses' work.

The academic programs of the branch campuses are designed to respond to the educational needs of a diverse population that includes employed commuting adults beyond the traditional college age. At the undergraduate level, the curriculum is comprised of upper division courses of study.

The branch campuses seek to build and maintain strong ties with regional industries, businesses, civic agencies and organizations, and educational institutions. They pay particular attention to cooperation with neighboring community colleges and baccalaureate colleges, in order to satisfy the higher education needs of the central Puget Sound region. In service to the people of central Puget Sound, the branch campuses are committed to serving the full range of ethnic, social, and economic groups that comprise the area's population.

APPROVED BY:  
FACULTY SENATE  
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
25 January 1990

## APPENDIX C

### CAMPUS RULES and POLICIES

#### CH. 2: APPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTION OF THE FACULTY

##### Sec. 1: The Tenure and Promotion File

A) After the time a candidate's file for tenure and/or promotion is evaluated by the review committee, should the candidate wish to add material to the file, the candidate must:

1. inform the review committee and program director/dean regarding the addition to the file, if the departmental vote has not yet taken place
2. if the program vote has already taken place, the candidate must inform Academic Affairs about the addition to the file.

In both cases, the material must be clearly annotated including the letter(s) informing the review committee, program director/dean, and/or Academic Affairs regarding the addition to the file, and the date the material is added. All materials shall be placed in a separate folder and labeled as such, making it clear the material is an addendum.

There will be a log denoting the date and time the committee, director/dean, and/or Academic Affairs Office accepted the additional material.

Approved by: Faculty Assembly, University of Washington Tacoma, 22 June 2009.