****

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

February 23, 2018 1:00-3:00pm GWP 320

***Present:*** *Lauren Montgomery, Leighann Chaffee, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee, , Jill Purdy, Nicole Blair, Ellen Moore, Mark Pendras, Sushil Oswal, Arindam Tripathy, Ji-Hyun Ahn, Justin Wadland, Jack Vincent, Charles Costarella, D.C. Grant, Eugene Sivadas****,*** *Menaka Abraham,*

***ZOOM:*** *Michelle Garner, Laura Feuerborn, Greg Rose, Katie Haerling.*

***GUESTS:*** *Jeremy Davis, Mary Chapman*

***Excused:*** *Mark Pagano, Jutta Heller, Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Jie Sheng*

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

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

1. **Announcements**
   * Volunteer call for someone to serve on the Distinguished Service Award committee for the Staff Association. Entails one meeting and review of nominees. EC member, Chuck Costeralla volunteered. FA Admin will put him in touch with the Staff Associatoin.
   * 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.
   * Communicating with UW Tacoma Faculty via uwtfac@uw.edu
     1. All official (as EC or committee reps.) communication with faculty should occur via:
        + uwtfac@uw.edu
        + uwtfacpt@uw.edu
     2. Unofficial communications as individual faculty members can occur via AAUP or other modalities.
   * Policy Formation Flowchart – Class A, B, C Legislation
     1. UW Tacoma Legislative Process – from Bylaws
        + Class A action – An action that requires a change to the By-Laws. Requires a simple majority of those present in a FA meeting, given notice two weeks in advance of the meeting to consider the legislation, and representation from all units.
        + Class B action – All other legislation. Requires a simple majority vote of a quorum of the Executive Council. (Quorum = 50% +1, with all units represented.)
        + Class C action – (from UW Fac. Code) non-legislative actions which include passage of resolutions, appointment of committees, approval or disapproval of committee reports, reception of reports or information, and determination of Senate By-Laws.
        + UW Tacoma Policy Development Flowchart: APT, FAC, and APCC are three circles with arrows pointing toward EC. EC is a larger circle with an arrow pointing to Faculty Assembly for Class A legislation (bylaws change) and an arrow pointing to classes B and C legislation (EC can approve these types of legislation without full Faculty Assembly vote).
     2. From Article XII – Delegation of Powers to Academic Units
     3. Upon request, the administrative head of the academic unit shall provide the faculty of the unit with information concerning salaries, teaching schedules, salary and operations budget requests, appropriations, allotments, disbursements and similar data pertaining to the programmatic unit. (23-46.H).
     4. Questions about interpretation of UWT By-Laws or UW Faculty Code should be directed to Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty.
   * Administrative Leader Search Updates/Timelines
     1. EVCAA search update: applications are in, zoom interviews in Feb., on-campus site visits expected in the first 2 weeks in the Spring quarter.
   * Chancellor Listening Sessions for Faculty
     1. The Chancellor is hosting two sessions over the lunch hour to hear from faculty about what is going well and what challenges faculty are facing. They are
        + March 12 & April 9: 12:30-1:30pm, WCG322 – TT and Tenure
        + April 25: 12:30-1:30pm, WCG322 , Lecturer Tracks
   * Time Matrix and Scheduling
     1. New Time Schedule Matrix next year: Make sure your faculty know:
        + Scheduling is done within units, NOT through the registrar.
        + If problems with schedule contact the PA or the Dean/Director.
        + Familiarize your unit faculty with the schedule and the two policy guideline statements EC has issued around it.
     2. EC Chair, Lauren Montgomery requested feedback from EC on if she should also send this information to all faculty via email. They agreed it would be helpful. She will send it and attach the two related guidelines, as well as, a new TSM graphic from the Registrar’s Office. She will consult with the Registrar on the best timing for this message to be sent.
   * Advisory Vote for name change: School of Engineering and Technology
     1. The proposed name change has been the result of much deliberation. A concern was raised about what impact this name might have on any future degrees that include the term “engineering,” i.e. an Environmental Engineering that could eventually be offered by SIAS. This is something to keep in mind moving forward.
     2. **VOTE -** The Executive Council took an advisory vote in support of the Institute of Technology changing their name to School of Engineering and Technology:14 yes, 1 no, 0 abstain, 4 absent/late, (19 eligible to vote).
2. **Unit Reports** *- full reports on the EC Team Drive*
   * The Institute of Technology has bylaws
     1. course scheduling is mostly done by PA, in collaboration with advisors and faculty
   * SWCJ has bylaws; their faculty council meets with director and PA
     1. course releases for program chairs with some exceptions
     2. course assignment and scheduling, constrained by accreditation and program requirements (e.g. MSW is a part-time evening program).
   * UEAC has bylaws
     1. UEAC does not schedule any courses or have course releases
   * SIAS has bylaws that divisions follow
     1. chair of faculty council in SIAS gets 1 course release
   * MIAS (Masters in IAS)
     1. the only graduate degree in SIAS
     2. course scheduling: director is responsible to schedule courses
     3. Director gets 3 courses off and $100 per month stipend.
   * CAC (Culture and Arts Communication)
     1. chair (3 course release), vice chair (2 course releases). $100 per month stipend
     2. vice chair takes care of scheduling and annual reviews. Scheduling in collaboration with advisors.
   * SBHS
     1. scheduling: chair receives data from SIAS, collects info from faculty
     2. 1 chair (3 course releases)
   * SAM
     1. 4 majors
     2. scheduling done by chairs
     3. vice chair (recent addition), 1-2 course releases depending on rank
     4. chairs: among (tenure track) TT faculty, serve 2-3 years, 2.5 course releases
     5. TT faculty has a teaching load of 4.5 because of labs
3. **Coordination of Non-Competitive Hiring Policy –** *Appendix A: Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Appointments*
   * The goal of this policy is to encourage competitive hires and reduce the number of non-competitive hires over time
     1. Non-competitive hiring lends itself toward “someone you know” and “someone like me” instead of broadening the pool and encouraging diverse applicants
     2. Non-competitive hiring also enables a tendency to hire part-time faculty repetitively instead of hiring permanent, full-time faculty
        + This creates an unstable work situation for the part-time faculty member
        + We need to ensure that students are getting a high-quality education
     3. Ideally, every position we have should be competitively hired, but there are some situations when this isn’t feasible
     4. We need to begin to make better predictions of what we will need so that we can do competitive hires (which take more time)
   * Concern about requiring a competitive hire in the first year of a non-competitive hire; it might be too soon to know the long-term need
   * Suggestion to make the trigger for competitive hire in the second year after non-competitive hire, if determined then that these courses will need to be taught on an ongoing basis. This eliminates the gap year for re-hire after reaching the three -maximum for temporary appointments. But allows units a full year to determine ongoing needs after a temporary hire
   * Consider making two separate policies – one for noncompetitive hires, and one for the part time hires since they are rather different policies
   * Concern that much of this procedure occurs in Academic H.R. and the EVCAA office, and the policy must be developed in concert with admin., not just EC
   * Wording of the policy is too narrow. Not just sabbatical replacements, but also Family/Medical Leave, admin. course releases, faculty leaving for other jobs mid-year and other emergencies that arise. There are many reasons why units might need to hire a temporary or part time person
   * Possibly an MOU between FA and EVCAA about hiring practices would be preferable to a policy. This is something to check out with Jill.
   * Part time policy is complicated enough that enforcement may be impractical or even impossible. Who will do the oversight/enforcement?
   * According to the Secretary of the Faculty, the Faculty Code states that the faculty’s role in appointments is to see a list of candidates and to vote on the candidate to receive the appointment. All other aspects of appointment are with the administration. Faculty can advise on appointment policies in a spirit of shared governance, but cannot impose appointment policies.
   * This discussion was tabled for a future meeting due to time constraints.
4. **APT Guidelines –** *Appendix B: APT Guidelines* 
   * APT expanded their guidelines and included links within the document. Their goal is for it to be a step-by-step guide for academic units. In APT’s review of P&T cases, they saw a variety of issues, i.e. length of narrative sometimes being far too long at 50 pages.
   * This document will accompany the upcoming APT P&T workshops and be posted on their website.
   * EC noted some minor edits to wording. Overall EC members were very thankful to APT for creating this document.
   * **VOTE: The APT Guidelines were approve by EC: Mark Pendras moved, D.C. Grant seconded: 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 2 absent, (19 eligible to vote).**
5. **Actionable Items in Response to Student Panel**
   * Request for more information, depth, and broader representation (including graduate students)
   * Focus groups to get more information
     1. Some EC members expressed interest in leading this effort
     2. Student expressed concern about Library hours, textbooks
     3. Maybe focus groups with themes
   * Student have expressed concerns about safety on campus
   * Faculty Affairs: climate surveys will provide more comprehensive info
   * Suggestion for a feedback box
   * The Student Perspectives Dialogue notes can be found [here](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/node/22518).
6. **Adjourn**

**APPENDICES:**

**TO: UW TACOMA DEANS and DIRECTORS and Faculty Councils: GUIDELINES FROM UWT APT COMMITTEE 2017-18 (updated February 2018)**

General Guidelines

Promotional Timelines and Forms are available on the UW Tacoma Faculty Assembly Website at <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/academic-affairs/promotion-tenure>

A Promotion and Tenure Checklist identifying needed documents is also available at <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/AcademicAffairs/ahr/NEW%20checklist%202017.pdf>

1. Candidates
   1. Provide multi-authored publication contribution in CV. A brief statement for each multi-authored publication should suffice (for example, *equal contribution on all aspects*; designed study and *collected and analyzed data).*
   2. Explicitly justify non-mandatory (early) review for tenure and promotion from Asst. to Assoc. Prof and Promotion to Full Professor or Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer in short time frames if applicable.
   3. Describe contract in detail (i.e. teaching load, start-up package, other differences from the “norm”).
   4. Address “urban serving” mission in narrative if applicable.
   5. Address contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion if applicable.
   6. Candidates are advised that they be mindful of the length of their narratives and are strongly encouraged to be concise and direct in their narratives.
   7. Candidates do have a clear say in the composition of their review committees and should not be pressured to accept anyone on their review committees by the Dean or Senior Faculty.
   8. Candidates who have not spent as much time on the UW Tacoma Faculty (for example those going up for promotion in a relatively short time frame), should feel free to include additional information that could strengthen their case (such as teaching evaluations from another institution). Note: If candidates are providing teaching evaluations from another institution they should provide all evaluations for an Academic Year or Years or not cherry pick evaluations.
   9. Candidates are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the tenure & promotion guidelines developed by their programs/units. <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/faculty-assembly/appointment-promotion-tenure>
   10. Candidates are also encouraged to refer to Appendix A of the University of Tacoma Faculty Handbook. Appendix A outlines policies regarding external reviewers. <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UWT_handbook_7.13.17_final_0.pdf>
2. Review Committees
   1. Review committees may be comprised of members who have a mentoring relationship with the candidate, or who have collaborated with the candidate on scholarly/teaching activities. However, such review committee members need to be mindful that when they serve on the review committee, they are performing an “independent” and “impartial” evaluation of the candidate’s record.
   2. Therefore, review committee members should distance themselves from reviewing/editing or commenting on the candidate’s materials in advance of the actual review to avoid the appearance of bias.
      1. During the review, the committee may ask for additional materials/information if they deem it important to consideration of the candidate’s case (document these requests and the additional materials provided).
   3. Review committee members should not coach the candidates as to whom the candidate should include in their list of external reviewers and review committee members should not solicit opinions from the candidate on who should be included in the school’s list of external reviewers.
   4. Appendix A of the UW Tacoma Faculty Handbooks outlines policies regarding external reviewers. <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UWT_handbook_7.13.17_final_0.pdf>
   5. Provide external reviewer justification
      1. Why chosen?
      2. From whose list (Candidate or School)?
      3. Final list
      4. We strongly recommend that reviewers be chosen from both candidate and school lists. Attention should be paid to credibility and sufficient independence of external reviewers
      5. Language to be used with solicitation of external reviewer letters can be found here <http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/global/documents/chancellor/policy_on_letters_to_external_reviewer.pdf>
   6. Address red flags in review, do not ignore; address any “negative” comments made by external reviewers.
   7. Explicitly justify non-mandatory (early) review for tenure and promotion from Asst. to Assoc. Prof and Promotion to Full Professor or Senior or Principal Lecturer in short time frames if applicable.
   8. Describe contract in detail (i.e. teaching load, start-up package, other differences from the “norm”).
   9. Discussions of service sometimes inadequate and needs to be addressed.
   10. Address contribution of faculty member to “urban serving” mission and strategic plan to inform scholarly output if applicable.
   11. Address program/school P&T criteria explicitly in review.
   12. Address contributions to diversity, equity and inclusion to inform scholarly output, teaching, and service if applicable.
3. Voting School/Program Faculty Discussion
   1. Address reasons stated for negative votes (or indicate if no reason given).
4. Dean/Director Review
   1. Clearly identify "any outside the UWT typical" resources given to candidate (such as reduced teaching loads) and how their performance is commensurable to those resources given.
   2. For early tenure or “early” promotion cases, please make a case for why they merit those promotions in a shorter time frame.
   3. In cases where there is significant difference of opinion among the faculty voting on a case, the Dean/Director's letter, while making a recommendation, should try and address the concerns of the other perspective and clarify why the Dean/Director does not agree with the contrarian (to Dean/Director's recommendation) views.
   4. Dean/Director should not pressure the candidates to accept any particular individual on their review committee.
   5. Dean/Director letter should strive for consistency between the letter and information contained in annual performance reviews. In the event of inconsistency between information in annual reviews and promotion review, Deans and Directors should clearly explain reasons for the same.
   6. Dean/Director letters should ideally be a synopsis of an ongoing conversation with the candidate and make clear how the candidate has made progress towards promotion. The letter should also provide context of candidate’s trajectory and highlight any special circumstances or special tasks undertaken.
   7. Deans/Directors are requested to keep the Chair of the Review Committee in the loop regarding the responses from contacted external reviewers. This is good practice to ensure that the final list of external reviewers represents the desired range of expertise and independence with respect to the candidate.
   8. **Addition of Items to the File:** As noted in Chapter 2, Appendix A of the UW Tacoma Faculty Handbook, **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 academic unit’s faculty vote has not yet taken place 2. if the academic unit’s vote has already taken place, the candidate must inform the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (EVCAA) 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 EVCAA 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.
5. Faculty Councils
   1. Faculty Councils are encouraged to periodically review their unit’s T&P criteria to ensure that they have kept pace with developments and priorities of the campus and those of the program/unit.
   2. Faculty Councils are encouraged to examine their unit’s T&P criteria against the backdrop of the mission of the unit and campus.
   3. In schools/programs, or other academic units that act as a tenure-home, with limited number of Full Professors, the Faculty Council could consider developing a list of potential review committee members from other units within UW Tacoma or within the University of Washington.
6. APT Deliberation
   1. Dean/Director may be contacted to seek clarifications.

Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive and Part-Time Faculty Appointments

It is understandable that some level of non-competitive faculty hiring and use of part-time faculty is required. The following policy on non-competitive and part-time hiring processes is introduced to ensure equity, inclusiveness and diversity are incorporated in all aspects of faculty hiring:

Whenever a non-competitive full-time position is filled, (with exception of temporary appointment to cover for a faculty member on sabbatical) a competitive hiring process must be immediately undertaken to fill the position through a diversity focused and inclusive process. Non-competitive full-time faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of one year and may be renewed for a maximum of one more year, if required to complete the competitive hiring process. Any further extension must be justified for review and potential approval by the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Committee (per the faculty responsibility over appointment\*). The APT will not allow such approval for more than one final year.

Most part time faculty positions should exist to satisfy unexpected shortcomings in faculty course coverage. When a college or school\*\* makes use of part-time faculty to cover the equivalent of two full-time faculty positions for a period of two consecutive years, a competitive hiring process must be undertaken for at least one full-time position at the beginning of the third year.

An academic program may apply to the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee for a specific faculty member’s appointment to be considered exempt from these standards due to a persistent need for a clinical and/or professional appointment.

\* “In accordance with [Executive Order No. IV](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EOIV.html), Legislative Authority of the Faculty, the faculty of the University of Washington Tacoma shares with its Chancellor the responsibility for…Criteria for faculty tenure, appointment, and promotion…” – [Faculty Assembly Bylaws](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/UWT_Bylaws_Final-060617.pdf)

\*Faculty Responsibility over appointment also found in the Faculty Code, [Section 23-43.B](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH23.html#2343)

\*\*Department where the Regents have not yet created a college or school headed by a dean within the University of Washington Tacoma as described in [Executive Order V](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EOV.html).

*Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee 11.13.17*