****

**Agenda**

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

Friday, March 31, 2017 1:00-3:00pm GWP 320

1. Consent Agenda & Recording Permission
2. Approval of Minutes
	* 1. *Meeting Materials: March 10, 2017 EC Meeting Minutes* **pg. 7-12**
3. Announcements: 10 min.
	* Faculty Assembly Vice Chair Nomination Call: 4/3/17 – 4/17/17; Voting will run 4/24/17 - 5/8/17
	* 6th Annual Luau - Hosted by the Asian Pacific Islander Student Union: 5/27/17 **pg. 2**
	* [VC Finance & Administration Job Description](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/attachment/assembly/41920/4f6706de1ef5697a858734c1ec7a8d1b?inline=1) [(Word Version Available Here)](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/conversation/assembly/990927)
	* First Annual Faculty & Staff Variety Show! 10/27/17
	* Immigration Legal Clinic: 4/7/17, 5-7pm, WPH- *a free consultation available to students, staff, faculty and their households/families*
4. Chair’s Report and Discussion Items
	* Changes to Admissions Language at UWS: Capacity-Constrained vs. Competitive 10 min.
	* Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting: 4/21/17 @ UWY 20 min.
	* Campus Policy for Equity in Teaching Distribution Among Rank 20 min.
		1. *Meeting Material: Guidelines for Equitable Teaching for UW Tacoma* **pg. 2**
	* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost 10 min.
		1. *Meeting Material: Baldasty Letter and Salary Policy Framing* **pg. 3-6**
	* Adding UEAC Chair as Exoffico – **Vote**  10 min.
	* UW Open Access Policy 20 min.
		1. *Meeting Material:* [*Proposed UW Open Access Policy*](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/oapolicy)  *&* [*FAQ*](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/faq)
5. Adjourn

**Upcoming Faculty Assembly Executive Council Meetings**

4/14/17 1:00-3:00pm CP 206 C - BUDGET TRAINING 101!

4/26/17 12:30-1:25pm CP 206 C

**SAVE THE DATE:**

Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting 4/21/17 | 1:30-3:30pm | UWY

2 Commencement Ceremonies: 6/14/17

Guidelines for Equitable Teaching for UW Tacoma

Faculty Assembly Executive Council

March 2017

The size of our campus at this juncture in time necessitates the creation of policy guidelines to ensure the equitable distribution of teaching responsibilities across all faculty ranks. This includes both a distribution of course level (upper and lower division), and of teaching times throughout the day and evening time slots. This is important now because classroom space is limited and greater utilization of outlying time slots is required. Sharing the responsibility of these outlying time slots across faculty rank is best practice both in terms of student experience and equitable labor practices. Similarly, students benefit when faculty of all ranks teach lower division courses, and faculty also benefit from exposure to students at earlier stages in their academic careers. Thus, both of these principles are best practices in terms of pedagogy and equitable labor practice.

 Toward this, the following guidelines are recommended:

1. Each full-time faculty member makes themselves available to teach at least one class in the early morning (8:00am) or evening (after 5:00pm) each year.
2. No faculty member shall be scheduled to teach more than two such courses (8am or after 5:00pm) each year, unless they request so.
3. Each full-time faculty member makes themselves available to teach at least two lower division or service courses in their unit each year. (A service course is one that is required for a major.)

Mitigating factors that might exempt individual faculty members from these guidelines include:

* Teaching specialty courses such as service learning, labs or field work, that require scheduling commensurate with community organizations and activities.

Teaching specialty, upper division courses is ***not*** a mitigating factor according to these guidelines.

Announcement information continued:

* + 6th Annual Luau - Hosted by the Asian Pacific Islander Student Union: 5/27/17
		1. Doors open at 3pm, show starts at 4pm
		2. Ticket Prices: presale (May 1-25) $20; at the door $25
		3. For more ticket information: email hokc2@uw.edu OR 253-507-2703
		4. GoFundMe page for donations: <https://www.gofundme.com/apisu-annual-luau>

February 15, 2017

Members of the Board of Deans and Chancellors

Dear colleagues:

I am following up on our conversations on faculty salary policy and, particularly, on Executive Order 64. As we’ve discussed, the revision of EO 64 came about because of a collaboration among the leadership of the Faculty Senate, Board of Deans and Chancellors, and the Provost’s Office. We have made significant progress in the past six months or so and are in a good position to tackle some of the salary issues the faculty have said they believe need to be addressed.

I’m asking each of you to create a three-year plan, **in collaboration with your Elected Faculty Council, your department chairs, and your leadership team**, with a view to making good use of the various components of the revised EO 64. The tools provided there are:

* Regular Merit
* Additional Merit
* Promotion Raises
* Unit Adjustments
* Retention Raises

Please use this process to *plan* for the next three (or more, if you wish) years, thinking proactively about salary equity, compression, and inversion. I’m asking that you give me your preliminary thoughts by May 1. We will spend time in May and early June (and beyond) learning from one another in the BODC.

I realize that any modeling you do will necessarily be an estimate — an estimate that will depend on many things we cannot predict (e.g., undergraduate and graduate tuition increases, legislative allocations). Given the range of variation possible in these areas, I suggest you think of two or three scenarios.

You will know best how to proceed. I have no greater ability than any of you to predict the future, but I think it would be useful to think about tuition increases at approximately 2 percent per year, both undergraduate and graduate (note I am assuming either a tuition increase or a backfill). As provost, I will continue to try to provide you with some central funds for compensation, too.

I ask that you focus a good deal of attention to merit (both regular and additional) and to unit adjustments. The unit adjustment is now configured to provide you with a great deal of flexibility in addressing issues of compression, inversion, and to proactively deal with issues around retention. Some of you have been inundated with retention raises. If so, you might want to think about alternative ways to consider them, perhaps more proactively leveraging the unit adjustment tool rather than reactively through the retention tool.

As I noted above, you know best how to proceed in this work.  I am providing additional information, however, thinking that it may well be useful to you.

First, as the Faculty Salary Policy document we discussed (and revised) together notes, we are looking not just at salary, but at broader issues of human capital needs that require funding and thus impact the size of any salary pool. Specifically, the way we work (number of FTEs, size of curriculum, and broad work load issues) all affect the amount of money we need to do our work. In many ways, the modeling that needs to be done is about (a) making explicit the costs related to our activities, (b) deciding how to prioritize those activities in a way that really serves our mission and addresses our needs and interests, and (c) being strategic about how we distribute funds.

The Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting will separately transmit to you materials developed by them that can be used to quantitatively model your salary system. The materials illustrate the impact of the four critical input variables (FTE, total salary funds pool, entry point salary, and rate at which all-faculty off-campus peer salaries are rising) that largely determine the shape of your average salary vs. years of service curve. These models should help you determine what new investment is needed every year to keep pace with off campus-peers, and what continuing faculty raise can be funded with these new funds combined with the “overage” released by retirees. The models teach, among other things, the lesson that average faculty salaries rise with years of service if, and only if, the continuing faculty raise exceeds the rate the entry point salary is rising.

We will continue to discuss this work at our BODC meetings this winter and spring so that we can learn from one another.

I know that this requires a good deal of time and thought, although I know that many of you have already begun this work. I want to emphasize that I believe this is a great opportunity for extensive and deep collaboration between faculty and administration in each school and college. I see the elected faculty councils, department chairs, and leadership teams as a necessary part of this work, both in terms of ideas and advice, and also as a way to create a sophisticated university environment in which we understand the intellectual as well as the financial implications of what we do.

I look forward to our continued conversations on these issues.

Jerry

**Faculty salary policy**

*Note: This is meant as a framing document, with a goal of starting a robust conversation across the UW about compensation and related issues. Each school, college, and campus may well differ in how the conversation unfolds. The key thing is to get the conversation going.*

Ultimately, the discussions and solutions are not just about salary. They are about the quality of the faculty, meritorious work, and market pressures. These issues also concern human capital needs. Program/curriculum design, faculty workload, staffing mix, and salary policy goals/objectives are all inextricably linked together to create a dynamic system. Sustaining long term institutional success requires us to thoughtfully manage them all and appreciate better the dynamic linkages between many contributing factors.

**Assumptions:**

* No new major internal funds available from Provost to address your needs/goals
* State dollars essentially flat
* Modest tuition increases (~2% per year)
* Necessary to collaborate between administration (deans, chancellors) and elected faculty councils, department chairs, and leadership teams

**There are six key questions:**

1. **What are your goals, in terms of salary averages by rank?**
2. **What is your current salary pool?**
3. **What is your goal, in terms of a salary pool?**
4. **How many faculty FTEs do you have? (what is the mix? Rank, etc.)**
5. **What is a reasonable time line to address salary policy broadly, considering that your faculty profile naturally changes over time (from retirements, resignations, etc.)?**
6. **What do you need to do in order to be competitive in your discipline in the next 2-3 decades?**

**Things to consider:**

1. **Needs/Costs assessment**
	1. What is the cost of your curriculum?
		1. Program offerings (how many degrees? Certificates? Undergrad, grad?)
		2. Program curriculum design (how many courses?)
		3. Delivery modes (Face to face? Other formats?)
		4. Enrollments (total number of majors, minors, SCH)
		5. Class size (small classes, large? A mix?).
		6. Teaching loads (how many classes do faculty teach? Mix of faculty teaching loads, contributions of lecturers)
	2. Current Staffing mix in your unit (TT/NTT/Teaching assistants/clinical staff, etc.)
2. **Resources assessment**
	1. What resources are available to your unit to fund the work done in the unit (teaching, research, etc.)?
		1. Current state $$
		2. Program tuition (current? Flexibility to adjust?)
		3. Enrollments (current, anticipated demand, trends?)
		4. Buyouts
		5. ICR
		6. Endowments
		7. Other
3. **Constraints on your funds**
	1. Compliance, risk
	2. Regulatory and legal requirements
	3. Accreditation standards and requirements (e.g., accreditation rules about class size, curriculum, use of full–time faculty, library staffing and access, etc.)
	4. Curriculum
	5. Space
	6. Current tuition levels vs peers/regional competitors
	7. Etc.
4. **Gap Analysis**
	1. What is the best mix of faculty to enhance your ability to achieve your unit’s goals and objectives for teaching, research/scholarship, and service?
	2. What’s your current mix of faculty?
	3. What gaps exist, and how do they need to be closed in order to better align mix of faculty with ability to achieve your goals and objectives?
	4. Given your mission, who are your market peers (may differ by programs/departments within unit)?
	5. Salary needs to sustain ability to recruit and retain high quality faculty in desired mix to support mission related activities, goals and objectives?
	6. What things can you quit doing? Are there things in your program that are not key to your unit’s mission and that can be eliminated?
5. **Need/goal prioritization**
	1. Revisit unit strategic plan
	2. Prioritize, rank gaps
	3. Create a timeline for and develop a plan to address gaps

February 15, 2017

15 February Faculty Salary Policy

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

March 10, 2017 1:00-3:00pm CP 206 C

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

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

The agenda was approved with the addition of an update about the Time Schedule Matrix.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The February 17, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved

1. **Announcements:**
	* Time Schedule Matrix Update

The Chancellor’s Cabinet has approved the new Time Schedule Matrix! Thank you to all who worked on this. Students are excited about this positive change. There will be an email announcement going out about this next week.

* + Request for Recommendations for the Chancellor’s Medal - Appendix A
	+ Outlook Calendar Meeting Invitations for EC: Starting Fall 2017

EC members were in favor of adopting this scheduling practice; those who have a different calendar system agreed that they can disregard the outlook invite messages.

* + Academic Unit Liaisons to Student of Concern Team – Appendix B
	+ Faculty Assembly Vice Chair Nomination Call: 4/3/17 – 4/17/17; Voting will run 4/24/17 - 5/8/17

1. **EVCAA Report**
* **Memorandum of Understanding for CORE Faculty Fellows:** Deans and Directors have seen the latest draft of this MOU. It is an agreement to commit a certain portion of a faculty member’s teaching load to CORE for a 3-year term (to better facilitate scheduling, though the time-frame is negotiable). EVCAA Lavitt will be hosting informational sessions for faculty soon to answer questions about CORE Faculty Fellows and gauge who is interested. CORE is an important part of the first-year experience. It consists of 4 courses: 3 Areas of Knowledge and a writing course. Though CORE is required, the reputation of CORE among students is poor. Thus, many students figure out other ways to fulfill the requirements. One of the goals of having a CORE Faculty Fellows is to improve CORE for first year students, and as a by-product, improve its reputation so that students want to take it and benefit from CORE. Eventually, CORE could be structured so that students are in a meta-major and then can scaffold toward majors that are more specific. The current research on what works best for first year students is robust and asserts that if students declare a major/path earlier on, it is better for their retention in college.

The Office of Undergraduate Education has authority over the first-year experience and CORE classes, but not all 100/200 level courses. The Undergraduate Education Academic Council is the faculty body that had circular oversight of the first-year experience and CORE classes.

EC members asked if part-time lecturers could be eligible for CORE Faculty Fellows. They won’t be excluded, but there will be extra work (meetings, etc.) and EVCAA Lavitt doesn’t want them to be exploited to do extra work unless they are aware of it and willing to do it. CORE Faculty Fellows must have some experience teaching freshman and/or coming in equipped with some professional development like the SEED program. Until the info session and seeing how many faculty members are interested, it’s difficult to know how selective to be. The hope is to have a robust roster of well-equipped faculty members to teach CORE classes. CORE classes should be courses that include compelling experiences, which research shows, students benefit from sooner than later: conversations with professors outside of class, community engagement, undergraduate research, internships, etc. **Info Sessions for CORE Faculty Fellows are to be scheduled for post-Spring Break.**

Jan Rutledge, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance, went through years of data looking at TCORE classes (including writing) and calculated the academic units’ average contribution to CORE. Deans and Directors have been told that this amount has been prepaid for CORE instruction. This model is not meant to bankrupt units; Academic Affairs will backfill to help academic units cover course, as needed.

EC members suggested that the CORE Faculty Fellows also include a mentoring structure for faculty within the program. They also brought up that replacing a tenure-track faculty member with a part-time lecturer in one’s home unit may look bad to outside reviewers if it puts the ratio of part-time faculty higher than full-time faculty. Additionally, in some academic units, a faculty member in expected to mentor the instructor who fills in for their course. This means that a faculty member teaching in CORE and mentoring the instructor will have a double layer of service in joining CORE Faculty Fellows.

As this was a topic that elicited much discussion, EC chair asserted that the topic would be continued on a future agenda, potentially with UEAC members joining the conversation.

* **Budget:** Deans and Directors have been notified of the budget challenges faced by UW Tacoma. In regards to future (new) program approval, funding priority will go to hiring faculty and staff to support current and currently approved academic programs. For instance, Electrical Engineering and Biomedical Sciences were already approved as new programs, therefore, the faculty and staff needed for those programs will be funded. Lecturer conversions are required. EVCAA Lavitt is not calling a moratorium on future programs, but is prioritizing funding for current and currently approved academic programs.
* **New Program Approval Process Flowchart:** Deans and Directors have been reviewing drafts of a new program approval process flowchart. It’s almost ready to share; they’re adding the new 75 day review by UW’s accreditation body.
1. **Chair’s Report and Discussion Items**
* Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting: 4/21/17 1:30-3:30pm “The Erosion of Tenure”

The title, “Erosion of Tenure” was floated because it might appeal to more people. A potential topic/starting question for this Faculty Assembly meeting is, “What will we do to manage faculty composition moving forward?” Chair, Mark Pendras, asked EC to give feedback on this and also share ideas of how to talk about this topic.

**Suggestions and Discussion:**

* + The title “Erosion of Tenure” suggests that there is a problem and could be inflammatory; perhaps instead, “The Future of Tenure”
	+ Consider choosing a topic of wider concern that pertains to the issues facing our country/world (like the forums being hosted by the UW Senate)
		- Yes, there need to be multiple venues for those conversations, especially at the unit level. Perhaps the Faculty Assembly meeting is a time to take care of some issues faculty are facing at UW Tacoma
	+ There are rumors that academia is moving towards getting rid of the tenure-track
	+ Sometimes the ratio of part-time faculty to full-time faculty in an academic unit is used to judge a unit’s strength/weakness
	+ Frame it as a discussion about appointments; we need guidelines that say “when you hire [insert rank here] you get [insert great advantages here]”
	+ JW Harrington wrote up something like this when he was Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs; perhaps faculty can use this as a starting place and write up guidelines together
	+ It is important to look at all of the dimensions/ depth of this topic; part of issue is the subtle move to try and privatize public institutions, i.e. looking for lowest cost labor possible and lecturers cost less
	+ Frame the conversation by sharing the numbers, then have a panel so that we can hear the experience of faculty in various ranks
	+ Bring in the economics of higher education; faculty are empowered to have a voice in the budget process and strategic plan; suggestion to title the meeting, “Economics of Higher Ed.”
	+ Tenure-track or lecturer hiring is not often a faculty decision; we don’t get to choose, but we should; that’s part of the issue
	+ Talk about issues surrounding tenure: people dropping out of participation once they reach tenure
	+ Creating competitive lecturer lines is a win-win because it cuts the economic incentive for hiring lecturers in half
	+ Part-time faculty are insecure in their jobs and are paid poorly; if we were to have part-time lecturers’ salaries pro-rated that also takes out the monetary incentive
	+ Suggestion to capture table discussions at the FA meeting
	+ Creating an open space to discuss this topic is good, but it may also open some wounds, so this needs to be framed carefully in a way that doesn’t set people against one another

Due to this number of ideas and concerns just in EC, it shows that there is room for discussion of this at a larger Faculty Assembly meeting. EC will continue this discussion at their following meeting on 3/31/17.

* Update on Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments – Appendix C - *Marian Harris*

Faculty Affairs Committee is still working on drafting the next version of this proposed policy. Marian met with Academic HR, Alison Hendricks. Alison shared the current UW-wide guidelines ([*Provost’s Lecturer Guidelines*](http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/policies/lecturer-guidelines/) .) These guidelines do not effectively address the issue they are trying to address with this proposed policy. FAC will review the Faculty Code on non-tenure track hires. Marian will bring to EC another draft of this policy before the end of academic year. She asked that any feedback or wording be sent to her via email. There was a suggestion to include part-time lectures in this policy. Faculty Affairs is working through how to fit proposed policies with existing UW policies; there is need to have a compelling reason for a new policy. EC asked that FAC members circulate the current draft of this proposed policy to their units for feedback.

* Campus Policy for Equity in Teaching Distribution Among Rank

EC considered the current SIAS policy on this ([SIAS Curriculum Scheduling Guidelines](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/attachment/assembly/41920/877eb4c19bd65ab55b3d57b144a46cb9?inline=1)  [Word Version](https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/conversation/assembly/989335) ) . Having a campus-wide policy like this will be more important now because of the new Time Schedule Matrix, which includes a later time-slot. The guidelines within the SIAS policy are that all faculty have 1/3 of their teaching load in 100/200 level classes and teach at least one 8am or evening class annually.

**Discussion and Suggestions:**

* + A campus-wide policy should be couched as guidelines because there are some specialty classes that need to be covered by particular faculty members.
	+ Additionally, service-learning/field experience courses must often be during school hours.
	+ Perhaps consider that faculty members with small children should not be required to teach at night.
	+ Program Administrators have found it difficult to accommodate all faculty scheduling requests. This policy would hopefully ease that burden.
	+ Mathematically, if all full-time faculty were available for either one 8am or one evening course per year, then there would be more than enough people to fill in those time-slots.
	+ Faculty should not be expected to take on more than one of the “extreme” time-slots unless they decide they want more. Some people have been pressured into teaching both 8am and an evening course in the same day.
	+ Perhaps use the language “expected to make themselves available.”
	+ Also, consider that some service courses (courses needed by the whole campus) are not always 100/200 level; perhaps use the language, “lower division and/or service courses.”
	+ The assigning of courses is a disciplinary decision to be made by the academic unit faculty.
	+ Program Administrator’s work within the Time Schedule Matrix to schedule class times and spaces. This is very challenging because there is limited time and space.
	+ Perhaps include in policy guidelines that units should be having an annual conversation about scheduling.
	+ In some sub-sub units, a policy like the proposed is in place, but the issue is the process. Usually people asked to submit what they want to teach, but then process becomes mysterious, and faculty are told what to teach.
	+ Instead, units should put out a list of courses needed in coming year (create slots, curriculum needed) and then gather people in the room and say who can do what. This process would be smoother and more open about how decisions are made.
	+ That process sounds like a good one to consider. Perhaps bring it back to division chairs.
	+ In discussing this at EC with EVCAA Lavitt present, EC is showing her that this is important to faculty and that we would like her support in enforcing it.

After discussion, vice chair, Lauren Montgomery, asked EC if they thought they should create a policy about equitable distribution of teaching across times/levels. The majority of EC members were in favor (no official vote taken). Lauren Montgomery, Sushil Oswal, and Mark Pendras agreed to work on a draft for EC to review at the next meeting.

* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost

The Provost has asked that the Chancellor work with faculty groups on this exercise. This is connected to the [Faculty Salary Policy and Executive Order](http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO64.html). Apparently, units have not yet talked about the three-year planning exercise around salaries that the Provost has charged UW Tacoma. It is supposed to be happening in collaboration with elected representatives of faculty councils, i.e. EC. Then EC reps would make sure this exercise is happening in their units. FA chair, Mark Pendras, will work with the Chancellor to know where UW Tacoma is in the process and formulate a plan.

Discussion:

* + EC reps asked for guidance in having these kind of difficult discussions within their units.
	+ The goal/expectation is that deans and directors care about issues of compression and are working to address them. If not, then they should be.
	+ Historically, salary decisions have been made without structure, though some units do have their faculty councils involved in looking at salary raises annually.
	+ The point of this exercise is to be making decisions responsibly; having a plan instead of making decisions in the moment.
	+ The exercise asks us to look at unit adjustments (promotion raises are set) with the priorities of addressing equity and compression. If nothing else, at least clarifying the picture of salaries over the next few years.
	+ Units won’t get extra funds for this, but they can decide how to distribute the money that is available within their unit.

Chair, Mark Pendras, will bring this back to EC.

* Campus-wide W-Course Policy & Review (Policy yet to come through APCC)
	+ Writing Advisory Committee in Governance Structure

The Writing Advisory Committee has proposed a campus-wide W-Course Policy. APCC has not yet voted to approve it, though they have been reviewing it. There has been much push-back from units. APCC is asking that EC empower them to bring WAC into the Faculty Assembly governance structure as an ad hoc committee that is representative of all academic units (though smaller units could share representation as long as a reporting structure is in place.)

WAC has done a lot of valuable work on the W-Course policy, yet without representation from all units. Therefore, it doesn’t take into account variables affecting some units.

**VOTE:** Vice chair, Lauren Montgomery, moved that WAC be an ad hoc committee of APCC with representation from all units, an elected chair, and Asao Inoue, the Director of the University Writing Program, as a voting exofficio member. The motion was seconded: 15 in favor, 0 abstain, 0 against, 5 absent, 20 eligible.

APCC chair, Jeff Cohen, will get in touch with WAC leadership to discuss moving this decision forward.

1. **Adjourn**

**Appendix A**

Dear Faculty, Staff and Students,

Each year a student receiving an undergraduate degree is recognized by the Chancellor at our commencement ceremony for his or her extraordinary achievement as a student at UW Tacoma.

Nominations are solicited from campus in early spring and are open for 1-3 weeks. Faculty, staff and students and those affiliated with UW Tacoma are eligible and encouraged to submit nominations for this prestigious award.

Nominees must have above a 3.0 cumulative grade point average or above and are earning a degree in autumn, winter, spring or summer of the respective academic year.  The award recognizes an individual who has been a consistent source of inspiration for faculty and fellow students, and has over overcome significant obstacles in order to complete a degree.

Please see the link below for the nomination guidelines and criteria.   Send your recommendations toalinau@uw.edu in the Office of the Chancellor no later than Wednesday, March 22.

<http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/commencement/chancellors-medal>

Thank you on behalf of the selection committee,

Alina

**Appendix B**

The following was compiled from the Faculty-Role-on-the-Student-of-Concern-Team Subcommittee proposal that was presented to EC on 2/1/17. See the 2/1/17 EC agenda for the full proposal.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Each academic unit should identify a person for the Student of Concern team to contact, as needed, so that there can be greater communication between the Concern Team and any involved faculty when a Concern issues arises.

The following academic units have appointed these people to this role:

School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences: Chris Demaske, Associate Dean of Faculty and Student Affairs

Milgard, School of Business: Gregory Noronha, Associate Dean

Social Work & Criminal Justice: Tom Diehm, Interim Director (temporarily until SWCJ has further discussion)

School of Education: Jarek Sierschynski, Assistant Professor

Nursing & Healthcare Leadership: Sharon Fought, Director

The Institute of Technology: Charles Costarella (volunteered, pending confirmation at upcoming IT faculty meeting)

Urban Studies: Ali Modarres, Director

Responsibilities include:

> If notified when a Concern issue arises, check in with individual faculty members to make sure they are comfortable with the process and support them when and if needed

> Receive notifications (emails, phone calls) from Jeri Carter when a Mental Health concern is raised and resolved

> Receive notifications (emails, phone calls) from Susan Wagshul-Golden and Ed Mirecki when behavioral concerns are raised and resolved

> Receive notifications (emails, phone calls) from Ginger MacDonald as she reaches out periodically to make sure there are no outstanding concerns

> **When transitioning out of this role, this person should make sure that someone else in their unit will become the point of contact for the Student of Concern Team and facilitate the transition by connecting the Student of Concern Team with the academic unit's new point of contact**

> The workload will not be significant as the Student of Concern Team does the bulk of the work involved. This role is to be a communication liaison between the faculty in an academic unit and the Student of Concern Team

The Faculty Assembly Administrative Coordinator will forward this list of liaisons to the Student of Concern Team. As the people in this role change, it is the academic unit’s responsibility to contact the Student of Concern Team with the name of their new liaison. Student of Concern Team members include: Ed Mirecki, Ginger MacDonald, Susan Wagshul-Golden, Jeri Carter.

**Appendix C**

Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments

It is understandable and normal for some level of non-competitive hiring (and the use of temporary or adjunct faculty) to be customary. ~~to satisfy unanticipated circumstances and emergency situations.~~ To ensure equity, inclusiveness and diversity are incorporated in all aspects of the faculty hiring process, the Faculty Affairs Committee herewith proposes the following policy on non-competitive hiring process:

Non-competitive full-time faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of one year. ~~to satisfy unexpected shortcomings in faculty course coverage~~. Whenever a non-competitive full-time position is filled, the competitive hiring process must be immediately undertaken to fill the position through a diversity focused and inclusive process for the following year. Non-competitive hires are assumed\* to be included in the candidate pool for the competitively hired position, unless they opt out of the process, but are not afforded special treatment due to their incumbency.

\* eligible to apply / If non-comp hires are part of pool

-add part-time, or similar policy

-equity for race and rank (lecturers)

Draft Version 1.0 / 2016-11-30 ; edits added at EC 2.17.17