****

**Agenda**

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

Wednesday, April 26, 2017 12:30-1:25pm CP 206 C

1. Consent Agenda & Recording Permission
2. Approval of Minutes
	* 1. *Meeting Materials: March 31 & April 14, 2017 EC Meeting Minutes* **pg. 2 –** **7,** *both sets*
3. Chair’s Report and Discussion Items
	* Professional Development – *Richard Wilkinson* 10 min.
		1. *Meeting Material:* [*Training & Development Manager Overview*](https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/11b8cb7a85818d723b612913caada4ec753e65558f3068be35754b8e3b1e2b16?inline=1)
	* FA Meeting De-brief 15 min.
	* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost 20 min.
	* UW Open Access Policy 10 min.
		1. *Meeting Material:* [*Proposed UW Open Access Policy*](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/oapolicy)  *&* [*FAQ*](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/faq)
4. Adjourn

**Upcoming Faculty Assembly Executive Council Meetings**

5/19/17 1:00-3:00pm CP 206 C

5/31/17 12:30-1:25pm CP 206 C

**SAVE THE DATE:**

2 Commencement Ceremonies: 6/14/17

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

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

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

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

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

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The March 10, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved.

1. **Announcements:**
	* 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 - APISU sent a formal donation request and invitation to Faculty Assembly, thus, FA is passing this information along to faculty since the FA budget cannot donate.
	* [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) - Katie Haerling is the Faculty representative on this search. Forward comments and questions to her.
	* First Annual Faculty & Staff Variety Show! 10/27/17 - FA will be one of the hosts, along with the Staff Association. Meant to build community with faculty and staff. Suggestion as BINGO in addition to solicit more participation. Though, participation may not be an issue since faculty and staff amount to approximately 600 people. BINGO as a suggestion for a future event as well.
	* Immigration Legal Clinic: 4/7/17, 5-7pm, WPH
2. **Chair’s Report and Discussion Items**
* Changes to Admissions Language at UWS: Capacity-Constrained vs. Competitive

This is an effort to signal that some majors simply do not have space available and communicate more clearly with students and make the language less stressful. EC can decide if they would rather come up with different language to address this issue. For instance, “space limited” could be an option.

FA chair, Mark Pendras, checked in with the three units at UW Tacoma who have competitive majors (Milgard, IT and Biomed.) There was general support. With that input, EC decided to follow the Seattle Policy. FA leadership will communicate with the appropriate parties so that the advisors will be informed, as they are the front lines with students around entry into majors. Then, EC suggested that perhaps brief explanation should be added in the catalog about what "capacity constrained" means. Lauren Montgomery, FA vice chair will ask APCC chair, Jeff Cohen, to put it on the APCC agenda as an announcement too, so APCC member and Director of the Academic Advising Center, Lorraine Dinnel, will also hear about it verbally.

* Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting: 4/21/17

EC members talked at length about how to frame the important conversation around faculty input in appointments, faculty composition by categories, and what the goal of this conversation should be:

* + The goal could be to identify what kind of faculty we want to hire moving forward
	+ The new Strategic Plan does not directly address faculty hiring and composition
	+ There are many pressures/constraints/forces at play affecting hiring decisions
	+ Why and when do we hire faculty at the various ranks we have?
	+ Why are we asking for the lines we’re asking for?
	+ Suggestion: create a document that describes the complementary things that each position/category contributes to campus – a strategic hiring plan
	+ The conversation we should have is about who we want to become and not get too bogged down with the definitions of the various faculty ranks
	+ Avoid conversation about what individuals do, and make it more about the categories, why we have them, and when we should hire people to fill various categories
	+ The reality has been increased hiring of lecturers; we have become path-dependent, so change the course to increase the hiring of Tenure-Track positions
	+ There should be tenure for teaching lines
	+ Perhaps we have not used the full range of faculty categories to get the various tasks done
	+ After three years of non-competitively hiring the same lecturer, the line will be converted to competitively-hired, 3-5 year contract; often the incumbent is hired
	+ Faculty have more power over hiring decisions than they realize – what kind of decisions should we be making? We haven’t had this conversation, and therefore, haven’t been strategic about it
	+ UW Seattle does not have pay ranges for faculty categories
	+ Alison Hendricks, Academic HR, would be a good resource for this conversation
	+ Keep in mind that this is a sensitive topic
	+ Go back to the Strategic Plan – what faculty categories do we need to realize this plan?
	+ Criteria to evaluate solutions; faculty-mix criteria
	+ Who are we as teachers? The Strategic Plan doesn’t have goals specific to teaching
	+ Brainstorm on questions at tables and collect data into a report
	+ Suggestion to move FA meeting date back to have more time to plan
	+ Suggestion to consult with Zoe Barsness, Faculty Senate Chair

EC agreed to have this conversation at the Faculty Assembly Spring meeting and will continue to work on how to structure it. The Strategic Plan values are a good starting point, as well as asking, what kind of university are we? This discussion will continue at EC’s 4.14.17 meeting.

* Campus Policy for Equity in Teaching Distribution Among Rank

EC reviewed the draft that Lauren, Mark, and Sushil worked on was. EC clarified that service courses are classes that serve more students than those just within your major, i.e. Calculus, Writing. EC reviewed the wording and made edits. With edits made (See Appendix A), the Equity in Teaching Distribution Among Rank Guidelines were approved by the Executive Council. Faculty Assembly leadership will communicate the guidelines to campus administration, academic units, and faculty.

It was noted that some units are experiencing new-policy fatigue. This guideline at the campus level will help the EVCAA inforce this best practice, as needed.

**VOTE:** Motion to approve by Sushil Oswal; Seconded by Jim Gawel; 13 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstain.

* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost - *Discussion postponed.*
* Adding UEAC Chair as Exoffico - *Unnecessary agenda item as it was discussed and decided on 1.6.17.*
* UW Open Access Policy – *Justin Wadland* - [*Proposed UW Open Access Policy*](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/oapolicy)  *&* [*FAQ*](http://www.lib.washington.edu/scholpub/faq)

Open Access Journals are typically accessed by anyone for free. As a public institution, the UW should be making the publications of its employees open to the public. Thus, the penultimate version of an article will made available through University of Washington Library system. This will be an opt-out policy.

Operationally, this policy applies to only scholarly research – articles being published in peer-reviewed scholarly journals, not books or creative writing. If this passes, it gives the University and the Library the right to share the final draft, though the author will retain the copyright.

This allows the Library to set up a system to recognize and harvest when these publications come out. Harvard and UC system have similar policy. Authors will receive a message when the system notices that an article has been published. It will be something like, “Please upload final draft of article here, or opt out.” The waiver will be simple, similar to an “opt-out” button. It is foreseen that there will be three options: upload the article final draft; indicate that you’ve already uploaded the article in another repository; or choose to opt out of uploading it. EC members had many questions, for instance: why is university proposing this? There is a lot of overlap with existing archives across disciplines. Also: what impact will this have on the Digital Commons (institutional repository)? Part of this policy is a budget request to improve research archiving. Hopefully, Digital Commons and this policy will align well. Even if this passes, it will take a couple years to get it up and running.

The best person to answer questions about this would be the Director of the Scholarly Communications at the UW Library. He has prepared the linked-above FAQs in regards to this proposed policy. FA leadership will work with Justin to learn more and then come back and continue this discussion with EC.

1. **Adjourn**

**Appendix A (3.31.17 minutes)**

Guidelines for Equitable Teaching for UW Tacoma

Faculty Assembly Executive Council

Approved March 31st, 2017

The growing size of our campus now 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 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 goal, Faculty Assembly recommends the following guidelines:

1. Each full-time faculty member makes themselves available to teach at least one class in the early morning (8:00am) or evening (beginning after 5:00pm) each year.
2. No faculty member shall be required to teach more than two such courses (8am or beginning 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 courses in their unit or service courses each year. (A service course is one that is required for other majors.)

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

* Teaching specialty courses such as service learning, labs or field work, that require scheduling commensurate with community organizations and activities or daylight hours. The programs should, however, try to share such workload by providing opportunities to other faculty to develop expertise in such specialty areas.

According to these guidelines, teaching specialty courses in the upper division is ***not*** a mitigating factor.

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

April 14, 2017 1:00-3:00pm CP 206 C

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

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission**

The agenda was approved with the addition of an update on the Open Access Policy and a brief discussion about the Variety Show. Permission was given to record for the minutes.

1. **Approval of Minutes**

The March 31, 2017 Executive Council meeting minutes will be reviewed for approval at the April 26 meeting.

1. **Announcements:**
	* End of Year Standing Committee Reports Due: 5/19/17
	* Updated New Program Flowchart & Process – *Jeff Cohen* Appendix A

An updated New Program Flowchart and Process has come out of Academic Affairs. APCC reviewed it at their 4.12.17 meeting. From their perspective, these are procedural changes for the New Undergraduate Program (1503) process, but not content changes. These procedural changes attend to some of APCC’s concerns about having information at the right times in the process to make informed decisions. The procedural changes: 1) ensure that deans/directors know what else is happening on campus; 2) the Executive Budget Committee (EBC) will ensure that as a campus we know what we’re agreeing to pay for; 3) Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities now requires a 75 day minimum review on all new programs at the end of the UW process.

There is currently a PNOI template being drafted by a subcommittee of APCC which will align with the new flowchart. There are still some changes that may affect the flowchart, namely, the addition of a “step zero” at the beginning of the process which will consist of 30 days for tri-campus review of the program name and concept to identify possible overlap and collaboration. This step won’t be a barrier to program development. It will be facilitated by the new UW Curriculum Management system. It will be best practice to talk with one’s dean/director before submitting a new program idea to the “step zero.” The policy for “step zero” is not yet written. APCC chair, Jeff Cohen, will suggest that the policy include a suggestion to consult with one’s dean/director first. At the tri-campus review steps, it is made clear that no campus can stop a program on any other campus. This will be true for “step zero” as well. UW Seattle has sometimes been protective of their programs being duplicated. In reality, some programs need to be duplicated to serve place-bound students.

A new program can only be stopped for curricular reasons at APCC, as faculty have oversight on curriculum. Academic Affairs and EBC can put a hold on a program due to resources. The initial pro-forma budget is not a deal-breaker and commitment to support a program will not change due to inflation.

When this flowchart is no longer in draft, it will need to be forwarded to deans, directors, program administrators, and faculty with clear messaging. The legend should include a highlighting of the new aspects of the procedure and include the overall time it may take for a new program to complete all of the necessary steps and reviews (2 years at minimum.)

* Update on Open Access Policy – This proposed policy needs to go through the Attorney General’s (AG) office, specifically asking if this policy could work as both an opt-in and an opt-out. It may begin to infringe on employment contract language, and therefore, it needs to be reviewed for legality. EC members had questions about the AG’s role in UW Tacoma’s policy making. FA leadership will consult with the Secretary of the Faculty on this question about the AG and report back to EC members.
* All Staff, All Faculty Variety Show – EC members discussed the most conducive time to host this event. They considered 5pm-8pm to be the best timeframe so that people wouldn’t have to leave to go home and then come back. There was also the suggestion of prizes for participants, i.e. most creative, most dystopian, etc. or to invite participants to enter a drawing for a prize.
1. **EVCAA Report**

1) There have been concerns about uneven structuring at UW Tacoma in regards to having 4 schools and 3 programs. For example, the last attempt for Urban Studies to become a school only included ad hoc criteria for how programs become schools. There was a general lack of guidance. 2) There have also been concerns from within SIAS about their divisional structure, i.e. does it do the job it’s supposed to? Would departmentalization work better?3) Lastly, there is usually a regular convening of the head academic officer with all department chairs, but this best practice doesn’t happen at UW Tacoma yet.

Due to these three concerns, UW Tacoma administration, deans, and directors are suggesting that a Limited RCEP process be looked into. They are seeking permission from EC, as the representative faculty body, to begin to examine UW Tacoma’s organizational structure and figure out how the two procedures within Limited RCEP would apply to UW Tacoma (since UW Tacoma could fit into multiple distinctions: campus, unit, school, which has schools and units within it.) Provost, Jerry Baldasty is waiting for EC to endorse and support this first stage. When EC officially endorses this, they will let the EVCAA and Chancellor know, then the Chancellor will let the Provost know, and then the Limited RCEP timeline (clock) will start. Urban Studies Director, Ali Modarres, will lead a group of deans, directors, faculty, and Faculty Assembly leadership who will (potentially) develop the process, find data, discuss, and vote.

EC asked for more information on the justification of the concerns/problem. EVCAA Lavitt clarified that the main issue at hand is the need for a policy in how programs become schools, as well as, what constitutes restructuring within a school from divisions to departments. EC asked for time to intentionally engage with faculty about this, affirming that this is not something to rush through. After EC has further discussions about this, they will vote on whether or not to allow analysis of restructuring at UW Tacoma. Currently, SIAS is doing a structure assessment. They are collecting systematic data on how their structure is working and not-working; the issues and benefits of their current structure. This current work could help inform future decisions.

EC will have discussion time for this on a future agenda.

1. **Chair’s Report and Discussion Items**
* Faculty Assembly Spring Meeting: 4/21/17

EC members talked at length about how to frame the important conversation around faculty input in appointments, faculty composition by categories, and what the goal of this conversation should be. They reviewed a [Powerpoint presentation to be used at the FA spring meeting](https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/11b8cb7a85818d723b612913caada4ec326e97c51cd4360c9bee5dc3fb273038?inline=1). EC members called for consideration of the goal/outcome desired from this conversation at the FA spring meeting. There was a suggestion to include faculty category data by unit and have this conversation at the unit level as well. EC acknowledged that there are many complex combinations of issues related to this conversation. EC members continued to discuss how the discussion questions should be framed, i.e. who makes the strategic hiring decisions in your unit? What’s important to you in a new hire? Etc.

The table discussion notes from the FA spring meeting will be collected into a report to share with campus leadership, deans, and directors.

* Salary Planning Exercise from Provost - Discussion postponed.
1. **Adjourn**

**Appendix A (4.14.17 minutes)**

