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

December 10, 2018 / 1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

GWP 320 – Dawn Lucien Board Room

***Present***: Menaka Abraham, Nicole Blair, Kathy Beaudoin, Nicole Blair, Leighann Chafee, Charles Costarella, Michelle Garner, D.C. Grant, Katie Haerling, Sarah Hampson, Marian Harris, Danica Miller, Lauren Montgomery, Sushil Oswal, Mark Pagano, Mark Pendras, Jill Purdy, Eugene Sivadas, Etga Ugur, Justin Wadland, Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee ***Attending Remotely***: Loly Alcaide Ramirez, Jenny Sheng, Arindam Tripathy ***Excused:*** Rupinder Jindal

***Guests***: LeAnne Laux-Bachand

1. **Consent Agenda & Recording Permission, Approval of Minutes**
* Consent Consent to approve agenda and record meeting given by unanimous show of hands from all members present and verbal consent given by 2 members on phone. *16 approved, 0 no, 0 abstentions*
* Executive Council minutes from 11/30/18 were approved as written by a motion from Charles Costarella, seconded by Menaka Abraham.

*15 approved, 0 no, 0 abstentions*

1. **Announcements**
* The UWT Budgeting primer, approved at the Executive Budget Committee meeting on 11/19/18, was distributed to Executive Council members. Executive Council members were asked to review it for discussion in winter quarter.
* Feedback from units was requested on two proposed policies from the Faculty Affairs Council: Teaching Evaluation Policy and the Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Hiring (*see Appendix A*). Executive Council members were asked to take these to their units for feedback; the policies will be on the agenda for the January 28th meeting of Executive Council. Both policies were previously submitted to Executive Council but were sent back to FAC for changes. By a show of hands, 15 members requested background on what changes were made prior to this most recent 12/10/18 submission and FAC member Sarah Hampson will create a short document for Executive Council. Members can also email questions to FAC Chair D.C. Grant.
* Members were encouraged to purchase snacks from the snack cart to support the Pantry.
1. **Election Plan from Standing Committee Chairs**
* **Faculty Affairs Committee**: Members will email current Chair D.C. Grant suggestions for Chair nominees (which can include themselves) by February 14, 2019. Voting will then take place at the February 21, 2019 FAC meeting.
* **Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee**: APT is currently reviewing promotion packets through January 18th of 2019 and will address elections starting in mid-February through March.
* **Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee**: Although the bylaws state that Spring quarter is when elections occur, APCC members agree that “job training” for the chair position is necessary. Nominations for APCC Chair will be discussed at the 12/12/18 APCC meeting. Elections will take place at the first APCC meeting in January of 2019. The incoming Chair will shadow current APCC Chair during the 2019 Winter and Spring quarters.
1. **Academic Plan Policy and Process Appendix B**
* Changes to the Academic Planning Policy and Process document have been made by the Steering Committee and Lauren Montgomery since the last Executive Council meeting in November; these were shared at the meeting. Key points during the discussion of the policy were:
1. The document has been renamed “Academic Planning Policy and Process.”
2. Fee based programs were added to the scope of future academic plans.
3. A paragraph was added to the scope section regarding the separation of the approval and planning process.
4. The wordings in the document must make clear that “scholarly work” should not be limited.
5. Units should think about who their representatives are on EC and APCC during planning years.
6. It is the responsibility of the unit to look at departures from projected numbers – either up or down, to provide accountability from all programs but still allow for qualitative success of programs.
7. The plan schedule has been changed to a four-year cycle instead of the previously planned five-year process in response to faculty feedback. The planning process will take one year. The assessment stage will happen separately through administrative offices.
* Lauren Montgomery will update the Academic Planning Policy and Process document.
1. **Key Topics**
* Faculty Affairs Committee will add historical background of 2 proposed policies: Teaching Evaluation and the Policy on Non-Competitive and Part-Time Faculty Appointments in order for members to see where changes have occurred. Sarah Hampson will write statement regarding historical background of 2 proposed policies.
* Members enjoyed snacks from the Snack Cart while supporting the Pantry; The School of Engineering and Technology made a generous donation of food.
* Executive Council members are tasked to read the budget primer.  The UWT Budget Primer was distributed electronically and hard copies were provided at the meeting.
* Election plan for new 2019-20 chairs were received from FAC, APCC and APT committees.
* The Academic Planning Policy and Process document will be revised to account for faculty feedback.
1. **Adjournment**
* The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.
* The next meeting of Executive Council will be Friday, January 11, 2019, from 1:00-3:00 p.m. in GWP 320.

**Appendix A**

**FAC Proposed Campus-Wide Policy for Teaching Evaluation**

*Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on 12.6.18*

In response to the 2016 Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows, the Faculty Affairs Committee proposes the adoption of the following campus-wide policy:

According to the University of Washington’s “Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices (2016)” and supported by extensive research in the “Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows”, UWT academic units should rely on all three of the following methods of teaching evaluation: peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and student evaluation of teaching. Each unit should:

1. Review and update teaching assessment guidelines to ensure that they match best practices for student, peer, and self-assessment. Academic unit guidelines should clearly identify which kinds of teaching assessment are used for which purposes and how much weight they will be given in merit, contract renewal, and promotion and tenure decisions.
2. Define teaching excellence, directly addressing the diverse needs of our students as well as fair and just evaluation of all faculty, including women and faculty-of-color.
3. Clarify with students the use of and reasons for student evaluation feedback. Only those student comments relevant to the learning process should be utilized for teaching evaluations.
4. Provide resources for and remove barriers to effective teaching practices. Best practices include:

●Reduced faculty teaching loads to allow time for training and provision of thorough and systematic peer review.

●Recognize self-assessments as a critical component in merit review, contract renewal, promotion and tenure decisions,

●Support the participatory development of student success and teaching excellence.

●Create assessment and support systems appropriate to faculty rank and teaching experience.

1. Refer to University of Washington’s [“​Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases: Guide to Best Practices (2016)”](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/Evaluating_Teaching_P.T._Guide_Draft_Kalikoff_TLC_UWS.pdf) and the [“​Report of the Teaching Evaluation Campus Fellows​”](http://www.tacoma.uw.edu/sites/default/files/sections/FacultyAssembly/Teaching_Evaluation_campus-Fellows_report_final_6.8.16_0.pdf) for guidance on the implementation of best practices.

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

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

UW Tacoma requires all full-time positions to be on the Tacoma campus hiring plan and be conducted via competitive searches. This includes full-time temporary lecturers. Each unit within UW Tacoma is expected to document the number of hires that were competitive and/or non -competitive. This documentation shall be submitted to the FAC on or before December 15th of odd numbered years. 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 or medical leave, etc.) a competitive hiring process must be 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 Faculty Affairs Committee.

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. A specific faculty appointment may be considered exempt from these standards due to a persistent need for a clinical and/or professional appointment.

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

Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee 12 6 18

**Appendix B**

*Academic Planning Policy & Process* - **DRAFT**

UW *Tacoma Executive Council, November 2018*

**Rationale**:

The faculty and administration of the UW Tacoma recognize the need for a comprehensive academic planning process to guide the future development of our campus. It is important to balance continuing improvement of our academic work with its growth and development. The process is rooted in shared governance and fulfills the requirements of the UW Tacoma By-Laws. The content of academic programs is determined by the faculty, with approval of administrative leaders both in Tacoma and Seattle. An initial, limited academic planning process, undertaken in 2017/18-2018/19, allowed us to pilot the process and helped determine the framework for this policy.

**Academic Plan Steering Committee:**

The steering committee will consist of the Faculty Assembly Chair and Vice Chair, the EVCAA and the Chair of the Council of Deans/Directors. These four people will guide the planning process in each two-year planning process. The EVCAA will lead the planning process ensuring timely meetings, collaboration with faculty, the VCFA and Deans/Directors as well as due process.

**Scope**:

The scope of each academic planning process is the entire academic enterprise of the campus. It includes all academic offerings, including: minors, certificates, fee based programs and other non-degree academic programs and related scholarly activities and initiatives.

The first year of the planning process will entail an *assessment* of these areas and the second year a *plan* for the next five years of operation, improvement and growth. Campus-wide plans for new and significant changes to academic offerings will be based on proposals (Proposed Notice of Intent or PNOI) submitted by each unit at the start of the second year.

The academic planning process is separate from the program approval process. A flowchart showing how the two separate processes are integrated is attached in appendix x. Essentially, The academic plan review is inserted in between the PNOI and the 1503 approval process, and is the step where a faculty driven, campus-wide academic planning process can occur.

**Decision Authority:**

The UW Tacoma Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee, APCC, will review all the PNOI’s in each planning cycle simultaneously, and make a recommendation to the Faculty Assembly Executive Council for programs to go forward and develop full 1503 proposals. (In the first plan cycle, there will be two due dates for PNOIs, one in Autumn quarter and one in Winter quarter to accommodate more recently initiated programs.) The APCC deliberations will be informed by campus budget projections provided by the VCFA and this faculty body will consider resource impact during their review process. Further approvals of the 1503‘s will occur as established in the curriculum development process, with subsequent approvals from unit faculty, Deans/Directors, APCC, EVCAA, EBC, UW President (undergraduate programs) and UW Regents (graduate programs).

**Workload**

During planning years, the campus faculty, staff and administration, and especially APCC, EC and the planning team members will have added responsibilities relative to non-planning years. However, the EVCAA and her/his office will incur the greatest increase in workload.

**Monitoring of Academic Plan**

An annual review of the academic plan will be conducted by the EVCAA to monitor and adjust to changing circumstances within and outside of our campus. Proposals for adding a new program (degrees, minors, and certificates) outside the proposed cycle of academic planning should provide justification explaining how a delay would negatively affect the success of the program. These will be reviewed annually by the EVCAA and EC.

**Criteria for New Program Assessment**

To assess new program PNOI’s, APCC will use the four, unranked criteria developed during Plan 1, or those added, deleted or changed through Class C legislation in Executive Council. The four criteria are:

\*Alignment with Strategic Plan

\*Campus-wide Balance of Academic Disciplines and Programs - building on our existing expertise and interdisciplinary emphasis

\*Community/Student/Market demand and impact

\*Resource Impact

**Program Changes**

Program change proposals that require new resources will be also be collected and considered in every planning cycle, in addition to new program proposals. The resource requests will also be included in the Executive Budget Committee. The intention is to integrate ongoing refinement and improvement of our academic offerings.

Only "Substantive Program changes" will be included in academic planning as defined by UW Seattle:

* “**Substantive program changes and examples**
	+ Changes that alter degree information on a student transcript.  For example, changing the name of a degree, option, or minor.
	+ Changes in prerequisites that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students admitted to the major, minor, or option.  For example, requiring more credits for admission to a program, or adding minimum grade requirements.
	+ Changes in graduation requirements that would significantly increase or decrease the number of students completing the major, minor, or option. For example, changing the number of credits required for a major, minor, or option, or adding a continuation policy.
	+ Program changes on one campus that could significantly alter enrollments in specific programs on one of the other two campuses.  For example, changing the program format to distance learning or fee-based learning.
* **Non-substantive program changes and examples**
	+ Changes that do not significantly alter existing admission or graduation requirements, but do require changes to the general catalog.
	+ Examples include:
		- Course prefix and/or number changes.
		- Addition and/or removal of courses that do not alter the total credits for existing admission or graduation requirements.
		- Changing credit distribution (such as for core courses and electives) without altering the total credits for existing graduation requirements.
		- Changing electives listed in the general catalog to stating, “See website for approved list of electives.”

**Unit Faculty Responsibilities:**

Faculty in each unit will be responsible for the program reviews within their unit, submitting the documents on time, including the PNOI’s for new programs and program changes.

**Unit Faculty/Dean/Director Accountability:**

Units will be accountable for the operation of their academic programs once launched. Management of student enrollment and faculty numbers is the responsibility of the unit and **significant departures from planned numbers, either up or down, will need to be addressed in** **the next planning cycle.**

**Plan Schedule:**

The Academic Planning process will occur over two years, with a five-year implementation period. (See Table 1 below.) Planning for the next cycle will occur in the last two years of the previous one. Thus, planning activities will occur for two years followed by a three-year interim period. (The first plan was more limited and occurred in one year followed by a four-year implementation period.)

Table 1. – Timeline for UW Tacoma academic planning cycles.

2017 '18-19 '19-20 '20-21 '22-23 '23-24 '24-25 25'26 '26-27 '27-28

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Plan 1 | -------- | -------- | -------- | -------- |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Pilot) | Pilot |  | P | Plan 2 | -------- | -------- | -------- | -------- | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Plan 3 | first year plan 3 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Policy Changes**

This policy can be changed using the rules for Class B legislation as stated in the UW Tacoma By-Laws.