Summary of Feedback from FA Fall Retreat

September 27, 2024, 1-3 PM, Milgard Hall

*Faculty Assembly Standing Committees*

**Faculty Affairs**

* **Implement recommendations of workload equity report**
* Mechanisms to *improve and change practice*: faculty committees should not do work that is the proper purview and responsibility of administration; improved clarity on faculty work that we are empowered and enabled to do, under our own bylaws
  + Refrain from the desire to respond to and address every issue that comes up, affecting faculty; **this is a workload equity issue**. Take time to identify and understand where we have *spaces for action*, and where we need to press for and, when indicated, take more.
  + Continue the move to *enlist administration in sustaining programs* that are their purview and responsibility (e.g. faculty award programs for research, teaching, and community engagement; support and recognition for international faculty; safe classrooms, offices, and common spaces).
  + Undertake FA committee *work sparingly and intentionally* (standing, ad-hoc, and advisory committees) to align with likely impact and success, build trust, and respect faculty labor.
  + Create *more precision in role clarity* and communication practices. What is each committee empowered to do, who are they responsible to and what outcomes do they generate; sharing agendas, meeting schedules, decision points, and materials for review with sufficient notice and shared expectations; following Robert’s Rules to ensure smooth and efficient EC meetings.
  + *Consider the role of the retreat*. Have we outgrown a full campus faculty gathering (direct democracy)? Does waning attendance indicate closer identification with, and maximized co-learning commitments at the unit level? Since we now have Schools with EFCs – not programs with directors – should we have a retreat for EC members and EFC chairs (representative democracy)? How can we use the quarterly retreats to further effective faculty governance, in line with changes in scale, numbers, and the locus of service activity for most faculty?

**Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure**

* **“black box” obscures and hinders** strong norms and shared practices at the campus level.
* Faculty need to have *confidence in how this committee works*, including norms of collegial review, expectations for stated and written evaluations, and understanding of time commitment, workload, and privacy for candidates.
  + Documenting expectations and best practices would help acknowledge the existing enormity of APT committee work, current and ongoing (increasing overall appreciation)
  + Labor and time in “reinventing the wheel” each year, or overly relying on past members as go-to antidote, would be aided by a guidance document for the committee
* Areas of importance and *needed policy change* in review practices, voting eligibility, and emphasis of evaluation (procedural/substantive) remain and need to be addressed.
  + Changes to our bylaws to adjust APT policy and practice through Class A legislation need to originate in the APT Standing Committee – EC cannot do this
  + Changes to bylaws need to be vetted and reviewed for compliance with the UW Faculty Code, in addition to responding to findings of the task force reports
  + Current UW Faculty Code trumps task force recommendations; APT membership voting rights are constrained by university policy, and faculty being reviewed must be protected by our campus-level policy
  + APT is the “natural” home for informed deliberation and proposed policy change as only members who have served have experience with the process, confidentiality, and potential conflicts that arise, unique to our campus and out of public view (by legal necessity)

**Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee**

* **“black box” relates to the specifics, volume, and multi-stage review** of new courses, programs, and proposed revisions of the same – not a need for privacy or a lack of clear procedural direction on who can vote or perform substantive review (as with APT)
  + Work with administration on *Workshops for Curriculum Development*; Academic Affairs has an interest in faculty becoming more adept and knowledgeable: how the process of approval works, best practices for how course learning outcomes (CLO’s) support program learning outcomes (PLO’s), stages of the process and what to expect
  + Support *use of available data* to strengthen curriculum proposals and align with our campus mission and regional human capital needs; partner with Academic Affairs to upskill EFC chairs (or a designee in each unit) on key metrics for program performance (PLO’s) and course rationales (CLO’s)
* Big picture *campus and tri-campus policy* may impose an unrealistic burden on APCC given the ongoing, year-long, deadline driven load of curriculum review on a still-growing and rapidly developing R2 campus
  + Require updates to APCC from, and coordination with academic policy bodies, permanent and ad-hoc (eg. Teaching@UW, UEAC, AI Taskforce)
  + Realism about, and support for APCC coordination with larger processes of Academic Planning (Academic Affairs) and Strategic Planning (Chancellor’s Office)
    - Do we want APCC to propose updates to the Academic Plan survey questionnaire for program invigoration, following the first cycle of new proposals that require its completion?
    - Do we want APCC to provide leadership on shaping Strategic Plan curricular/spatial planning priorities, and/or implementing the same through future program review and evaluation?
    - What support is needed for this, and given the current focus of APCC how can this be structured and enabled to activate those with interest/capacity?

*Faculty Assembly Advisory Committees*

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty Forum**

This body is essential, the needs and concerns of NTTF are separate and distinct from TTF.

Campus wide pressure to reduce courseload for tenure-track faculty to improve research footprint, implies risk for non-tenured teaching faculty; at UWB this was accomplished on the backs of NTTF. How can we keep our eyes open about this, and recognize the structural need to hold policy and negotiating space for Teaching faculty, on a non-union campus, to realistically build rather than erode collegiality, as well as teaching and research practice? How is research being defined for NTTF, now that this is included in evaluation and review, and how does this differ (if at all) from TTF definitions?

NTTF may need to propose Class A legislation through Faculty Affairs or other standing committees, but they need to be a stand-alone body with discretion and charge and permanence, to identify and advocate for the needs of Teaching faculty.

Is this, or should this be a Standing Committee?

**Budget Planning Commmittee**

Faculty need to understand the budget.

Mismanagement of the budget can have negative consequences on faculty.

Non-salary budget – can affect how we work – having more knowledge can help us.

Workday has been a huge shift for everyone, and some faculty have made the shift (or have had to) more completely than others. What are the specific issues that this platform has introduced for faculty, what are the opportunities for learning and improvement that it provides, and how can this committee better represent the needs and interests of faculty in this transition?

Yes, we have a campus budget committee, and a great VCFA – faculty interests related to the budget and campus finance are sometimes distinct, and require coordination and an opportunity to learn together, use our voice, and be more effective in engaging the process.

**Research Advisory Committee**

Way to empower and be mindful of disciplinary differences – how can non-STEM colleagues secure strong research funding, how can PAR and CEL obtain extra-institutional support, and can we better leverage these faculty strengths at UWT with research resources?

Communicate more of what the RAC has accomplished, what they have advocated for and helped to provide, in the past.

Build skills to communicate across teams, and build interdisciplinary teams – business is different than the arts, how do we write a fungible proposal together, so we can amplify student support?

What are some effective ways to matchmake across units and disciplines, and build more connections for cross-departmental research? Can the RAC help enable and sustain these?

**BIG PICTURE**

These are not (or not currently treated as) “Standing Committees” but they are permanent faculty advocacy needs and require annual investment and empowerment to coordinate effectively with administration, and propose legislation (as necessary) to further faculty interests. “Advisory Councils”?

Each is absolutely mission-central and the faculty depend on the thriving function, respectful footprint, and wellness of Teaching Faculty, Budget Engagement, and Research Funding. Can we clarify the role of each of these groups; are they committees, councils, for a – does what we call them matter, how many people on each, who chairs, to what ends, and who decides?

**Support for the policy and shared governance importance** of NTTF, BAC, RAC, and desire to see this elevated and clarified, in our bylaws. Permanent, non-subsidiary, shared governance advocacy role for faculty.