

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
UWT Executive Council
Meeting Minutes
WCG 106
February 11, 2009

Meeting was called to order 12:35 p.m.

In attendance: Chair, Michael Forman, Vice Chair, Johann Reusch, Gregory Benner, Marjorie Dobratz, Janice Laakso, Mark Pendras, Josh Tenenberg, Siân Davies-Vollum, Ehsan Feroz

Guests: Charles Emlet, Chair, Appointment, Tenure and Promotion

Synopsis:

1. Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of minutes from Jan. 27 meeting
3. Appointment, Tenure and Promotion, Charles Emlet, chair
4. Faculty Research Incentive Program, Greg Benner
5. Restructuring Faculty Assembly: report from programs
6. Adjournment

-
1. Agenda was approved.
 2. Meeting Minutes from January 27, 2009 were approved with corrections.
 3. Appointment, Tenure and Promotion (APT)

Michael Forman introduced Charles Emlet, Chair of APT. Emlet discussed the committee at length. The major role of this council is to review cases for Tenure and Promotion. In the past, Apt reviewed junior faculty applications for research quarter leave. It judged that this was not consistent with the process of review for sabbatical leaves so APT will no longer review these requests. There are three to four meetings left during this academic year. The focus of the remaining meetings will be on priorities of policy and procedure. Emlet suggested that Star Murray, office assistant, should attend these meetings to take minutes.

Marjorie Dobratz asked about the impact of the budget cut in the review of APT cases. Emlet explained that in a recent meeting he posed this concern to Beth Rushing. According to the feedback from Beth Rushing, Emlet understood that there was no issue about budgetary issues impacting APT cases, rather than, for example, academic concerns.

Siân Davis-Vollum asked whether budget cuts would affect those who come up for tenure early (before the standard six years).

Forman advised that guidelines in the *Handbook* were unclear about cases for early promotion. However, the Academic Human Resources webpage (http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/faculty/promotion_tenure.html) includes explicit guidelines about early tenure. In the past the Provost has relied on the latter's guidelines.

Emllet mentioned that there are concerns about the frequency of Associate to Full professor reviews. Forman suggested that Marcia Killien, Secretary of the UW Faculty Senate is the point contact about these and other concerns having to do with the Code. Josh Tenenberg suggested that this might be addressed at the program level. Forman advised that APT should clarify if Associates in APT can vote on Associate to Full professor reviews. Tenenberg questioned whether the bylaws already regulate this process. Forman referred this question should be addressed to Marcia Killien.

Forman asked about unit representation and participation in the APT review process. Sect. 24.54 C of the Handbook says that "when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused." Forman suggested that, even in an advisory capacity the views of the department representative may unduly influence the APT council. Emllet explained that department representatives stay in the APT review process to answer specific questions from the committee and then they leave before the committee's discussion. Emllet clarified that the point of having the department representative is solely to address questions and clarifications. The council members are aware of possible biases; they are to discern objectively.

Dobratz questioned whether the colleges or units need to be present for these types of questions and clarifications. Emllet responded that unit representatives did not vote or participate in discussion leading up to the APT vote. In his view, their input is useful because committee members are often not well informed about the candidate's field. Tenenberg asked about time commitment on this council. Emllet advised that this council meets once per month for about 2 hours. File reviews and completing file reviews takes more time. Tenenberg asked whether there were tacit understandings in this committee, for example, about the substance of the candidate's work. Emllet explained that in the past Vice Chancellor Jack added an evaluative component. In other words, now the committee is a hybrid of procedure and evaluation. Yet, none of this has been codified.

Forman suggested that APT might examine the *UWT Bylaws* and the *Code* in order to establish whether the review should extend beyond procedure.

Dobratz asked about the extent to which APT's recommendations influence the review process. Janice Laakso also asked about APT's vote and the lack of clarity about how this impacts recommendations. Dobratz suggested that there should be clarification about whether the recommendations are procedural or evaluative and to what extent this impacts the APT recommendations.

Forman suggested that APT should be answering to the faculty.

Johann Reusch asked whether there is an internal mechanism for faculty advocacy when someone is turned down for tenure. Forman noted that this is a situation where the difference between a faculty union and a faculty governance body is clear. A union would represent and advocate for the faculty member as an employee. In the case of the Faculty Senate, the UWT Faculty Assembly, the APT, the situation is different because, in principle, these are the bodies which the determinations about tenure and promotion. Eshan Feroz asked how procedural issues will be addressed.

Emlet explained that during the rest of the academic year, APT would address, in particular, the following: the right of the unit director/dean to vote in tenure and promotion cases, and the establishment of a set date on which the candidate's file closes and she/he can no longer add to it.

Forman thanked Emlet for his visit to the EC, and asked that to APT elect a new chair by the end of this academic year as Emlet's two year appointment will be completed in June 2009.

4. Faculty Research Incentive Program, Gregory Benner

Forman advised he had discussed the Faculty Research Incentive Program at his regular meeting with Beth Rushing. There, Rushing indicated that she was looking into the location of the funds that were supposed to go to the principal investigator's (PI) units. Rushing was absent from today's EC meeting because she was meeting with Ysabel Trinidad and Jan Rutledge about this very issue. Rushing explained that she would send inform the EC via meeting about her meeting with Trinidad and Rutledge.

Gregory Benner summarized the process and explained how direct and indirect costs were allocated in federal grants. 20% of cost recovery was to return to the PI's unit.

Benner explained that Finance had to submit an annual report to the sponsor.

Laakso asked whether part of the 20% of indirect costs goes to UW Seattle. Benner confirmed that UW Tacoma keeps this entire amount.

Benner advised there are three issues to be addressed; the vacancy in Elise's position Asst Vice Chancellor for Research and Scholarship Support, information about the breakdown of the funds in question and their current allocation, and whether a statement from the Faculty would be necessary. Forman urged that the Council refrain from making such a statement, pending the results of VCAA Rushing's efforts.

Emlet advised that this process could be invoked with indirects from grants other than Federal grants. Dobratz discussed grants and contracts in Seattle and asked about adding indirects. Benner proposed that the policy should be designed to be compliant with the policy currently applied to Federal grants.

Pendras asked whether over the past nine months there had been an accounting mechanism. Laakso added that accountability should be addressed.

Emlet suggested that the faculty should send a message to Administrators. Forman added that he would follow up with Rushing about her meeting with Rutledge and Trinidad. Dobratz expressed that this was a very serious issue.

Laakso noted that Elise's position must be filled. Forman explained that the faculty are not universally interested in filling this position in the current financial climate. He added that VCAA Rushing was exploring the possibility of hiring a staff person with grants administration experience. This would be less expensive while still fulfilling one the crucial roles of this position

Tenenberg suggested that for the next meeting some objectives be discussed should be draft changes, revision of policy, and issues such as accountability and filling Elise's position.

Action: Forman will place this issue on the agenda for the next meeting.

5. Restructuring Faculty Assembly report from programs

Forman discussed the breakdown by department:

Education: 11 (plus one on leave)

IAS: 62 (plus one on leave)

Business: 23 (plus one on leave)

Nursing: 9 (Plus one on leave)

Social Work: 11

Institute of Technology: 13 (plus one on leave)

Urban Studies: 7 (plus one on leave)

Total:

123 voting faculty (plus 6 on leave)

Forman suggested that there be one representative for every 30 faculty members.

Tenenberg asked whether Forman was aware of any concerns. Forman said that IAS faculty had endorsed these reforms unanimously.

(Note, following this meeting, Mark Pendas, Urban Studies representative, Sian Davies-Vollum, IAS representative, and Janice Laakso, Social Work representative, confirmed via e-mail that their groups had unanimously endorsed the position.)

6. Meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.