

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Minutes
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)
Thursday, June 10, 2010
CP 206c
12:30-2:00 p.m.

Attendance: Johann Reusch, Chair; Marcie Lazzari, Vice Chair; Zoe Barsness, Chair-elect; Greg Benner, Donald Chinn, Linda Dawson, Marjorie Dobratz, Ehsan Feroz, Emily N. Ignacio, Janice Laakso, Mark Pendras, Deirdre Raynor, Peter Selkin, Tracy Thompson, Larry Wear, Beth Rushing, ex-officio
Guests: Rich Furman, Rai Nauman Mumtaz, President ASUWT; Ally Diana Molloy, Vice President ASUWT

1. The minutes from May 27, 2010 will be revised and approved at the June 15th meeting.
2. Graduate School Council - Kima Cargill

Cargill will notify the FA EC if she decided to serve on the Graduate School Council.

3. Discussion of Process for Proposed Advising Plan
 - a. Last year Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs met with the Advising Taskforce, which started meeting in February 2009. She doesn't recall how the faculty members were nominated to the taskforce. The Advising Council meets regularly and includes all the academic advisors, at least one program administrator, and at least one person from Admissions Advising and Outreach. Many of these members were involved in the Advising Taskforce evaluation. Following the Advising Taskforce recommendations, the Advising Council has met to implement various recommendations of the Taskforce such as to create pre-major codes and to get the process in place.
 1. This year, some units at UW Tacoma have been periodically sharing advising staff between programs. For example, Jill Haugen is split between Social Work and Urban Studies; Erica Coker is split between IT and Undergraduate Education. Karen Dalesky meets with undergrads and 1st year students in IAS and Undergraduate Education.
 2. There is still some uneven distribution with some advisors. Some students are still getting caught in the gaps. There is the new Criminal Justice Program (starting in autumn 2010) and Sustainable Urban Development starting in Autumn 2011.

3. Structural and distribution problem and a bleak economic picture next year will impact how advising is structured. There were more advising FTE requested that now must be considered in light of a potential 15% budget reduction. UW Tacoma must figure out a resolution in light of the budget reduction.
 4. In addition, there is a structural problem and centralization is necessary according to Beth Rushing. Rushing has been working with the advisors over the past several months. She felt that meeting with the advisors first, prior to further campus conversations about changes in advising structure, was the respectful thing to do.
- b. Janice Laakso asked whether Rushing's process for deciding to move to a centralized model for advising was informing the advisors of this restructuring to which Rushing responded, "yes."
 - c. Zoe Barsness noted that Business submitted a detailed response with recommendations not fully in line with Rushing's recommendations. The feedback was provided to the steering committee. Rushing responded that the steering committee is separate from the Advising Council. Barsness asked who voted. Rushing met with the steering committee and subsets of this committee, the program administrators, and directors. Some had concerns about how well the advising needs of their students were being met. Rushing explained she looked at the budget and how to make this work. Knowing that the taskforce needed to have some advising work across programs, it was a series of conversations and Rushing making the decisions.
 - d. Emily Ignacio asked for clarification about how the members were selected for the taskforce. Rushing responded she formed this taskforce in February 2009 and the taskforce made their final recommendations in May 2009. Ignacio noted this meeting with the FA EC today could have been avoided if a representative from Academic Policy was represented in the initial taskforce.
 - e. Dobratz asked whether a model can work to fix the parts which are not broken. How can we fix the undeclared majors and not impact the students who are working well under the current model? Rushing responded it is not just the undeclared majors. Declared majors across some programs do not have advisors. There are a number of categories of students who are being impacted, partially because of the budget cuts.
 - f. Dobratz asked about the cost of hiring another advisor. Rushing responded one half-time advisor will not solve these problems. UW Tacoma probably needs at least two FTE advisors. Rushing noted part of the problem with the split model is the authority comes from their Program supervisors. We have collective responsibility for all students. Another alternative would be that UW Tacoma can centralize authority to address the collective needs of students.
 - g. Tracy Thompson noted that Shared Governance "the decision domain" affects the whole campus. Faculty Assembly should be involved. The process that Rushing has described is a serious issue that we should deal with. There are additional issues with how the problem is defined and the data to reinforce

this problem. Rushing added the point of the change is to better meet the needs of students.

- h. Barsness asked Rushing what data the Advising Taskforce collected to justify the problem and what the criteria was for identifying the problem. Thompson added the FA EC is concerned with Faculty Assembly's lack of being involved since this is a policy which affects the whole university. Rushing responded she did not see the structure of advising as a shared governance (SG) issue.
- i. Ehsan Feroz added in addition to the procedural issues, the fundamental question is whether there is scholarly evidence to show a centralized model is better than a decentralized model. Rushing responded that there is scholarly evidence to support a range of models for advising. Feroz noted this decision also has ramifications for shared governance.
- j. Lazzari clarified that Thompson raised this as a policy issue and a violation of Code; that Rushing does not see advising structure as an SG issue. Rushing responded she will be happy to be pointed in the right direction. Reusch added the process for making advising restructuring is a SG issue according to the UW Handbook. Rushing responded that the concerns with advising predate the Foundations of Excellence (FoE) report. Rushing noted her decision came out of months of trying to figure out the needs of certain programs to meet the needs of their students. Barsness asked whether Rushing considered bringing this to the APC to which Rushing responded, "no." Rushing did not see it that would require going to APC.
- k. Barsness asked about the ability for the students to meet the requirements for graduation. The structural change in advising has a significant impact. Barsness noted the FA EC has read the recommendations; staff administrators, advisors and faculty feel there is not sufficient information and input for the proposed solution. Rushing noted from May 2009- May 2010 the Advising Council has met regularly and she met with them several times during that period as well. Barsness noted Rushing did not take the recommendations from the faculty and a significant opportunity was missed since Faculty Assembly was not involved in this process.
- l. Ignacio noted in general there is a campus level a problem with shared understanding of this process, as well as with others. Ignacio noted the conversations with the program advisors and directors make sense and there is nothing the FA EC can do about how the taskforce was formed. Looking ahead, it might be a good idea for someone from one of the standing committees to be present on the new taskforce.
- m. Feroz noted the FA EC needs a resolution in terms of how to inform this issue. In order for SG to have a resolution, SG needs an independent third body. Instead of having additional conversations, it would make sense for FA EC to bring this to the Secretary of the Faculty to see if this is a SG issue. Rushing responded Academic Affairs and FA EC can work together to resolve it. Feroz added if we don't agree on the fundamental problem it would be difficult to move forward.

- n. Thompson cited the Code and Rushing responded she is familiar with the language.
- o. Reusch asked when the Advising Taskforce stopped meeting. Rushing responded the Advising Taskforce concluded its work in May or June 2009. Reusch noted in fall of 2009 Academic Affairs asked for a list of committees but there was no mention of this committee. Rushing noted the Advising Taskforce was no longer in existence, the FoE was not a policy making body, the Advising Council was made of staff members.
- p. Reusch asked when Rushing will respond to this resolution. Rushing noted it will be on Tuesday.
- q. Peter Selkin asked what the FA EC would like in situations like this one. Barsness noted that one first step is having a conversation about process and what a model looks like before it is launched. Also, the FA EC and Academic Affairs should clarify the roles of the Standing Committees in the working and the review stages. Lazzari noted that the FA EC leadership will discuss issues such as this, this summer and outline them for next year. The other issue is unevenness in what is shared from Directors to faculty. Issues emerge when some faculty are not informed. If we think about this over the summer we can move along in a positive way.
- r. Rushing agreed and asked for some feedback since the advisors are waiting and faculty contracts end next week. Rushing asked if she should wait until September. Reusch responded “yes” in order for the FA EC to gather information and models from other institutions. Ignacio noted the FA EC needs a statement from the Advisory Council as to what they recommended.
- s. Rich Furman noted a significant problem in Social Work for the new Criminal Justice program. Furman asked for a decision prior to this summer. Furman noted he thinks there is enough data to show “the system is broken” given the budget constraints. In Social Work students and advisors only meet on certain days. If the FA EC would like to postpone the change it should only be until within a month or two of fall quarter. Thompson responded the data has not been shared. Donald Chinn noted a concern that the data would be collected out of contract. Lazzari cited results from a winter 2010 survey of 420 students showing the level of advising satisfaction (48.10% very satisfied and 30.48% having used advising and having some concerns) for students. Rushing noted she has data on distribution of advisors. Ignacio noted from whose angle is also important with regards to the data. Ignacio would like the faculty input but not at the advisors’ expense. Linda Dawson agreed with stopping the process over the summer and suggested the FA EC meet to talk about SG to rebuild our trust and how to work together.
- t. Barsness noted that the FA EC has highlighted shortcomings in the current data. External data is also missing. The FA EC can send a student catalyst survey regarding advising and gather quantitative data from the advisors, and send the results to all the programs to evaluate. There would be a timeline where the data is reviewed, a time frame to provide feedback, and bring this back to FA EC.

- u. Chinn asked what other than the premajor codes have been implemented. Rushing noted the Advising Council recommended moving some staff from units with lower adviser:student ratios to units with higher adviser:student ratios. One went from business to IAS, and one is split between Undergraduate Education and the Institute.
5. Update on Writing Policy: postponed
 6. Update on Annual Faculty Retreat Agenda: postponed
 7. Agenda items for last meeting June 15, 2010: postponed
 8. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.