Minutes
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
Faculty Assembly Executive Council
Thursday, November 12, 2009
12:30 – 1:25 p.m. CP 206c

Attendees: Johann Reusch, Chair; Marcie Lazzari, Vice Chair; Mark Pendras, Ehsan Feroz, Tracy Thompson, Janice Laakso, Larry Wear, Emily Ignacio, Kima Cargill, Peter Selkin, Marjorie Dobratz

Synopsis:
1. Approve the Minutes.
2. Faculty Vote on UWT Bylaws Change.
3. Tenure & Promotion Committee membership
4. Standing Committees agendas
5. Standing Committees mailing lists and attendees
6. Ad hoc Committees
7. Academic Assessment Committee and the relationship to the Executive Council

Minutes:
1. The October 29, 2009 minutes will be revised pending Tracy Thompson’s revisions. They will then be put to an online vote.

2. Set date for Faculty Vote on UWT Bylaws Change:
The EC will hold a catalyst vote for the Faculty Assembly.

3. Appointment Tenure & Promotion Committee (AT & P) membership number

After a question was raised about the membership number for AT&P in accordance with the bylaws, Johann Reusch consulted with Faculty Senate. UW Seattle Faculty Senate does not have an ATP committee. At UW Seattle Faculty Affairs covers AT&P issues, but each school or college has its own T & P committee with representatives from all departments or programs. UWT relates to the Seattle structure like a college, thus every program has to provide a member.

Emily Ignacio noted that the bylaws convey that the chair of a program cannot sit on the committee. Ignacio noted that if a committee member from a program were to recuse oneself from a faculty review, the bylaws and the committee practices would be in compliance. Ignacio also noted that the 7 members language is in the bylaws.

Marcie Lazzari noted that in Social Work there is an issue with representation. Not having a Director/Dean serve on a faculty review is a safeguard. Thompson suggested that EC should consider removing the number of required members along with the requirement for tenured faculty members, if there is no one available. This issue will be addressed at a later time.
4. Standing committee agenda for the year
Reusch noted that the Standing Committees are working on their agendas and will be sending their plans to the EC.

5. Standing committees mailing lists and attendees

There was a question about who to include on Standing Committee mailing lists. Tracy suggested that only members and ex officios should be on the list. The EC agreed.

6. Proposal of ad hoc Committees

Reusch discussed the implementation of a Planning and Budgeting ad hoc committee. This will give Faculty Assembly an opportunity to officially participate. Ad hoc committees are allowed in the bylaws. Mark Pendras asked if Academic Affairs would have to be consulted before creating such a committee. Reusch noted that this is within the purview of the Faculty Assembly as specified in the code but that the Administration will be informed. Thompson noted that the ad hoc committee will help the Faculty Assembly gain clarity about the budget processes as they are being developed and what role the faculty have in these processes. Faculty Assembly will pick people to represent. This committee meets ad hoc and reports to the EC.

Marcie Lazzari suggested that she and Reusch will talk with the Chancellor about this and Seattle’s existing model.

Action: The EC will inform the Chancellor’s office and request information about the existing Budget and Planning processes. The EC voted unanimously approved to form an ad hoc committee for Planning and Budgeting.

7. The relationship of the Academic Assessment Committee to EC
Academic Assessment Committee: Marjorie Dobratz inquired about this committee. Larry Wear, a member of this committee advised that it was formed as an administrative committee.

Reusch noted that on the Bothell campus admission standards are addressed by Campus Council on Academic Standards and Curriculum and at UWT come under the purview of the ACP.
Peter Selkin noted that in Tacoma this will be looked at by the Joint Council on Enrollment Planning and Policy (JCEPP).

Thompson noted that Faculty Assembly and Academic Affairs must have mechanisms for ensuring shared governance with new faculty committees that come from Administration.
Thompson asked about the FoE. After the FoE is drafted then this should go to APC then to EC. The role of Deirdre Raynor, Chair of the Academic Policy Committee, should be to look at the document in that role as chair and acknowledge a conflict of interest. Reusch noted that he and Lazarri reminded the Beth Rushing, Vice-Chancellor on Academic Affairs about this process.

Ignacio asked about if and when the EC will have the list of survey questions in order to evaluate FoE data. She noted that a request had been forwarded to APC chair Deirdre Raynor. There has not been a response to date.

Larry Wear explained that Academic Assessment meets once per month. This committee helps Ginger MacDonald collect data for the next campus assessment for accreditation. This helps programs by providing suggestions for the next assessment.

Lazzari noted that JCEPP and Academic Leadership meet once per month, thus not facilitating the work that needs to be accomplished. Dobratz suggested that the EC asks the Academic Assessment Committee to report once per quarter. Ignacio asked for clarification about whether this committee is short term and task oriented. Thompson noted that this committee is ongoing. Thompson spoke with MacDonald, who is trying to ensure that each program will have data for the upcoming assessment. Thompson suggested that the EC request that APC be responsible for tracking the progress of this committee.

Lazzari suggested that we address the Chancellor, asking her to include the Faculty Assembly prior to the formation of new faculty committees.

Reusch recommended that the EC table this discussion and request the Academic Assessment Committee report to the EC. Reusch will draft a proposal for the ad hoc committee on Planning and Budgeting and forward this to the EC to review by email.

The meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.