

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
Faculty Assembly Executive Council (FA EC)
Minutes

Thursday, November 18, 2010

CP 206

12:30-2:00 p.m.

Attendance: Marcie Lazzari, Chair; Zoe Barsness, Vice Chair; Donald Chinn, Marjorie Dobratz, Linda Dawson, Charles Emlet, Ehsan H. Feroz, Mark Pendras, Jose Rios, Emily N. Ignacio, Diane Kinder, Peter Selkin, Tracy Thompson, Larry Wear, Charles Williams, Chancellor Patricia Spakes, Beth Rushing, ex-officio

- 1. The minutes from November 4, 2010 were approved with minor adjustments.**
- 2. UW-Tacoma faculty member for the Faculty Council on University Libraries**
Please contact Marcie Lazzari with nominations.
- 3. Standing Committees**

Faculty Affairs (FA)

Donald Chinn explained FA members' struggle with any individual standing committee's role in approaching programs concerning a workload policy. One example was third-year reviews. Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, responded that with the help of the Appointment Tenure and Promotion and the Executive Council's direction, it is her role to ask programs directly. Chinn views FA's role as a fact finding committee on issues such as these. The EC also views FA's initiatives, along with Academic Affairs and programs as a collaborative effort. Rushing suggested that a meeting between herself, Faculty Assembly Standing Committees (in this case APT and FA), and Programs will help communicate issues, possibly in December or the near future, whatever is the most appropriate.

Questions: Ehsan Feroz asked Chinn if he has looked at other academic institutions for example, program-specific workload policies at UW Bothell. Chinn has looked at Bothell and has consulted Jim Posey to get data. FA will gather more data.

Tracy Thompson asked Chinn if FA has considered how program-specific workload policies might impact future budget constraints. Chinn explained that a systematic way to establish a program-specific workload policy could justify equity among faculty members. Zoe Barsness, Faculty Assembly Vice-Chair, suggested this discussion might be useful in establishing a common transparent collection of data that will help faculty understand faculty workloads across campus and the budget cuts.

Curriculum Committee

Jose Rios announced the CC is encouraging programs to submit temporary course proposal applications, when thinking about directed studies. These course applications

ease from the shift when a course moves from temporary to permanent status, because they have already been reviewed. This might address the issues of multiple directed studies and alleviate work for the registrar.

The CC met with Ingrid Walker to discuss the formation of the new group to advise undergraduate education. Rios volunteered to serve on Walker's undergraduate education committee. Rios finds it important that a faculty member has knowledge of curriculum and has also taught in the core. Thanks to Rios!

Appointment Tenure and Promotion

Emily Ignacio announced the APT has contacted Marcia Killien regarding the APT checklist to make sure the requirements are in line with the UW Code. They are waiting for a response from Killien. The APT will convene on December 3, 2010 to review the mandatory file.

4. Student Evaluations

Ehsan Feroz met with Jim Posey. Posey forwarded some data that supports this is an issue being debated nationally. Marcie Lazzari followed up with Ehsan Feroz to ask if he can form a committee to address student evaluations. Feroz is already serving on three other committees this quarter. The Faculty Assembly has decided to temporarily postpone this initiative.

5. UW Senator Elections

The EC will need to elect new senators at the end of this academic term. This year all four senators are serving only one year. In February the Faculty Senate office will contact Faculty Assembly. At this time the Executive Council will need to consider how the newly elected senators will represent UW Tacoma, if it will be by program or at a campus level. This will go on the Full Faculty Assembly meeting agenda.

6. Program Evaluations and Preliminary input

Two documents were given to the EC. They were developed as directed by the Board of Deans and Chancellors and Provost Lindstrom.

Rushing referred to the first document: "Working Draft: Elements of Program Evaluations." Rushing explained the Deans and Chancellors have been discussing criteria for program evaluation which are embedded in the 2Y2D Sustainable Academic Business plan. Rushing indicated that deans were asked to solicit faculty input on the weights assigned to the criteria and the data elements, or measures to be utilized to evaluation programs on these criteria. Rushing, Deans, and Chancellors were given a short deadline (without faculty input) to provide preliminary input.

Rushing also described the other document as a working draft. This is the initial response from UW Tacoma, with input from Chancellor Patricia Spakes, Ysabel Trinidad, and Jim Posey. Rushing confirmed Academic Affairs' role is to guide articulation of the appropriate measures and criteria. Academic Affairs does not foresee the elimination of academic programs. In February, Rushing and Chancellor Spakes will make a presentation to the Provost to report on the results of these evaluations. Rushing will take a collective response weighted at the program level and campus level.

Questions

Mark Pendras asked whether UW Seattle has responded to Bothell and Tacoma's ability to address budget issues differently. Chancellor Patricia Spakes responded, no. Chancellor Spakes explained that all campuses must evaluate their programs to help establish common data and fit with 2Y2D. Chancellor Spakes added that even though Provost Lidstrom will not require Tacoma and Bothell to follow UW Seattle's program evaluation, we must report Tacoma's efficiencies in February 2011.

Zoe Barsness noted that the collective understanding at the campus level should be initiated before the programs weigh in. Rushing noted that due to time constraints this must happen simultaneously.

Charles Emler asked if EC will be evaluating the criteria for the program specific self studies. Rushing needs data criteria to be incorporated into these self-studies. Rushing added that even though UW Tacoma is not eliminating programs, they have been directed to engage in this self-study at the campus level and thus across programs

Barsness wanted the EC to distinguish between equity and equality norms of fairness when programs engage in such a self-study. She noted that equity is established when resources (or cuts) would be distributed on the basis of program contributions whereas an equality approach would mean that resources (or cuts) would be distributed equally across programs. Barsness noted also that it is important to emphasize in our budget discussions that we, as a campus, continue to seek to identify efficiencies that would allow us to reallocate such savings later to leverage opportunities for growth going forward. Barsness added that if revenue streams are tied to enrollment growth in specific programs, this may dictate where students enroll. Alternatively, understanding where student demand and campus capacity are highest, would enable UW Tacoma to know where to invest resources to support targeted enrollment growth.

Feroz asked Chancellor Spakes if an assessment for non-academic areas is being developed in Seattle. Chancellor Spakes clarified the assessment process for UWT's non-academic areas. UWT will use a framework based on other universities around the region. Jim Posey is collecting data in Bothell, Vancouver, and other institutions of similar size and mission. UWT will look at see how much is spent compared with other institutions, for example, in Student Affairs and Facilities to look for efficiencies and identify best practices that might be adopted. By February, UWT will need to have assessed all programs for effectiveness and efficiencies to fit with the mission. At UW

Seattle, they are using an “organizational effectiveness model.”

Charles Williams commented that we should keep the “equality” dimension in mind.

Jose Rios commented that the reality we are facing is one of budget cuts. Rios would like an open meeting to discuss growth with fewer resources. Lazzari explained this has already is happening in the Executive Planning Council. Rushing noted programs have identified the possibility of growing by 468 FTE with minimal resources (for one year). Chancellor Spakes noted that considering their initial response she has given the directors a third option for growth over 2 and 6 years to hire permanent faculty and staff. Rushing reported on the ASUWT state of the student address. Results from a student survey indicate that students do not want a three-day week. Student survey response shows support for online learning.

7. Update on Meeting with Chair of Bothell's General Faculty Organization (10-15-10)

Lazzari and Barsness met with Bothell GFO to talk about Bothell’s budget process. It is different in that the budget is discussed and developed by a cabinet made up of the UWB Chancellor, top administrators, program directions, and their EC. Collectively they look at the entire budget and strive to develop significant consensus through the process. When consensus at Bothell is absent, decisions/proposals lacking such support are not implemented. The EC Friday budget workshop meetings have been a movement in this same direction as Bothell’s cabinet. EC should consider constituencies that should be involved at the Friday meetings that aren’t already involved.

Lazzari and Barsness also discussed the undergraduate curriculum at Bothell (CUSP). At Bothell a multi-year taskforce that looked at the lower division curriculum is finishing up this year.

Questions

Wear asked what Bothell is doing with regard to a transition to schools and colleges. Lazzari and Barsness reported that they are moving forward with a transition to Schools. The larger programs (IAS, Science & Technology, and Business) will become schools while smaller programs plan to wait. Chancellor Spakes clarified that deans are not paid more than directors and that Academic Affairs is waiting for the direction of the faculty.

Feroz asked if Bothell has explored unionization of the faculty. No one was aware that it had been discussed.

8. Update on Advising Systems Task Force meeting (10-16-10)

Beth Rushing, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs reminded the EC that the Advising Systems Taskforce met over the summer. The Advising Steering Council (parallel to the Taskforce) which includes all academic advisors made a recommendation for an undergraduate central advising center.

Rushing indicated that at the last meeting of the Advising Systems Taskforce, they did not take a vote, but the task force members were talking about the relative merits of proposal forwarded from the advising Steering council. Rushing decided to figure out how to implement this centralized advising system. Rushing had conversations with HR about split supervision. They will have an advising coordinator. Ysabel Trinidad was consulted about space. Rushing spoke with Urban Studies. Rushing looked at the data, and concluded that a hybrid centralized model is not a system that could work.

Rushing will send out an announcement. All undergraduate advisers will be housed in a central center with the exception of nursing. All relevant programs will retain their graduate advisers. The new central advising system leaves half an FTE in IAS and Business for graduate advising and a full FTE in Nursing to serve as both a graduate and undergraduate advisor. There is a vacancy for a graduate advisor in IT.

Academic Affairs contacted Carolyn Gellermen, a consultant, who has a background in organizational design and business skills to help the new center in its implementation stage. The new center will be located in the Joy building and the old Urban Studies suite in WCG. The combined suite has twelve offices. The new center won't be open until spring quarter.

Questions

The Advising Systems Taskforce met after the EC passed a Resolution that no centralized model would be implemented until data was gathered and shared with the Taskforce. Rushing noted that the taskforce that met over the summer was composed of her, student leaders, faculty, program directors, program administrators, and academic advisors. During the last Taskforce meeting Rushing was under the impression that they supported the Advising Council's recommendation to implement the centralized model for freshmen, undeclared students, and program based advising for other students.

Barsness understood that the Taskforce asked Rushing at this last meeting to collect additional data and that this data would be brought back to the taskforce for discussion. Barsness does not feel that the Taskforce had the data to determine the best model. There are two contingencies: coordination with enrollment services and with key programs. This new model does not clearly articulate how to sustain what works well under the current system (i.e., coordination with the programs). There is also no clarification about how coordination with programs will be managed effectively so as to support UWT's targeted efforts to increase enrollment. There are no clear cost savings associated with Rushing's proposed model. The work of the advising taskforce was not complete.

Rushing responded there are a number of questions that cannot be addressed before a model is implemented. Assessment, coordination, supervision, cannot be determined until UWT has identified a structure.

9. The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.