

**Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting**

April 18, 12:30 pm – 2:00 pm

Tacoma Room

**Attendees:** *Katie Baird, Zoe Barsness, Greg Benner, Donald Chinn, Sergio Davalos, Yonn Dierwechter, Marjorie Dobratz, Debra Friedman, J.W. Harrington, Matt Kelley, Marcie Lazzari, Jill Purdy, Tracy Thompson (via phone), Charles Williams*

**Absent:** *Luther Adams, Orlando Baiocchi, Bonnie Becker, Linda Dawson, Rich Furman, and Nita McKinley*

**1) Consent Agenda:**

The minutes from January 24 and April 3 EC meetings were approved.

**2) Updates, Announcements, and Information:**

- Reminder: Debra and JW's final decisions about hires for next year were distributed to all EC members by email.
- The Coalition On Academic Careers and Higher Education (COACHE) climate survey reports will be coming out soon.
  - Results will be discussed after the FA meeting on Friday May 3.
- Admissions and the role of faculty:
  - Cedric Howard, Vice Chancellor for Student and Enrollment Services, will be attending the May 30 EC meeting. The purpose of his visit is to inform EC on how admission decisions are made, the criteria for those decisions, and trends.
  - The Faculty Assembly is currently planning for the fall new faculty orientation, and looking to develop a handbook for lecturers
  - A Catalyst survey will be sent to all Lecturers asking for input on the handbook.

**3) Executive Council (EC) Structure:**

The Executive Council has been in place for four years; Katie stated that this is a good time to review EC's effectiveness, organization, and efficiency. She framed the discussion with observations of the Faculty Assembly in terms of two things Faculty Assembly is trying to accomplish: developing routine processes, and addressing longer-term substantive issues.

Routine processes:

- Successes
  - Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (APT)—we know expectations, and timeline
  - Curriculum process—fairly routine
- Challenges:
  - Admissions—specifically, faculty input into and knowledge about how admission decisions are made and the criteria for the decisions
  - Academic misconduct— similar issues periodically com up and need addressing, without really addressing them (they reappear).

Substantive issues:

- Progress:

- Campus Fellows-good recommendations to improve academic content and quality of education
- Lecturer issues—Ad hoc committee on Lecturer affairs has made significant progress in changing our practices
- Challenges:
  - Budget advice and consultation
  - Growth and academic planning—ideally conversations are taking place in units, but if they aren't what can FA and EC can do to foster these conversations?

#### 4) Strategic Budget Committee (SBC) Structure:

From the Faculty Assembly point of view, the SBC is a fairly expensive process in terms of the amount of faculty that it involves; also, SBC is not our means for giving budget advice as specified in the code. This year faculty has used the Executive Council which was recommended to be the best option going forward. Jill Purdy redistributed proposal on the structure of budget advice. The document analyzes the structure of the SBC and the EC and gives recommendations, which include evaluating whether faculty should retain the leadership role of SBC. Important considerations discussed regarding the SBC:



Structure of Budget Advice at UW Tacoma

- SBC is very valuable as it provides stakeholder wide view.
- SBC structure is currently dictated by our bylaws, and we may want re-visit and make changes in order to reflect what we now envision as our plan.
- Model is set up to be reflective of Seattle's model; we want to move to a model more reflective of Bothell's model.

Jill encouraged faculty to give comments and feedback on the proposal. The EC needs to collectively make a decision on what structure to follow, before the end of the year.

#### 5) UWT Budget

Budget consultation and advice was the main topic for the meeting; specifically what works or could be improved. Main issues discussed include the following:

- Ad hoc versus all of EC in terms of budget training and expertise
- EC and SBC level of operation—keeping focus at the appropriate level
- Strategic planning—faculty lack the capacity currently to do long-term strategic planning, strategic planning occurs at the unit level
- Clarification of long range, policy-type budgetary issues versus immediate budgetary issues
- Communication channels and a missing link between resources that are going to programs and what is actually happening in academic programs
- No formal connections between EC and academic programs' faculty councils
- Bylaws—there are currently no bylaws in the units except for the Nursing program.

#### Suggestions/discussions followed to address budget issues:

- Create an ad hoc group within the EC , and tasking a few individuals to have some particular expertise that they can report to the committee versus all of EC
- EC members discussed possibility of having a cycled timeline, in which representatives from each unit would report to EC about their unit's strategic plan, vision, hiring priorities, etc. Doing this would:
  - Bring conversations to the table and promote collective knowledge and awareness of what is happening in units
  - Communicate expectations to EC members and unit representatives
  - Help identify synergies and opportunities for collaboration from higher level

- Chancellor Friedman suggested creating workshops through the FA focused on writing bylaws, budget, and strategic planning
- Develop a “ Budget boot camp” to provide deeper knowledge on the campus budget
- Develop a living document to review SBC procedures, problems we’ve identified, successes, etc.
- Once a year, have EC and academic councils meet together to identify opportunities for collaboration and information exchange
- Designate a time to work with units on long and short term strategic planning

**6) Miscellaneous:**

- Faculty Assembly Meeting Agenda: May 03, 2013  
Forty-five minutes of this meeting will be dedicated to brainstorming and/or discussion around specific issues. There will be several roundtables with concurrent discussions in which faculty can self-select which topic to participate in. EC briefly discussed possible topics including:
  - ✓ Strategic planning
  - ✓ Budget advice and consultation in the unit
  - ✓ Professional development for faculty
  - ✓ Ideas for campus fellows next year
  - ✓ Summer Funds. Debra expressed strong preference not to discuss this.

- Faculty Assembly Discretionary funds

Katie informed the EC that the discretionary funds contributed by the Chancellor’s office earlier in the year are almost depleted. The purpose of discretionary funds is to provide flexibility in purchasing items for food and entertainment that are not permitted to be purchased with state funds. She asked help from the council to replenish these funds via payroll deduction or donation bucket. Discussion about whether we should ask all faculty to contribute, or just EC members. Both JW and Debra thought that EC might be most appropriate. Debra agreed to match whatever contributions EC members contribute. Several members noted that they could obtain matching gifts for donations through their spouses’ employers. Katie agreed to bring tax write-off forms and donation bucket to next meeting.

**Meeting Adjourned 1:56 pm.**