

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Present: Ji-Hyun Ahn (substitute for Huatong Sun,) Kelly Forrest (via teleconference), Bryan Goda, Michelle Garner, Matt Kelley, Bill Kunz, Marcie Lazzari, Nita McKinley, Lauren Montgomery, Jill Purdy, and Haley Skipper.

Absent: Julia Aguirre, Orlando Baiocchi, Juliet Cao, Charles Costarella, Sergio Davalos, Denise Drevdahl, Janie Miller, Amos Nascimento, and Anne Wessells

A. Action Items

APCC Diversity Policy Recommendations (Appendix A)

Lauren Montgomery, APCC Chair, presented three recommendations, from the APCC

1) To create a monitoring and assessment process for the Diversity Designation

The purpose of this recommendation is to ensure that courses that were approved as diversity courses continue to be taught as proposed for the diversity designation.

2) To clarify the requirement in our Diversity Designation that is unique to our campus

“With a primary focus,” was added to requirement that courses address diversity in the U.S. The goal is to exclude courses that primarily cover a single culture outside of the U.S. A course can have some international content, but needs to have its focus primarily on U.S. groups. This campus-specific policy was adopted because of UWT’s goals for preparing students for regional and national citizenship.

3) To further clarify expectations for Diversity courses

The third recommendation is to include definition of “diversity” from the UW Policy Directory.

Faculty responded:

- Does the committee think the monitoring and assessment process was reasonable workload? Lauren replied that the committee believed it to be.
- What happens if a majority of the random sample does not fit the requirements? Lauren said that the committee would then perform a wide-spread review.
- Why does the focus need to be on the United States? Lauren responded that since this the required course is only 3 credits, it is best for U.S.-based students to focus on their region. This requirement is not desirable in Seattle because there is a large international student body. A member said that our students need to deal with issues in their nation and culture because of campus’s mission and concern with a framework of citizenship.
- Was this a faculty-driven or student-driven decision? Lauren replied that it was faculty-driven, though a student serves on APCC.
- Faculty requested that this policy include the rationale for the UWT-specific policy.

Jill Purdy moved to accept the first two recommendations in assessment and change in the criteria; Marcie Lazzari seconded. 10 members voted in favor no abstentions or dissent.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Nita asked that the historical reference/context be added by APCC, then be brought back to the council with the third recommendation.

Consent Agenda

The April 8th, 2015 Executive Council meeting minutes were accepted.

Faculty Representation on the Chancellor's Cabinet

Nita McKinley, argued that faculty representatives on the Chancellor's cabinet should fit these criteria: legitimacy as representatives of the faculty, expertise across campus constituencies, have some continuity in office, and not to add other layers of representation. Nita suggested that the Chair and Vice Chair serve on this cabinet; they are elected by faculty, have shown and continue to develop expertise, would provide continuity (two year, overlapping terms), and already involved in with representation of faculty with established lines of communication between faculty, EC, and the administration.

Faculty responded:

- Would it made sense for the past chair to represent on the cabinet? Nita answered that that having the past chair serve would not create continuity of overlapping terms of Chair and VC. Could be overlapping Chair and Past Chair with two year terms, but the Past Chair does not get any compensation from Faculty Assembly.
- Not adding another layer is very important.
- The Vice Chair and Chair are the only faculty elected by the total voting faculty.
- Faculty asked that, while the campus grows, the cabinet needs good representation; some folks need to be from arts and sciences and some need to be from professional lines.

Jill Purdy moved to propose to the Chancellor that the Faculty Assembly Chair and Vice Chair serve on his cabinet as faculty representation; Michelle Garner seconded. 10 members voted in favor; no abstentions and no dissent.

B. Discussion Items (in alphabetical order)

Ad hoc Admissions Committee recommendations

Marc Dupuis, Full-time Lecturer in the Institute of Technology, and Meg Henderson, Lecturer in SIAS, reported and shared their committee's draft report:

- i. **Campus needs to support mechanisms for local students:** they may be under-prepared and need resources to do support them. Are the admissions standards appropriate? The requirements stand at 2.7 GPA and greater than 400 per section on the Standardized Aptitude Test. Are these numbers working for our campus and how so?
- ii. **Data lacking:** gathering data proved harder than expected. The committee communicated several times with Institutional Research since October 2014, but was not granted the information needed for more analysis. The committee wanted to look at data on people admitted (i.e. drop out quarter, neighborhood, test scores, etc.) to see if there is a story told in what UWT students are successful in and how successful.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

- iii. **Future committee:** the committee requested that this become a permanent committee for faculty to hear admissions appeals
- iv. **Mentorship programs:** institutions nation-wide spend money on formal mentorship: peers, faculty, tutoring, and so on, with regular academic planning
- v. **Summer programs have decreased as the budget has shrunk:** UWT should have remedial summer classes versus sending students to community college. The Seattle campus holds remedial classes in the summer, and at 100-level, so that funding can apply to admissions. Students struggle to take to summer classes because financial aid will run out

Faculty voiced:

- Holding focus groups with students was suggested. Other types of data have value, but there are some assumptions in the design. We need to ask student who are failing about their experiences, as well as students identified by early alert. This could help while waiting for other data.
- Should this committee be an ad-hoc committee, a subcommittee that meets periodically, or standing committee in the future? More guidance is needed from the committee based off of workload and frequency of meeting.
- How will and did Karl Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Admissions Officer from Enrollment Services, respond? The committee answered his main point is in how we should approach appeals when student have been denied admissions.

Chair's Report

- i. **Faculty Representation on the Chancellor's Cabinet**

Recorded in Action Items due to a vote of approval

- ii. **Faculty salary policy proposal:** during the spring quarter 2015 Faculty Senate meetings, three plans will be presented to faculty for a straw poll. Responses to this poll will shape the work that the Salary Policy Working Group continues into the summer. Faculty Senate will likely vote on the final proposal in fall 2016. The three models were:
 - The policy presented on campus in January with some adjustments to make it more flexible
 - A revamp of the current code
 - No changes to the current code nor adapt a new policy
- iii. **Presidential search forums:** led by Kenyon Chan, chair of the search committee, and a regent on the search committee: campus will have the opportunity to voice their opinions on what our vision of the UW is and what type of leader we should recruit. Rather than having another faculty meeting, Nita asked representatives to poll faculty in unit meeting and/or via catalyst polls. There will be a catalyst survey for faculty overall to give their input. Nita suggested that units with multiple representatives communicate on how to reach their range of constituents.

Faculty responded that faculty might be struggling to understand how the President affects their role. They might need help understanding how this President connects to them. Nita will send out more specific instructions.

Investments in student success: salaries, state funding, and tuition

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Harlan Patterson, Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration, and Jan Rutledge, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance, presented. Bill Kunz also shared lists on 2015-2016 faculty search requests.

- i. **Lack of state budget:** without official decisions on higher education funding, decisions cannot be made on tuition and salary levels.
- ii. **One time reserve:** used for capital structures and renovations
 - The McDonald-Smith building will be open this fall with 50-some offices and 2-3 classrooms. Harlan is working with deans and directors to allocate space for faculty. The largest player, SIAS, hopes to group certain faculty together.
 - The Tacoma Paper & Stationery building needs \$10,000,000 from the state budget; planning has begun for the core and shell renovation. Program planning will wait until later. This building will house learning spaces, such as wet laboratories and technology laboratories, versus offices.
 - The Tioga building will become offices

Faculty asked:

- If there is concern that the reserve will dip below \$9,000,000. Harlan responded that the university is being put under pressure for holding reserves as the legislature does not like it.
- What will happen with this year's salary increases and merit reviews? Harlan stated that even if there are delays based on the timing of the legislature's decisions, the review process still needs to occur.
- How does the campus get money back into the one time reserve fund? Harlan indicated that enrollment growth has been greater than expected. This year is a reversal of that trend. Campus might need to delay hiring faculty for a year. Summer quarter enrollment can generate flexibility on the program level.

iii. **Summary Budget Requests for Fiscal Year 2016**

At a minimum, we have to commit to the same services we are currently offering versus going backward. The intention this year is to tie together student success and fiscal responsibility.

Faculty inquired:

- How much salaries and benefits cost, in total. Harlan answered around \$2.5 million.
- About how Finance chooses between requests. Harlan answered anything that progresses toward student success and degree attainment holds priority.

iv. **Risk Opportunity Fund: the operating budget**

For fiscal year 2015-2016, the operating budget will be closer to \$1,100,000 because we fall below projected enrollments. Campus is still growing, but the rate is closer to 5% than 7%. New hire expenses should be lower, because there will be fewer students. Staff hires will adjust the budget around \$5,000,000. For two years now, there have been no tuition or salary increases; but that pattern cannot continue.

Undergraduate Lower Division Update

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Deidre Raynor, Director of the Office of Undergraduate Education, and Christine Stevens, Undergraduate Education Academic Council Chair, reported

- i. **Background:** The Ad Hoc Task Force on Undergraduate Education met during summer 2014 to address retention issues in the first year experience. Additional concerns from the Office of Undergraduate Education (OUE) included the need for more faculty to be involved in the CORE, retaining a cohort model for community building for students, providing faculty development for all faculty and incorporating campus values of innovation, excellence, and urban-serving within the class, field trips, speakers, etc. Christine said, at the end of May, the Undergraduate Education Academic Council (UEAC) will meet with Chancellor Pagano and Bill Kunz to discuss these issues.
- ii. **Issues to be addressed:**
 - Campus needs to collect and use data versus trying something new every year.
 - Scaffolding of classes within programs.
 - A larger planning committee needs to pull together administrators, faculty, advisors, and so on.
 - A discussion on how to introduce disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs and at what timing to help students learn about majors

Nita hoped that any proposals for the first year experience would include provisions for faculty governance because curriculum is under the faculty's purview.

- iii. **Faculty Oversight:** Christine said that in 2013, the EC passed a policy requiring a faculty council for any unit making decisions on curriculum to ensure faculty oversight. The proposal developed in the Summer 2014 was developed without systematic faculty oversight; only Christine and Deidre were there to represent faculty, rather than the Undergraduate Education Academic Council (UEAC), which had been established for that purpose. It has been a difficult road because some folks do not believe that the UEAC should exist.
- iv. **Scheduling for autumn 2015:** Nicole Blair, OUE Assistant Director and Lecturer, has a schedule in place for fall quarter 2015 for CORE students. There needs to be a collective decision versus individuals deciding what the first year students need. We need to ask who the students are and how to serve them.

Faculty asked how quickly things can change. Christine responded that change can happen quickly, but with the problem of not enough voices involved. With a team together now, things could be ready for fall 2016.

VCAA Report

- i. **Improved faculty support:** Brigid Nulty wants to refine the survey through focus groups before releasing it to the full faculty.
Faculty agreed that there is survey fatigue.
- ii. **Moratorium on converting tuition-based program to fee-based programs:** There are guidelines from the former Provost/Interim President for conversions. Bill will bring these guidelines to APCC. The moratorium had expired and has been reenacted.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Faculty asked who would be the people with expertise to help make that decision. Bill will look into it.

- iii. **New degree and major proposals:** this process is being delineated and will need to be vetted. In the past, faculty approval has been sought before the budget approval; that will change.

Faculty added:

- Will the Planning Notice of Intent (PNOI) have enough information for faculty to review? Bill answered that there will be 3 pages which will include substantial information
- Lauren Montgomery, Chair of Academic Planning and Curriculum Committee (APCC), said that there will be notification of other units affected; this will allow APCC to request that folks are communicating with other units. Faculty need to be aware of what is going on on campus.
- Members discussed if EC should be informed of what programs are coming.
- Faculty, through APCC, needs to think how a new program fits into the university portfolio. These decisions shape the course of the campus.

- iv. **School conversions:** Two units have discussed their interested with the Interim Provost.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Appendix A: APCC Diversity Policy Recommendations

To: UW Tacoma, Executive Council

From: APCC

Date: 3/18/2015

In the interest of clarifying the process and policy of the UW Tacoma Diversity Designation for courses, we have the following recommendations.

- 1) To create a monitoring and assessment process for the Diversity Designation over time we propose three things:
 - i. That academic units be expected to assess continuity of SLO's and course descriptions on an ongoing basis.
 - ii. That all D courses have a diversity related question on their course evaluations assessing students' self perception of learning.
 - iii. That every three years, APCC select a random sample of 12 D courses to review to monitor the continuity as well. Programs will be asked to submit the most recent syllabus and course evaluations of the randomly selected courses.
- 2) To clarify the requirement in our Diversity Designation that is unique to our campus we recommend the following change to the existing policy:

Existing Policy:

Criteria for the Diversity Designation

To have the D (Diversity Designation) courses must

1. have at least 60% content focused on diversity,
2. provide students with understanding of human diversity in the United States
3. focus on one or more socially constructed identities such as race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, age, ethnicity, and nationality, and
4. have two or more of the following goals and they must be reflected in the course learning objectives:
 - To provide an in-depth analysis of at least one socially constructed identity
 - To teach about the intersections of socially constructed categories, perspectives and experiences
 - To teach students to think critically about power, inequality, marginality and activism
 - To explore the customs, traditions, and cultural expressions (art, dance, music, literature, etc.) as they relate to experiences of power, privilege, oppression and activism
 - To explore the historical precursors of contemporary power relationships and the interconnected histories of various people as they relate to power, privilege and oppression
 - To investigate contemporary society and how institutions like education, law, government, religion, science, health, military, and others contribute to the inequitable distribution of power and privilege in society.

Courses must meet these requirements every time they are taught to have a D designation. Courses that are taught differently at different times, such as TCORE courses, Special Topics courses, Independent Studies, or Internships, cannot not be given a D designation.

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

April 24th, 2015 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Recommended Change

Criteria for the Diversity Designation

To have the D (Diversity Designation) courses must

1. have at least 60% content focused on diversity,
2. provide students with understanding of human diversity **with a primary focus on** the United States
3. focus on one or more socially constructed identities such as race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, age, ethnicity, and nationality, and
4. have two or more of the following goals and they must be reflected in the course learning objectives:
 - To provide an in-depth analysis of at least one socially constructed identity
 - To teach about the intersections of socially constructed categories, perspectives and experiences
 - To teach students to think critically about power, inequality, marginality and activism
 - To explore the customs, traditions, and cultural expressions (art, dance, music, literature, etc.) as they relate to experiences of power, privilege, oppression and activism
 - To explore the historical precursors of contemporary power relationships and the interconnected histories of various people as they relate to power, privilege and oppression
 - To investigate contemporary society and how institutions like education, law, government, religion, science, health, military, and others contribute to the inequitable distribution of power and privilege in society.

Courses must meet these requirements every time they are taught to have a D designation. Courses that are taught differently at different times, such as TCORE courses, Special Topics courses, Independent Studies, or Internships, cannot not be given a D designation.

- 3) To further clarify expectations for Diversity courses we propose including the definition of “Diversity”, as defined in the UW Policy Directory, Chapter 114, Section 2, Subsection B.1.d., in the UW Tacoma Diversity Designation Policy document.

“No fewer than 3 credits of courses, approved by the appropriate school or college, which focus on the sociocultural, political, and economic diversity of human experience at local, regional, or global scales. This requirement is meant to help the student develop an understanding of the complexities of living in increasingly diverse and interconnected societies. Courses focus on cross-cultural analysis and communication; and historical and contemporary inequities such as those associated with race, ethnicity, class, sex and gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ability, religion, creed, age, or socioeconomic status. Course activities should encourage thinking critically on topics such as power, inequality, marginality, and social movements, and effective communication across cultural differences.”