

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting

January 14, 2014, 12:30 pm – 1:30 pm

GWP 320, Tacoma Room

Attendees: *Katie Baird, Greg Benner, Zhiyan Cao, Sam Chung, Rich Furman, Michelle Garner, J.W. Harrington, Matt Kelley, Nita McKinley, Janie Miller, Amos Nascimento, Jill Purdy, Sun Huatong, and Doug Wills*

Absent: *Orlando Baiocchi, Sergio Davalos, Linda Dawson, Denise Drevdahl, Kelly Forrest, and Debra Friedman*

1. Brief Updates from the Chair

- A. Campus Fellows Reports – Two out of three are posted on the Share drive, and all three will soon be on the website
- B. Resources for Unit and Program Bylaws - Jill requested that EC representatives inquire about the status of bylaws within their unit.
- C. COACHE Leadership Update – Jill announced the names of five faculty who volunteered and suggested that final composition be selected by JW, Jill & Nita based on volunteers' capabilities and links to other roles they hold on campus. Katie asked if the volunteers would be serving on a committee with JW, Jill and Nita? Jill replied that they would be an independent group. Katie asked how many members there would be, and Jill noted that the call said 1-3 and the possibility of more can be discussed, but funding would be needed.
- D. Jill also provided three updates from the Senate Executive Committee. First, Katie Baird and Libi Sundermann are representing UWT on the Provost's lecturer committee. Second, President Young stated that UW's legislative priority is to urge the state to fund State Need Grants. Finally, Jill will summarize a lengthy discussion on Intellectual Property Rights in the next faculty newsletter.

2. Consent Agenda

12-06-13 meeting minutes were corrected to state that Sam Chung and Sergio Davalos were present, and to indicate that the Faculty Affairs survey indicated that faculty would like information on "7 in 7." A motion to approve the amended minutes was made by Amos and seconded by Michelle. The vote was twelve in favor, none opposed, no abstentions.

3. Academic Policy and Curriculum Committee

Jill noted an increase in APCC's workload due to campus growth. She identified four categories of possible work for APCC: (1) Academic Policies, (2) Course and Curriculum (new and changes), (3) New Program Approval and (4) Admissions. She suggested that EC should take on Admissions, at least in the near future, because of the broad scope of impact.

Jill solicited discussion and questions. JW asked what it would like for EC to work on Admissions. Jill responded that Nita and she would work with Karl to identify what questions need to be answered and policies need to be established. Then EC could meet for an hour long meeting for group discussion and review.

Katie said that having EC work on Admissions doesn't solve the workload problem. Rich voiced concerns about combining the functions of Academic Policy and Curriculum in one committee. Nita disagreed, noting that the previous division of labor left one committee

focused on minutiae. If we were to create to committee again, a different division of responsibilities might be more useful. Doug (Chair of APCC) stated that the focus had been on minutiae and the charge of the committee was being lost. Rich noted that committee leadership, not just charge, is important to maintaining a broad perspective. Jill commented on the synergy of the two topics tied into one committee. She asked Doug to elaborate on how the committee might look at new programs. Doug said he may try a subcommittee on New Programs and see what happens over time.

Katie suggested a New Programs subcommittee could create resources and support for faculty creating new courses and programs. Matt agreed that this work was challenging because the procedures for designing a graduate program are so new. Michelle suggested this move would allow us to look for synergy in cross-campus collaboration. Rich reiterated concern with combining curriculum and academic policy, noting that innovation is great, but we shouldn't ignore what other universities have done. Jill noted the concern but stated that there appears to be consensus for an Ad Hoc committee of APCC to review new programs and for EC to work on admissions policy for the time being.

Mary A. Smith was introduced as the new Administrative Coordinator for the Faculty Assembly

4. Chancellor/VCAA Report

- A. Census day for this quarter is on Friday. Freshman applications are substantially up compared to past years; it's an earlier process than the transfer process.
- B. The state legislative session opened yesterday. It's a short session, so not a lot of decisions will be made on the budget. The challenge is how to fund its commitments. Funding for K-12 is a legislative priority over higher education.
- C. JW submitted a document with a Cover Memo, Guidelines and Proposal for the Formation of Schools, and Proposal for a School of IAS. This document is on the agenda for the January 24th all faculty meeting. IAS already has formed bylaws. This means that the proposal changes only the nomenclature of "unit" to "school" and "director" to "dean." This would also incur a recruitment process in May for a dean.

JW asked EC how to incorporate faculty in the process of approving IAS as a school. Jill asked whether EC should review the IAS bylaws. JW responded that faculty in units should be able to develop new bylaws without approval from another faculty committee. The "Code Cops" will do a review of the technical aspects of the bylaws so EC need not. Jill commented that a key thing to note about the policy is that Schools in Tacoma are different than in Seattle. Our schools still participate in the UWT campus-level faculty governance structures. JW affirmed that what is proposed here is that a school would go through campus committees and would go through campus approval. Each school needs to be accountable to the campus because we have a campus-wide system for curriculum, tenure, etc. Also, not every unit needs to become a school.

Katie asked what changes in the code are needed if IAS becomes a School. JW noted that the Code states that schools report to the Provost, but the Provost doesn't want to have any more report to her. Jill commented that she didn't see a clause that states that we need different authorities to approve if a School were to circumvent Campus-level governance. JW agreed to look for it in an earlier edition. Jill said that right now we have one school, but we have avoided a huge distinction of status or culture.

JW asked Jill how EC would proceed with the review for IAS becoming a school. Jill stated that EC would hear discussion and questions at the January 24th FA meeting, and could act before the end of winter quarter, perhaps even at the January 31st EC meeting. JW asked EC to perform close reading to make sure that the guidelines are sufficient and to email comments and suggestions.

Jill asked EC to help facilitate discussion at tables at the next FA meeting.

5. Good of the Order

No new business

6. Meeting adjourned at 1:31