



Minutes

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting

December 6, 2013, 9:00 am – 11:00 am

Tacoma Room, GWP 320

Present: Katie Baird, Greg Benner, Zhiyan Cao, Sam Chung, Sergio Davalos, Kelly Forrest, Rich Furman, JW Harrington, Nita McKinley, Jill Purdy, Huatong Sun, Doug Wills, Robin Evans-Agnew (substitute for Denise Drevdahl)

Absent: Orlando Baiocchi, Linda Dawson, Sergio Davalos, Denise Drevdahl, Debra Friedman, Matt Kelley, Janie Miller, Amos Nascimento

1. Brief Updates from the Chair

- A. Summary data on salary are being requested from the Chancellor to examine equity issues on demographics and at the unit level.
- B. The Writing Campus Fellows are preparing a table that identifies next steps, those responsible and deadlines. Executive Council will provide oversight and guidance of implementation. A first step is hiring a Writing Director. Rich suggested that units need assistance as most faculty are not experts in writing. JW noted that the Writing Director will serve the campus as a whole and he is currently considering where it will be housed structurally. Huatong said such faculty positions are usually housed in Writing Studies.
- C. A committee of Jill, Nita and Thuch Mam will interview candidates to replace Jamie Burks as Administrative Coordinator for Faculty Assembly. The hope is to hire someone who will start in January.

2. Consent Agenda

Meeting minutes from 11-01-13 and 11-20-13 Executive Council meetings were approved.

3. Academic Misconduct

Ed Mirecki, Dean of Student Engagement, is the Informal Hearing Officer for academic misconduct cases at UWT, a process important to maintaining the integrity of the degree. Ed summarized procedures for academic misconduct, including feedback loops to faculty members. Reports are acknowledged within 48 hours, hearings are held within 10 days. The informal hearing is a conversation between Ed and the student that is an educational opportunity about academic standards.

EC members asked questions about no-action reports vs. informal hearings. No-action reports might be a concern because faculty have significant leeway with grading without due process for students. Rich noted that if he reported every student who plagiarizes as a freshman, it would be 18 out of 22 students. Sergio said he would like to know information on past problems to establish patterns. Faculty should know that a report-only record does not follow the student or get reported outside the university context. What we're missing is informal norms about what constitutes a reportable violation. JW suggested that we have a faculty conversation about what we want our norms to be for grading and reporting academic misconduct.

Katie asked if faculty would be informed if they asked Ed about whether a student had prior reports. Ed would not share that but if multiple reports were received, Ed could take action to meet with a student. If a student goes to an informal hearing, the focus would be on the current violation but past history might be considered if relevant.

Robin asked whether data is being collected on racial bias. Ed said it was not but he could do that analysis.

Greg wondered if we are violating FERPA by talking about students among ourselves. Ed said that there are restrictions on faculty talking about students but the UW tends to interpret FERPA much more strictly than many institutions. JW noted that if there's a formal process in a unit to evaluate students' academic progress, it is protected.

4. Admissions Standards and Pathways to Promise

Karl Smith, Associate Vice Chancellor and Chief Admissions Officer was introduced. He explained that basic admissions criteria are set by the WA State Achievement Council including a minimum 2.0 GPA, complete application, personal statement, and CADR (distribution requirements). Karl shared high school requirements and the history of faculty involvement in admissions. UWT uses some holistic review but other schools such as WSU and Eastern are moving away from that toward a threshold model based on minimum scores. At UWT faculty were involved in admissions through 2008 but over time involvement faded.

Karl explained UWT's Pathways to Promise program with Tacoma and Puyallup School Districts and noted that Federal Way and Peninsula are interested in joining. The program states minimums of 2.7 GPA and 480 SAT (each section) or 21 ACT for assured admission. Karl stated that these criteria aren't written into the MOU – it says just that transparent criteria exist. The program's goals are transparent criteria, encouraging college, customizing admissions, and tracking outcomes.

Colleges are not publicly discussing thresholds but we compare pretty favorably to other schools. Publicly stated admissions numbers for other universities:

WSU	3.5 GPA minimum but it admits below that using admissions index
Eastern WA	3.3 GPA
Central WA	3.0 or admissions index (2.7 and 1250 SAT)
Cal State	3.0 GPA or eligibility index (2.7 and 740 on Critical Reading and Math SATs)

Karl has requested validity studies from College Board/SAT and is pulling together data by January for a customized analysis to find the correlation to students' first year GPA. Karl's office is trying to move toward a holistic review model that considers more than scores. They want to work with the faculty to norm the new process. He proposes to establish a faculty group to go through applications and evaluate 'if a student looks like this, would we want them admitted?'

Rich said a big concern is whether we are admitting students who are not succeeding or being retained. We have an analysis of retention but we need finer grained data since we are losing some high academic performers. Juliet asked how many of the student body come from the bottom of the applicant pool, and how will that proportion change under Pathways to Promise. Karl can provide data on the metrics of admitted students. Sam asked if we have any other index for predicting student retention. He stated that the relationship between faculty one-to-one contact and student retention should be very high, so this might be a metric to use.

Sergio asked how we as faculty can get involved in the admissions process. Karl suggested identifying a group to work with, a task force with monthly meetings to help set the holistic review

policy. He said Admissions would not set a threshold again without faculty input. They need faculty willing to understand the complexities of the situation. The demographics are changing and we'll need to account for that. We'll need to make admissions transparent for low income, diverse students. Academic Policy might be the right place for work on admissions.

5. Proposed Agenda for January Faculty Assembly Meeting

The proposed agenda (below) was approved by Executive Council.

1. Academic Misconduct – information and discussion with Ed
2. Admissions Standards – information and discussion with Karl
3. Schools at UWT – information and discussion with JW

EC members suggested using a roundtable format to engage faculty with guidance for facilitators at each table to manage interaction. Rich noted the connection between faculty roles and campus growth, suggesting '7 in 7' as a framework to discuss these issues. Greg suggested growth is a key reason to consider how we are getting prepared for the students we are going to have and how we'll retain and support them. Sam noted that the Faculty Affairs committee survey indicated that some faculty are not aware of '7 in 7' and should be provided with this information at a meeting.

6. Chancellor/VCAA Report

JW shared the following issues:

1. Lecturer Rehiring: Units need to have a faculty vote on any appointment that ends in June. The goal is to make a commitment to faculty for next year. The goal is to do 'notices of reappointment' rather than a letter that states we'd like to hire but we don't know if we have funding. The complication for full time lecturers who were hired without a competitive search. The Provost limits new appointments that happen without competitive searches so how do we continue long term appointments? In some cases units are doing searches for those positions.

2. Innovative Classroom space design: A discussion of the TLB 4th floor space occurred Dec 5.

3. Curriculum Development: It is very important to have faculty unit discussions on new programs given enrollment growth.

4. Writing Campus Fellows: Of four ideas from that report, two are faculty responsibilities. (1) *Curricular Integration* – How do we approach writing across the curriculum? How do we improve writing in math or economics? How do we help instructors understand and meet the expectations of W courses? Not all faculty know how to give feedback on writing. (2) *Assessment* – We need to work on making curricular changes based on a systematic review of student learning. The remaining two issues are for administration. (1) *Design of structure* – where do you put people? Writing needs some representation at the campus level. Perhaps the writing director will have some administrative role. (2) *Improving academic and pedagogical support services* –Beckie as director of the Teaching and Learning Center has been asked to plan for expanding the TLC to develop the capacity we need.

7. Good of the Order (new business)

None noted

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 am.