

Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

May 14, 2014, 12:30 – 1:25 p.m.; Tacoma Room

Present: Michelle Garner, Jill Purdy, Nita McKinley, Matt Kelley, Zhiyan Cao, J.W. Harrington, Greg Benner, Huatong Sun, Denise Drevdahl, Katie Baird and Doug Wills.

Absent: Orlando Baiocchi, Amos Nascimento, Janie Miller, Rich Furman, Linda Dawson, Sergio Davalos, Kenyon Chan, Sam Chung, and Kelly Forrest.

1. Action Items

Minutes of 4-25-14 Executive Council Meeting (Agenda Item 2)

A faculty member asked that, in the second sentence of part D of Harlan's presentation, a change be made to make the sentence flow better. The council agreed to accept the minutes with a circulated correction, with one abstention.

UW Accreditation Goals (Agenda Item 1, Appendix A)

Jill Purdy shared a draft of accreditation goals presented at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for faculty comment. The regional accreditation committee headed by Gerry Baldasty, Senior Vice Provost for Academic and Student Affairs is seeking input on university-wide goals. We should seek to ensure UW Tacoma's goals align with UW's goals. EC members and faculty should identify goals on the list or suggestions for new goals with her and/or Ginger MacDonald, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

B. Discussion Items (in alphabetical order)

Academic Planning Retreat (Agenda Item 3)

J.W. spoke about the event on May 16th for heads of academic units to discuss:

- a) academic units' plans and goals,
- b) curricular developments and modifications,
- c) how UW Tacoma can design programs to attract students,
- d) what high school and community college students want that UW Tacoma doesn't have,
- e) the largest majors on campuses of UW Tacoma's size,
- f) resources and structural needs, and
- g) the next steps:
 - faculty will design new programs in units during summer, including cross-unit work
 - in mid-autumn, small groups will revisit individual program ideas and report to a larger group that reports out to campus in turn.

The council showed concern that the market is driving curriculum versus faculty as the agent. J.W. responded that Debra Friedman always wanted units to design curriculum. J.W. seeks to understand what units are planning so that he can supply what is needed. On the other hand, UW Tacoma is losing potential students for lack of a certain degrees, such as biology. J.W. wants to avoid mirroring Evergreen, which offers mostly specially designed programs; they are too specific, and therefore Evergreen hasn't been growing. Jill Purdy said that she and Nita McKinley will report in June what happens at the retreat.

Classroom Disruptions (Agenda Item 1)

Jill Purdy announced that Ginger MacDonald, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, is willing to offer a workshop for faculty regarding disruptive classroom behavior in the near future.

Diversity Campus Fellows (Agenda Item 5 and Appendix C)

Jill Purdy shared a proposal for a new Campus Fellows group that would inventory resources, capabilities, and room for improvement related to faculty issues around diversity. Sharon Parker, Assistant Chancellor for Equity and Diversity, confirmed that a Diversity Campus Fellows group would not duplicate work of the UWT Diversity Task Force. Two related faculty initiatives were mentioned:

- a) UWS Teaching and Learning Center's Diversity Fellows, begun winter 2014, focuses narrowly on developing courses for diversity designation.
- b) The Office of Equity and Diversity and Undergraduate Education Academic Council are discussing development of a summer program to develop faculty's capabilities with diverse students in the classroom. SEED (Strengthening Education Excellence through Diversity) would be similar to iTech summer fellowship in that people would become experts and resources through intense summer learning and follow-up throughout the school year. SEED would not be a Faculty Assembly initiative.

Nita notes this would further conversations EC has had ensure diversity and equity remain significant. Nita reported that at Daryl G. Smith's talk on the importance of diversity in higher education, Smith argued that campuses put resources and time put into technology because they recognize the importance of technology for a 21st century institution. But campuses expect faculty to know how to teach for diverse students without planning or preparation. If UW Tacoma expects to know best practices for diverse students, faculty need to be trained. The institution needs to plan and teach how to reflect diversity and equity just as it plans and trains faculty for using technology in the classroom.

Jill stated that the issue at hand is whether or not EC wants to spend more money on Campus Fellows groups. She asked

- a) if the last process was valuable,
- b) should Faculty Assembly go with this proposal,
- c) if this proposal aligns with campus values and faculty issues, and
- d) if there should be an open call to faculty to see if they want to focus on this next.

A member asked how this proposal came about. Jill stated that it came from

- a) concerns raised last year over EC's lack of integrating diversity and equity issues into the issues it addresses,
- b) feedback though APCC regarding the American Studies proposal and the treatment of race, ethnicity and diversity in the curriculum,
- c) concern that the campus doesn't have a forum for shared values and expectations, and
- d) concern about campus's urban-serving profile and that faculty don't demographically match student profiles, especially first-year students, which affects student retention and success.

Members commented that in light of campus growth plans, this is an important topic at this time. A member asked for an evaluation of the past fellows groups with the outcomes. They were concerned about putting money into programs without seeing results. Jill responded that these outcomes are a work in progress, for example, currently UW Tacoma is interviewing for the Writing Directors position and a UWT Campus Fellow served on the Provost's committee on online learning.

Faculty Assembly will be creating a dashboard system this summer to be transparent on the progress made on the outcomes from the three fellows groups. Some actions have occurred through the Academic Affairs Office. The harder work is getting faculty units to support and evaluate

particular goals. But the Faculty Assembly will try to make the suggested steps clear and task people to move ahead. A member reminded the council that one of the driving ideas was to demonstrate that faculty can tackle substantive problems and have agency. It is crucial to have an objective and demonstrate progress. If it is falling apart at some level, EC needs to address what happened. Otherwise, faculty are recreating the problem of disengagement. Nita noted that the campus has done so much with the Writing Fellows' work: consultants visited and a director will be hired not just as an instructor offering some workshops on the side, but with administrative responsibilities. J.W. concurred that some tasks will take five years and, nevertheless, it is important to track progress to be fiscally responsible, legitimate, and transparent. Jill added that the Foundations of Excellence (FoE) has been working for five years and recently updated campus on their progress, through Ginger MacDonald, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. FoE had 75 or more action items. That group has done a lot of work and progressed, but campus didn't have a way of knowing it until recently. J.W. said that the Writing Fellows had a list of steps to check off. The council noted that units are responsible for completing some steps. Matt said that the Online Fellows have been working with Colleen Carmean, Assistant Chancellor for Instructional Technologies. Members noted that progress is hidden and needs to be more evident with a timeline to track progress. Jill assured EC that this summer a dashboard will be created to track progress more clearly.

Faculty Assembly Budget (Agenda Item 1)

Jill Purdy shared current figures from the Faculty Assembly budget, 06-0329, attached as Exhibit A.

- a) She has requested that the extra funds from Contractual Services be reallocated to Auxiliary Teaching Staff, which is how chairs and vice chairs within the Faculty Assembly receive course releases.
- b) There will be a fund balance of about \$6,500 because there was no staff member for Faculty Assembly from mid-November to early January. Possible uses of that money are:
 - replacing the antiquated laptop
 - producing videos of Distinguished Faculty Award recipients in tribute to them and in promotion of UW Tacoma.

A member asked to poll faculty on usage of the extra funds. Jill replied that there are commitments already made for the laptop and to the video expenditure, however use of any balance could be decided on by EC with faculty input. Another member asked if the balance would go away at the end of the biennium. Jill answered that it would carry over to the next biennium. Faculty asked if there is a benefit to spending it all. Jill responded that Faculty Assembly does not have to spend all the money, and if not, there would be a savings account.

Faculty Search Requests (Agenda Item 3)

J.W. stated that he will pay much more attention to faculty search requests in next school year or two with greatest needs of curricular development in view. UW Tacoma is adding faculty because it is growing but that may slow down in 5-6 years and the chosen areas of expertise then will be set. Careful planning is needed because the faculty hired now will be at Tacoma for a while.

Guiding Policies for APCC (Agenda Item 4, Appendix B)

Jill Purdy called attention to a draft of policies for APCC. They were created to codify the current processes. The changes made in the last year are because Faculty Assembly has a full-time staff member who has taken on some of the duties and because faculty are working collaboratively with Ginger MacDonald, Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs. Nita McKinley emphasized it is not a new policy, but a more clear guide. Approval processes might change in the future and then changes would occur on this document as well.

Discussion arose regarding the Roles and Responsibilities of APCC. APCC is charged to “ensure that program proposals are consistent with the mission and values of the campus community, including Excellence, Community, Diversity, and Innovation.”

- a) Members found this difficult because
 - a small body of faculty are making decisions based on the mission for all of campus.
 - each unit reviews each program; it might not be best practice for APCC to interfere.
 - “urban serving” was not listed. As faculty review curriculum along with the mission and values of the university, “urban-serving” needs to be there.
- b) Other members defended this wording
 - Jill reminded EC that APCC has a responsibility at campus-level that no other group has to make sure that programs are consistent with shared community values. A proposal can be written by only three or four people, for example; a larger group from campus-wide needs to review this proposal.
 - Nita stated, though course proposals are more the work of specific faculty, programs represent all of UW Tacoma and need more community review than just within the unit.
 - Another council member said that historically people haven’t impeded programs enough and agreed with this review, knowing it would be used sparingly.
 - Nita stated, for the record, “that APCC has never said no to a program but they have requested that programs address a certain issue.” APCC doesn’t simply impede programs, but rather asks units to address issues relative to the mission.
 - Faculty noted the accountability in having a campus group check for broad concepts.
 - Doug Wills, APCC Chair, responded that that APCC is made of people from across the disciplines with different perspectives.
 - Nita explained (relative to adding “urban serving”) that it is not APCC’s place to change the mission of UW Tacoma.
- c) Other models were offered
 - J.W. said the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy has a role in advising the Provost on new undergrad degree programs from all campuses. Faculty on one campus cannot tell another not to follow through with proposals, but rather the review raises questions the proposers must answer about their program. A subcommittee of that group sends out a survey that lists proposals. The committee sees comments and asks faculty to respond across the university. If issues are brought up, the originators have to speak to it. A member responded that J.W.’s example was great in that programs proposals need to be reviewed campus-wide. Concerns would be sent to the Chair of APCC. Jill responded that does happen in step 5 of the process: a summary of the proposals so that concerns can be sent to APCC. APCC cannot respond to and/or generate all concerns, but can facilitate between groups.
 - Jill said a new program review committee of staff, students, faculty, and administration could take on the role of evaluating new programs. Extra committees are not favored but, if it’s important, EC should take action.
- d) Members discussed the time in the process in which APCC should review 1503’s:
 - A member asked why a campus review happens after the 1503 is completed. A 1503 is very rigorous, creating around 100 hours of work. It might not be best for APCC to review something that is so complete. Jill answered that faculty within units are required to raise issues as it is being developed. Nita also stated that APCC has requested a review earlier in the process, but this has never happened.

Jill reminded EC that this was the first read and that a decision can happen later.

Law School at UW Tacoma Possibility (Agenda Item 3)

Faculty asked J.W. to address the reports of a law school starting at UW Tacoma. J.W. reported that the President was not in favor of the idea. If it comes about, it would be a law program housed on Tacoma's campus, but would be administered by the UW Law School. There are potential funders from the Tacoma community, but starting a law school is too expensive and gaining accreditation is too risky. J.W. shared that if there was a sustainable plan, UW Tacoma might accept an inherited school of law.

Tacoma Paper and Stationery's Theme: Urban Solutions Center (Agenda Item 3)

J.W., Josh Knudson, Vice Chancellor for Advancement, Harlan Patterson, Vice Chancellor for Finance & Administration, and Kenyon Chan, Interim Chancellor made decisions together regarding the proposals. Proposals revealed the most common need is: analysis and use of information with a view toward the public. This building might be seen as the public's front door to campus. Plans are not firm yet because funders need to buy into this building with the ideas for its use as well. The four strongest ideas currently are:

- a) School of Business: training floor, meetings rooms, and a data and business analytics center,
 - b) Urban Studies: GIS laboratories and urban action laboratories,
 - c) The Institute: computerized versus chemistry laboratories, and
 - d) IAS: science laboratories on top floor for easier ventilation.
- There is a need for innovative space for math and economics, but it will not be this building.
 - J.W. wants to know the proposed program goals by September. He is asking Business, IAS's sciences, IT, and Urban Studies what kinds of space they need. UW Tacoma needs to request capital funding from the Legislature to create the shell and present proposals to funders next summer (2015) to build into that shell.
 - J.W. asked for help to identify the unknown writer of the Halpern Center for Creative Studies proposal.
 - A member asked if there would be feedback to unselected proposals. J.W. agreed and stated that Kenyon will respond with feedback.

Exhibit A: Faculty Assembly Budget

	Budgeted Amount	2013-2014 Projected	2014-2015 Projected	Balance	Notes
SALARIES & WAGES	\$152,488	\$76,244	\$105,704	\$18,910	9 course releases of \$5,000 each year, Summer Stipend, Fellows of \$4,400; & COACHE of \$4,500
Aux Teaching Staff Salary	\$71,080	\$35,540	\$65,000	\$25,920	
Class (HEPB) Staff Salary	\$81,408	\$40,704	\$40,704	\$7,010	No staff Nov 17-Jan 6
CONTRACTUAL SERVICES	\$33,713	\$16,857	\$2,968	\$24,906	Includes Writing Consultants; telephones; copies; & staff training
TRAVEL	\$9,600	\$4,800	\$4,266	-\$1,817	Includes 1 course release of \$5,000; Writing Consultants; part of Academic Excellence Funds; personal mileage reimbursement for Senate meetings
SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	\$3,356	\$1,678	\$468	\$2,317	Includes office supplies & event food;
TOTAL	\$199,157	\$99,579	\$113,406	\$6,496	