



Faculty Assembly Executive Council (EC) Meeting Minutes

September 26, 2016 1:00-3:00pm CP 206C

Present: Jutta Heller; Mark Pendras; Marcie Lazzari; Ellen Moore; Julia Aguirre; Matt Kelley, Jim Gawel; Lauren Montgomery; Marian Harris; Melissa Lavitt; Greg Rose, Mark Pagano; Chuck Costarelli; Ji-Hyun Ahn; Ka Yee Yeung-Rhee; Nicole Blair; Jeff Cohen; Vanessa de Veritch Woodside; Marion Eberly; Michelle Garner; Katie Haerling; Jennifer Harris. **Guests:** Libi Sunderman; Jeremy Davis; Raj Katti; Zaide Chavez; Beth Jeffrey.

1) Consent Agenda

The June 1, 2016 Executive Council meeting minutes were approved online previous to this meeting. The agenda was accepted.

2) EVCAA Report: Due to her reporting-out at all of the program retreats, the EVCAA, Melissa Lavitt, refrained from repeating the report.

- a) **Update from Chancellor on Program to School shift for the Institute of Technology:** The Board of Regents has elevated the Institute of Technology to school status. The Chancellor has asked that they wait to change the name until more can be learned about the stipulations around the name change.

3) CSS Minor Elimination – Full or Limited Review - Appendix A CSS Minor RCEP Memo, RCEP flowcharts

Presentation/Discussion: The Faculty Assembly Administrative Coordinator summarized the stipulations for full vs. limited RCEP review of a program elimination (See Appendix A for flowcharts, etc.) The program elimination process for the CSS minor was started by the Institute of Technology in 2014, but was stalled in Seattle because the Executive Council (UW Tacoma’s elected faculty council) had not been directly consulted. The Institute of Technology faculty voted to eliminate the CSS minor because no students have completed it in 10 years. This is because the CSS minor contains the same classes required for the CSS major, as well as, the CSS minor is 50 credits while the CSS major (BA) is 60 credits. When students get as far as 50 credits, they have just been completing the additional 10 credits to gain the major. Since the elimination of the CSS minor does not affect any faculty member’s employment, is not considered a significant change in overall curriculum, and is not a significant departure from the mission, the Executive Council moved that the CSS minor should undergo a limited review in the RCEP process.

Vote: Lauren Montgomery made the motion for the CSS minor to undergo a limited review in the RCEP process. Jeff Cohen seconded: 19 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain, 0 absent, (19 eligible to vote).

4) Chair’s Report and Discussion Items

- a) Update on Time Schedule Matrix

Presentation/Discussion: Mark Pendras, EC chair, updated EC that the changes they had proposed making to the Time Schedule Matrix to increase the amount of time students and faculty have for connecting, attending meetings, and campus involvement, cannot be made at this time. During summer 2016, Mark Pendras consulted with the UW Tacoma Registrar and Space Planning Manager regarding changes to the TSM, and their reasons for not being able to make the changes are:

- Currently not enough classroom space to support these changes
 - Currently at 75%-80% occupancy
- Due to projected growth, the current Time Schedule Matrix will need to be re configured in 2019 anyway
- In order to implement some of the changes, teaching at 8am would have to be enforced,
 - i.e. stricter regulations around who teaches when
- UW Tacoma would need a new building by 2020 to accommodate the changes
- Currently, UW Tacoma has the latest start time of many institutions (8 am)

EC members brought up ideas for still being able to make some improvements to the TSM and issues with just keeping the current one:

- Hybrid classes – could we use classroom space more intentionally if schedulers told Hybrid classes when to meet? Though, this would take away a Hybrid class instructor’s flexibility
- There is a complexity of issues: budget priorities; classroom space; human needs (lunch; time to eat)
- True, there is not enough space, but we need a schedule that makes sense
- Student retention is connected to the ability for students to connect with faculty – are we allowing time for that?

Action: Mark Pendras and Jutta Heller will visit the Time Schedule Matrix to look for small gains that can be made, if not whole changes; note to get information on the specific breakdown of sections lost.

b) Support for the Arts on Campus - Appendix B Letter from Cultures, Arts, & Communication Division of SIAS

Discussion: Due to the decision from EC at their 6.1.16 meeting that, “The conversations around support for an Art Major at UWT and the need for a clearer program proposal process (pre-curriculum stage) will be ongoing next year, 2016-2017,” the discussion was continued at the first EC meeting at the beginning of the 2016-2017 academic year.

The Art Major proposal, though voted to move forward within SIAS, did not get to continue the process because of feasibility issues around the lack of art studio space. EVCAA Lavitt shared that she and SIAS Dean Bartlett are actively seeking studio space for art classes. Since there is overall support for the Arts at UW Tacoma, the discussion mainly centered on the process for prioritizing new programs. EVCAA Lavitt, spoke to this saying that UW Tacoma needs a proposal process that captures feasibility along with aspiration. The Deans & Directors, along with the EVCAA, are looking into having a clearer, more transparent program approval process. An EC member highlighted that faculty who are planning new programs need more support from Finance, Administration, and Advancement on how to assess feasibility and on how to fund programs that don’t pay for themselves, yet are still valuable to have. For example, faculty who have been proposing the Art Major have been sent back to the beginning multiple times instead of being helped at the stage in the process where more information was needed. The committee continued to question the current, unclear process and voice the needs of a clearer, big-picture process:

- EC desires a way in which to fulfill the responsibility laid out in the Faculty Assembly Bylaws to steward UW Tacoma’s curriculum – how can EC share in this responsibility with administration?
- There is need for a broader-level discussion about curriculum at UW Tacoma that includes accountability, visionary process, and an invitation for shared governance around principles, moving forward
- What values/priorities should the faculty put forth as a foundation for making curriculum decisions with leadership?
 - They could be tied in to fit with the Strategic Plan.
- Does UW Tacoma need the staff position of a Curriculum Development Coordinator?
- If a program gets a “no,” the “no” needs to come with feedback
- There needs to be something built into the program proposal process that includes, early-on, questions about budget and space feasibility
- At the PNOI stage there should be questions about cost, demand, fit with mission, and fit with future students
- There are issues with the Academic Policy & Curriculum Committee having a deficit in oversight perception, and they are explicitly not charged with considering budget/financial issues.

- Budget questions should be at the beginning of the program proposal process, and yet also a reasonable budget expectation that takes context into account and has programs support one another financially
- Student Enrollment Services and the Admissions Office are sharing more information with Academic Affairs to inform Academic Affairs' budget and curriculum decisions
- Academic Affairs along with Deans and Directors are developing a chart that will show which programs are in the "idea phase", "under construction", or "in the queue"
 - Once a quarter, the EVCAA could report this chart of pending programs to EC
- Is the Art Major "pattern" a SIAS level issue or a campus level issue? - Both
- UW Tacoma needs:
 - a spreadsheet of what "pencils out" in proposed programs
 - a wider campus conversation around programs
- Suggestions from EVCAA: more joint appointments and interdisciplinary hires, less silos, more cross-listed courses; more sharing; cluster hires; shared ownership of vacancies

EC considered if they need to field the concerns brought to them around this issues or initiate and develop a campus-wide conversation around principles and priorities for curriculum at UW Tacoma. Suggestion for EC representatives to come the EC with feedback about this from their academic units.

c) Announcement about Standing Committee Charges

Announcement: Faculty Assembly Vice Chair, Lauren Montgomery, asked that standing committee chairs meet and talk with their committees in regards to charge items for 2016-2017 and then be prepared to share them with EC at an upcoming meeting. In addition to each committee's formal charge in the bylaws, the committees will develop charge items for this year in collaboration with EC. Since Lecturer Affairs is an Ad Hoc committee of Faculty Affairs, Lecturer Affairs will bring their charge items to Faculty Affairs, and then up to EC as needed.

d) Faculty Role in Budget Process

Presentation/Discussion: Notes from the Faculty Assembly retreat (9/26/16) conversation on articulated priorities will be compiled and brought back to the EC.

Chair, Mark Pendas, began with asking, "What is the role of Faculty Assembly and the Executive Council in undergraduate education, faculty composition /workload, and the budget process?" There is a long history of how UW Tacoma faculty have sought to be informed and involved in the budget process, but there have continued to be challenges in gaining access to information and collaborating effectively with campus leadership.

Chancellor Pagano and EVCAA, Melissa Lavitt, are currently in the process of rebuilding the budgetary system. The current structure is that there are two budget committees: 1) the Campus Budget Committee which includes representation for across campus; the Faculty Assembly chair and vice chair represent the faculty on this committee, 2) the Executive Budget Committee, in which the chair of the Faculty Assembly represents the faculty. This structure is functional, and yet requires more work to engage members for adequate input and improve the process. The number and representation of people involved in the budgeting process has increased since Chancellor Pagano first arrived at UW Tacoma. The Campus Budget Committee will have 3 meetings this fall, 1 in winter, and 1 in the spring. It will be chair by the Chancellor. The information they go over will be posted on their webpage for transparency.

Action: From these fall meetings, the chair and vice chair of Faculty Assembly will come back to EC and discuss faculty budget priorities and report back to the Campus Budget Committee. The Chancellor will report back to EC about budget decisions regarding budget proposals for FY18. Chancellor Pagano shared that he will pull out about 1% of the budget to fund the implementation and direction of the Strategic Plan (i.e. work across academic units; work with students.) EC will continue this conversation about how faculty should to be involved in the budget process.

5) Adjourn

APPENDIX A

TO: Interim Chancellor, Kenyon Chan
Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Bill Kunz
FROM: Director, Institute of Technology, Rob Friedman 
DATE: December 26, 2014
RE: Eliminating the Minor in Computer Science Systems

Pursuant to the Secretary of the Faculty's position that elimination of a minor program represents "A significant change in the overall curriculum of a college, school, or campus, or of the University as a whole" (Faculty Code, 26-41.B1.d), and therefore, in concert with the Guiding Principles for Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures articulated in Faculty Code, 26-41.B2.g, to wit:

Protect, to the maximum extent possible:

- a. The overall curriculum and educational needs of the students;
- b. The quality of the program;
- c. Other programs in the University that may be affected by the proposal;
- d. The University's commitment to tenure; and
- e. The University's commitment to diversity in faculty, staff and students;

The Institute of Technology seeks to eliminate the Minor in Computer Science and Systems from its program offerings and remove reference to it from the DARS system.

Since its inception in 2003, not one student has attempted, no less completed, the requirements for this minor. Unlike most 25-30 credit hour minors at UWT, this minor consists of 50 credit hours of computing courses – every 100-300 level required TCSS course for the BA CSS, plus one senior elective.

There is an Applied Computing minor in which students engage, and it is far less onerous in its credit hour demand, more flexible in its requirements and eminently more sensible in its composition, its goal being to offer computing courses that have practical relevance to non-computer science majors.

Academic advisors have continuously commented to Institute faculty on the inordinate implicit pre-requisite burden the minor presents, and they have apprised the faculty of its failure to attract students and award the minor distinction. The faculty have deliberated (in curriculum committee) and voted at the faculty meeting that took place on February 20, 2015 to eliminate the Computer Science and Systems minor from the Institute's offerings. The vote result was the following: Motion: To eliminate the Computer Science and Systems minor.

Moved: G. Mobus

Seconded: C. Marriott

In favor: 23

Against: 0

Abstain: 0

12 years of no activity is a sufficient period of time to acknowledge its lack of value. We seek your concurrence and support for eliminating the Minor in Computer Software and Systems from the program offerings at UW Tacoma.

College/School/Campus Curriculum Committee: 	Date: 4/22/15
Dean/Vice Chancellor: 	Date: 4/22/15

RCEP Flowcharts:

**Summary of (full) Procedures for Reorganization, Consolidation, or Elimination of Programs
[see Faculty Code, 26-41.B and 26-41.C]**

Dean or chancellor consults with their elected faculty council.

Dean or chancellor requests through provost the authority to initiate a formal review to identify program(s) for elimination, reorganization, or consolidation.

Provost considers request in consultation with Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

If provost approval is granted:

Dean or chancellor notifies Secretary of the Faculty of his/her intention to initiate a review. Within ten (10) instructional days, and after consultation with the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Secretary appoints an external faculty committee (EFC).

Within thirty (30) instructional days of EFC appointment, dean's or chancellor's intention to conduct RCEP is announced; dean or chancellor submits detailed specific report accompanied by an independent statement from the EFC to the provost, chair(s) of affected program(s), the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the Faculty. The dean/chancellor's final proposal and next steps in the review process are communicated in writing to each faculty member of affected program(s) before a public announcement is made.

Within five (5) instructional days of receipt of dean's or chancellor's intentions, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, in consultation with the EFC Chair and with the advice and consent of the Senate Executive Committee, appoints review committee.

Within five (5) instructional days of receipt of dean's or chancellor's and EFC reports, the Secretary of the Faculty shall publish them and the formation and membership of the review committee in a Class C Bulletin.

*Within twenty (20) instructional days of its appointment, the review committee shall conduct a review of the dean or chancellor's proposal, including receiving comments and/or materials from the dean or chancellor, the EFC, faculty, students, staff, and other constituencies in the University or the public. The review committee shall deliver its written recommendation to the president and provost, dean or chancellor and chair(s) of the affected programs within this twenty instructional day period.

Within ten (10) instructional days of the submission of the review committee report, the dean or chancellor and/or affected program(s) may submit additional statements or a proposed modified course of action to the president and provost.





Within fifteen (15) instructional days of the comment period described above, the president or president's delegate confers with SCPB and transmits a final decision to the Board of Regents (if required), dean or chancellor, chair(s) of affected program(s) and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

Summary of Procedures for Limited Reorganization & Consolidation of Programs RCEP
[see *Faculty Code*, 26-41.D]

The Dean or Chancellor holds detailed discussions with affected program(s) & faculty advisory committees.

The Dean or Chancellor submits a detailed justification of the proposed action to the provost and Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB).

Within twenty (20) instructional days following the SCPB discussion, a majority of the voting faculty of the affected academic program(s) may petition the provost for a full RCEP review under *Faculty Code*, 26-41.D.3.

Within ten (10) instructional days, the provost considers such petitions with the SCPB delivers a decision whether to conduct a full review, or decline a review.

If petition is declined, the provost must transmit a detailed statement explaining the decision to the petitioners, the dean or chancellor, and the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

If no petition, the RCEP is approved without further consideration.

APPENDIX B

A Quick History of (the lack of) an Art Major at UWT

*At our last meeting of the year as Culture, Arts and Communication faculty, we discussed the recent decision by the chancellor's office to defer the hire of two Arts faculty, which had earlier received support of the shared leadership in SIAS. These hires are needed to allow us to move forward with an Art Major.

*For approximately 14 years, we have been going through a cyclical process where faculty in IAS work on an Art Major (previously titled Arts in Community and Arts in Context) only to have their work shut down at the chancellor's office level. Each time, there are different reasons given for why we can't have the art major.

*Following the CAC meeting on May 20, the current CAC division chair (Chris Demaske), current vice chair (Riki Thompson), the incoming CAC chair (Joe Sharkey), the incoming vice chair (David Coon) and a representative from Writing Studies (Michael Kula) met on Friday, May 27, with the EVCAA Melissa Lavitt to express our concerns.

*Specifically, we met to address our concerns about this continued frustrating situation of the arts on campus and to explain that as faculty in the CAC division, we find this latest iteration in the saga to meaningfully fund an Arts major disheartening. We understand that financing is tight and that artists need space, but we also recognize that this finance argument has been raised many times before. In fact, we have created many new (and sometime expensive) majors throughout the years that we have been trying to have an art major.

*We believe that the arts are an integral part of higher education and that our lack of commitment to them at UWT is inexcusable.

Dr. Lavitt expressed interest in working with us and, while we remain hopeful that she will be a good ally for us, we are also, understandably leery of promises of support to come at some unidentified time in the future.

*As we work within our division, within SIAS and with Dr. Lavitt, we ask for that you also consider adding your voice to this important and timely issue.