1. The minutes from October 12, 2010 were approved

2. Faculty survey on research support

Sergio Davalos discussed how the Research Productivity Survey came about. It originated from year-long discussions in Faculty Affairs (FA). Faculty were running into research barriers; some were institutional, some were university policies the faculty were not aware of. Some asked about research funds, which are captured in Seattle and may not be coming to UWT. UWT faculty also mentioned issues with science and art lab space. Finally, some discussed interacting with colleagues in order to navigate the research environment at UW Tacoma.

Other questions arose respecting the faculty perception of their time, or workload for research. An important aspect was the departmental influence over faculty and how promotion and tenure are influenced by faculty research requirements.

Changes/Suggestions:

- Matthew Weinstein suggested eliminating questions related to skills and infrastructure. Instead, he would like to see the survey focus on the barriers to research.
- Denise Drevdahl was concerned that faculty will be unclear about the intent of the survey and how it is going to be used. Drevdahl suggested removing “productivity” in the title.
- Weinstein suggested changing the order and having questions that are open ended.
- Drevdahl suggested the faculty hold an open session meeting to discuss external funding. Donald Chinn noted that in addition to open ended questions and focus groups, the advantage of the Catalyst survey is that it is collected electronically. Other members mentioned the perks of the Catalyst survey are anonymity and possibly more participants.
- Erin Casey suggested the FA members discuss what they want to do with the data and think about who is the audience.
- Weinstein suggested FA add alternative forms of research such as multimedia and service on editorial boards.
• Chinn noted this survey is useful for Administration to know where to allocate resources. Faculty may have a better idea about where they need to ask for resources.
• Casey suggested the survey consider what can be controlled at UW Tacoma.

Action: Sergio and Donald will work on incorporating this input into the next draft of the survey.

3. **Faculty workload**

Donald Chinn developed a teaching and service workload document and will consult with faculty in the Institute of Technology for suggestions to improve the document.

There was a lengthy discussion. Some members voiced concerns that problems are program specific; that program-specific variables contribute to workload; that standardizing workload across workload is not possible because of these variables; and that course buyouts may increase operating costs within a program. Other suggestions included consideration of the state budget shortfall and cost effectiveness. Other considerations mentioned were the variations in the way programs are funded for workload. Erica Cline mentioned that Environmental Science courses are funded by the state differently, and this impacts course load. FA members suggested looking at models for this on other campuses. Chinn noted he had consulted a professor at UW Seattle, who informed him of the more informal policy of the computer science department there and of the much more formal and quantitative workload policy of computer science department at UC Berkeley. Some FA members were concerned that they should not be instructing programs how to assess workload.

It was suggested programs should identify their process for workload. Some FA members suggested they not recommend a numeric policy. The discussion was tabled due to meeting time constraints.

4. **Adjourn: 3:16 p.m.**