Date: Friday, April 3, 2015
Time: 12:30 – 2:30 pm
Location: Milgard Assembly Room
NOTE: Highlights indicate actions taken/decisions made

Agenda

I. General & Updates
   a. Approve 3/13/15 IAS Meeting notes

II. Reports:
   a. Faculty Senate
   b. Faculty Assembly EC
   c. Faculty Council

III. IAS Updates
   a. Updates
   b. SEED
   c. Student of Concern Process

IV. Associate Dean Reports
   a. Searches
   b. Curriculum & Scheduling
   c. Assessment

V. Discussion of Search Process

Attachments:
1. Attachment A:
2. Attachment B:

Discussion

I. General & Updates
   a. Boys on the Boat video played
   b. IAS Ground Rules reviewed
   c. Approve 3/13/15 IAS Meeting notes
      i. Minutes approved

II. Reports:
   a. Faculty Senate
      i. No update. There has been no Senate meeting since last update
      ii. Zoe Barsness was elected Vice Chair of Faculty Senate
   b. Faculty Assembly EC
      i. No update. Next meeting: 4/8
   c. Faculty Council
      i. Elections
         1. UWT committee elections
         2. Faculty Council tri-campus policy
         3. 2 university disciplinary committee
      ii. Multi-year lecturer
      iii. Voting procedures

III. IAS Updates – see Attachment A
   a. Updates
   b. SEED
   c. Student of Concern Process

IV. Associate Dean Reports – see Attachment A
   a. Searches
b. Curriculum & Scheduling

c. Assessment

V. Discussion of Search Process

COMMENT: There is a concern about how long lecturer searches take to get done. Last year it was put off to have the searches to happen late in the year. The decisions need to be made earlier than end of school year. The lecturer process should be thought through again and sped up.

RESPONSE: Faculty Council will/is addressing this.

COMMENT: Faculty member was not at the March 13th meeting. One of things of concern was to waiver of the 48 hour reading period of the search committee report. (Speeding up the process) is happening more and more with a desperate frenzy not to lose candidates. This does not make for good decision making. Time management is an important part of the context. Efforts to figure out how to do it better for a uniform timeline with staggered searches or process a timeline were developed at end of spring the year prior. A lot of thought and detail needed went into the search timeline. Maybe senior faculty can provide best practices from other institutions.

RESPONSE: (The current voting procedure was displayed.) It was agreed that it was too quick of turn around. The timing issue is critical.

COMMENT: Structure that makes sense needs to be more efficient to deal with rapid change and growth. It appears that culture has been forgotten and time needs to be made to process questions that are important to faculty. Faculty are not taking enough time for the faculty concerns. Faculty are not taking that time and need to build the trust that goes with the risk. How do you grow without risks? How do you build trust? What can be built into the structural process?

RESPONSE: It was agreed that it was too quick. There is a need to stick with the process as it did not work well when it was rushed. The current process is that in-person hiring discussion is needed and should be posted with the Catalyst vote for one week. It was agreed that in-person hiring discussion is needed

Faculty Council is discussing the following options:

- Go to an all online process.
- Shorten the online time to vote.
- Schedule more faculty meetings during “hunting season” keeping in mind that there is a need to make sure there is an in room discussion.
- Make sure all have voice and weigh in and turn around in a timely manner.

COMMENT: (There is a need to) change decision the making processes. There is a connection to broader problems. Due to the great growth, faculty will be spending hours reading reports in small windows of time or faculty will not read the reports and rubber stamp the work by smaller committees. Neither are appealing options. How can we find new ways to do this as this is not sustainable?

RESPONSE 1: Currently one of the IAS Faculty Fellows groups (J. Finke, W. McGuire, P. Kruse) is working on the issues of tenure and the concept of departmentalization. As of now, tenure is in IAS. IAS will not departmentalize “tomorrow”. As the university grows, the university will need to look at some sort of divisional model or departmentalization. Tenure can be moved to departments via university RCIP process when departments are created.

RESPONSE 2: Not sure if departmentalization means if the tenure home switches. Tenure would remain at the highest level.
RESPONSE 3: In the past it also talked about a way to move up the dates of starting searches. The process needs to start sooner. Many candidates had offers.

RESPONSE 4: The process was started sooner and it helped a lot although it depends on field of search (for “hunting season”).

RESPONSE 5: Regional Economics was conducted in the fall but even then there were some pressures. IAS has not heard what has been approved for next year’s searches. IAS prefers and hopes to hear this spring however IAS can be proactive and put together search committees in the spring so that the ads can be ready. If the ads are ready, the searches can be conducted sooner in the fall. Unfortunately, the budget may not be ready until July.

RESPONSE 6: (Addressing the project management skills) in 2013, lean groups were formed for hiring. The group created sample schedules. It was difficult to see whole process at once. There was a need to understand the bottlenecks. Extra work for writing ads for positions may or may not be approved however the sooner IAS can start, the quicker things can be done in a timely manner. There are tools available to help. The voting of process important and crucial.

COMMENT: There is a concern voiced about faculty meeting discussion of last meeting. There is no framework for writing search reports. There are no guidelines as to what is put into the report. Examples: coaching for length of the report, a section for concerns for the candidates would be better for analysis.

RESPONSE 1: It was expressed that a template is a good idea.

RESPONSE 2: There is a time management issue. A committee could be finished with a search and it is at least two weeks until the IAS Faculty Meeting. The only way around this is to have more faculty meetings scheduled during “hunting season”.

COMMENT: Faculty input into the search interview committee from faculty members who are not part of the committee report is important. This is a question of culture not a question of process. What input can faculty submit? There are other kinds of issues that could be submitted by faculty members who are not part of the process. How does the committee take those concerns into consideration and into the discussion? How are they reported upon?

RESPONSE 1: (Tenure track faculty search process guidelines displayed.) IAS is the only unit on campus when a search committee opens up the search to a wider for interview committee. This is an area of concern that will be brought to Faculty Council: how do faculty who are not on the committee provide feedback or relay information? How will this be done?

RESPONSE 2: Should there be a moment when the floor is open for dissent, to invite concerns? There is a need and want for a speedy efficient process but there is also a need to invite a place for dissent. This is not a true democratic process. This is a hierarchical institution. Although there is an “open forum and opportunity”, there is also a need to provide a safe environment.

RESPONSE 3: An opportunity to voice concern is a good suggestion.

RESPONSE 4: In the search process, the interview committee has the option to file a minority report.

RESPONSE 5: All information for interview committee needs to be available.
COMMENT: There is a culture of (hierarchical) vulnerability and gender vulnerability. There are conditional appointments for most lecturers.

COMMENT: It would be helpful if the interview committee provided the data in depth. It would be helpful if the person did not have to make a comment “live” and have the ability to send the written comments to the interview committee and have it be part of the report. This way the comments would be on paper.

RESPONSE 1: Information shared with members of the committee should be in writing for point of record so all faculty are looking at the same thing.

RESPONSE 2: Some people did not have the information and it was advised to not have the information on the report. Part of the problem was the rapid turn-around.

COMMENT: Why was the information taken to AHR?

RESPONSE: AHR was called for protocol.

COMMENT: Faculty member brought to the faculty’s attention that the point of order needs to be acknowledged as the discussion was heading to discuss historical accounts. It was recommended to move to executive session. The faculty could either discuss the process moving forward which means the meeting would be open to all and minutes would be public. If the discussion was to discuss a specific discussion held in the March 13, 2015 meeting, faculty member suggested closing the meeting and starting an executive session. Moving to an executive session means anyone who is not a faculty member would be asked to leave the room. The meeting would end and there would be no minutes. Comments would not be public and discussion about the search process would end.

RESPONSE 1: Discussion for an off record (executive session) would need to be voted upon.

RESPONSE 2: The faculty was asked if there were other comments of current discussion (search/voting process)?

RESPONSE 3: It was pointed out that the search process 16 years ago for faculty was different. There are now half lecturers and half tenure track/tenured faculty. Lecturers are not speaking in this discussion. Some feel do not have the voice. There is a need to create an environment to include everyone. Senior faculty did not do a good job so that everyone feels free and comfortable to voice issues and concerns. Faculty need to be able to ask questions and feels equally free to raise concerns.

COMMENT: There is a sense there is need a culture and need to get this right. Faculty need to stop and slow down to figure out what the next steps look like. The political culture of what faculty commitments are for each other, what faculty want to do well and get to the point to of issue. Faculty need to notice the red flag and slow down and figure out how to move forward. There is a sense of concerns that have not been articulated and a need to be sensitive to that. The pressures of speeding things up are clearly affecting the search process.

COMMENT: Executive session is needed as faculty discussion is moving from discussion of policies to a discussion of historical case. There is a false dichotomy as they are one in the same. Policy focus needs to have an executive session to move forward.
COMMENT: A faculty member echoed the need to have things written down for the interview committee and to slow things down. When there is a concern, the concern needs to be brought forth. The faculty member continued to state that if the member knew the person, the committee needs to figure out what questions need to be asked so there is a context. This does not mean to downplay the feelings and issues brought forth. If the interview committee and faculty are expected to make a decision on the report needs as much information as possible. A lot of people were not in the room and during the weekend vote, there were a lot of phone calls about the meeting. The interview committee needs to take into account the information so that it is inclusive in the report. The committee also needs to make sure the faculty have the information while respecting the person bringing forth the concerns.

- There was a move to an executive session.
- The move was seconded.
- One faculty member was not comfortable with the move to an executive session.

COMMENT: Faculty member expressed that there is a disadvantage to an executive session. It leads to problems faculty are struggling to overcome. It was pointed out that there is a lack of transparency and focus. An executive session is a way not to the concerns of the faculty public. An executive session is “more of the same”.

RESPONSE 1: A faculty member support the comment against an executive session. An executive session only pertains to the safety for the faculty member and the specifics of the case. It does not deliberate on the process that needs to be revised.

RESPONSE 2: A faculty member responded that the reason an executive session was because the discussion was turning into a discussion about a specific personnel case. If the discussion is not about a personnel case, there is no need for an executive session.

- There was another move to an executive session.
- The move was seconded.
- The faculty conducted a paper vote to move to an executive discussion.
- The faculty voted on the following: Should the meeting close and open an executive session?
  - YES: 22
  - NO: 15
  - ABSTAIN: 18
- The result of the vote is: no executive session.
- Discussion continued.

COMMENT: A faculty member stated, as a lecturer on the committee in question, assuming everyone did their job correctly, the faculty member noted that she does not feel marginalized nor a concern for herself. That said, she stated that is not possible for lecturers to put their collective needs first versus the needs about self. Many expressed equality but not everyone has said it. There is a lot of concern about one’s personal future.

COMMENT: A faculty member was puzzled about AHR. This is serious. It is the opposite of what we want in a good process. The faculty member was a victim of abusive behavior and then to talk about it again. The search proceeded and the information was not included.

RESPONSE: In retrospect, the process was too quick. There wasn’t enough time for the report and discussion.
COMMENT: A faculty member question why the term heresy was used in the report.

RESPONSE 1: The faculty discussion was summarized in the report.

RESPONSE 2: A faculty member expressed that heresy was used incorrectly in the report and there is a need to make all aware to recognize that it was someone’s story.

RESPONSE 3: A faculty member expressed that HR and the institution have expertise for policy. Faculty can go with the institution to any concern raised legally. It is the responsibility to one another and when thinking of a “story” brought by someone, the response is to look at who is telling the story. What is the concern? Faculty need to foster and provide, listen and understand. Faculty need to share commitment.

COMMENT: A faculty member pointed out that when a member of the faculty comments, there is a need to have each other’s back. There should not be a dent in their integrity. There is a need to trust colleagues. A culture where faculty do not have each other’s back is not something the faculty wishes to be a part of. There needs to be trust.

COMMENT: A faculty member has been reflecting a lot on situation since it took place. Faculty member shared a book title that was read: *No Asshole Rule Book*. It is about hiring practices and surrounds yourself with people you want to be surrounded by. It asks the question, is the person not an asshole? The faculty member continued to reflect about asking oneself if she had done something in life that she regretted and then follow-up with a question. How long ago did it happen? How did it change me? She pointed out that a person can change therefore she seems the good in people. She worries that faculty will not give someone a chance. What evidence is there that this person has not changed?

COMMENT: It was pointed out that what was said in the (March 13, 2015) meeting was brief. The person has no idea what happened and then asked the person was asked to make a decision. How do you call integrity into the question of colleagues who tried to act professionally?

COMMENT: A faculty member wants to assume the best intent. The faculty member heard from a few “how can one person bring down a whole search committee”? The faculty member was aware of the candidate’s weaknesses and hoping it would be brought forth and discussed. Student perception of the candidate was not included in the report. She was hoping weaknesses and concerns would have been discussed. She did not feel emotionally safe.

COMMENT: A faculty member follow-up with the *No Asshole Rule Book* and stated that there is a difference on testimony of one who is here and one who is not here. Having someone here, there is a need of corroboration. There is more value on a person who is here speaking. It is possible for someone to change over a decade, but a red flag was raised. This is a case that more discussion would have been good.

- Faculty Council will continue to work on policy and procedure of search/voting process.
- There was a move to adjourn meeting. Move was seconded. Meeting adjourned.