

Faculty Council Meeting

February 15, 2023, 9:00–10:00 am

Joy 201 and Zoom: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/96043150068>

Phone: +1 253 215-8782

MINUTES

Faculty Council Member	Capacity	Present (P), Absent (A), or Recusal (X) ¹
Bill Kunz	Faculty Council Chair	P
Ben Meiches	Vice Chair	P
Cassie Miura	CAC Representative	A
Jane Compson	PPPA Representative	P
Haley Skipper	SAM Representative	A
Leighann Chaffee	SBHS Representative	P
Libi Sundermann	SHS Representative	P
Scott Rayermann	Lecturer at Large (SAM)	P
Loly Alcaide Ramirez	Dean's Diversity Advisory Council representative (CAC)	P
Ex-Officio Members	Capacity	(P), (A), or (X)
Natalie Eschenbaum	Dean	P
Joyce Dinglasan-Panlilio	Chair, Committee of Chairs	P
Kathleen Pike Jones	Assistant to the Dean/Note-Taker	A
Non-Member Participant	Capacity	(P), (A), or (X)
Jessica Asplund	Director of Academic and Finance Administration	P
Jeremy Davis	Associate Dean of Programs & Operations	P
Stephen Ross	Associate Dean of Faculty Development & Student Support	P
Vanessa de Veritch Woodside	Associate Dean, Equity & Inclusion	P

AGENDA

1. Land Acknowledgment
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Updates & Announcements
 1. Teams Site
 2. Structure
 3. International Scholars Operations Draft Letter
 4. FCAS
 5. March 3rd Faculty Meeting
5. New Buisness: Faculty Safety & Support
6. New Business: 2023-2024 Budget
7. New Business Faculty Recommendation on Hiring
8. New Business: Teaching Faculty Promotion Guidelines
9. As May Arise
10. Adjourn

1. Land Acknowledgment

- a. Faculty Council Chair Bill Kunz called the meeting to order and the council took a moment to reflect on the SIAS Land Acknowledgment before beginning the business of the meeting. (9:05)

2. Approval of Agenda

- a. The agenda was approved as distributed by unanimous consent.
-

3. Approval of Minutes

- a. The agenda was approved as distributed by unanimous consent.

4. Updates & Announcements

- a. Teams. Jessica Asplund set up a Teams site for FC related materials. It now contains Distance Learning policy and structure documents. It is a common place for storing and accessing materials and will continue to
- b. Structure. The Dean, FC Chair, and FC VC are meeting following this FC meeting to discuss a model structure, which will be brought to full FC at the February 22nd 2023 meeting. FC Chair and VC also received an email from DAC co-chairs indicating they were devoting a full meeting on February 22nd to this issue as well. Desire is to have something to discuss at March meeting.
- c. International Scholars Operations-FC Chair, VC and Dean discussed a letter concerning ISO operations. They are checking with Academic Human Resources (Sarah Davies Breen) to ensure it is accurate. The intent isn't to call out the ISO, but explain the challenges we've been facing and see if they're more widespread. There was a question for clarification about the specific topics of this letter. FC Chair clarified it is being fact checked with AHR. Multiple issues such as faculty being unable to get permanent residency or work visas. On consultation with Kim Cargill on Faculty Affairs in Seattle, this was considered an appropriate response and may eventually go to the Chair of Faculty Senate. The point is to see how widespread the challenges we've been facing are. The Dean shared there were distinct issues, but the common theme has been challenges at the federal level. The ISO calendar no longer seems in sync with federal work system. Jessica Asplund shared that ISO is now working on a 12 month processing timeline. An FC member stated this needs to be raised as a factor when we are searching and considering hiring candidates.
- d. FCAS- Associate Dean Davis confirmed with the registrar that this is not a policy. Andrea Modarres, a representative to FCAS, also indicated that in a meeting on either 2/9 or 2/10 that FCAS was changing the language from mandating a common core to indicate programs *might* want a common core issue. FCAS should not compel change in majors at this time.
- e. March 3rd Faculty Meeting conflict- faculty received an email from SIAS faculty member Sonia de la Cruz regarding a Social Justice & Scholarship Research Initiative discussion on March 3rd focused on "What is Doing Social Justice," which runs from 12:30-2:00 and parallels the SIAS faculty meeting. FC Chair and VC were concerned this will force faculty to make a choice and potentially make it hard to get to a quorum, but there were not a lot of options because of a CAC meeting scheduled for 2:30 and the likelihood faculty will not attend meetings at atypical times. The plan is to move forward despite the conflict at this time. (9:13)

5. New Business: Faculty and Staff Safety and Support

- a. Special meeting scheduled for Friday February 17th at 12:30 to discuss details.
 1. Associate Dean Ross described the meeting. It is both in-person and hybrid. It will not be recorded to ensure faculty can speak their mind without worrying it will be shared out. Several campus units will be there including Surtida from the Office of Student Conduct, Susan Wagshul-Golden Director of Campus Safety, and Sarah Davies Breen from Academic Human Resources. The focus of this session will be on sharing information and listening to faculty concerns. This isn't intended to be a professional development workshop on deescalation skills. The

focus will be on classroom and office disruptions/disruptive behavior. What is our process for addressing these issues. What steps should staff and faculty take. What is their role in the process. What is the role of other units? What does OSC do? What does campus safety provide and not provide? What can AHR do? Most of the resources are on the student side, but fewer on the faculty side. This is an opportunity for faculty to share their concerns with individuals in charge of managing each side of these concerns.

- b. Discussion- Concerns were raised that based off recent events, faculty appear to have very few resources whereas a large number of resources exist to aid students in this situation. The key question here is how to better support faculty. Many people coming have good will and will be sympathetic, but we need more concrete support for faculty. AHR is our primary support, but this kind of situation isn't their strength it appears.
- c. Discussion- There are many more resources available than faculty realize. The goal isn't to train faculty on those resources here, but there could be follow up to ensure faculty have access to them.
- d. Discussion- Sometimes information on resources comes in an email with a series of links to different items. This isn't especially useful or productive for faculty. There needs to be more than a laundry list, but more proactive outreach in this situation. (9:27)

6. New Business: Budget

- a. Overview- the Dean described the budget cut which includes removing \$348,158.44 from the budget for next academic year. It is a permanent cut. It is fortunate SIAS modeled this cut in 2020 because a lot of the conversation and resources for thinking about the cut had already occurred. Priorities may be different now, but the modeling was simpler. This is not an enormous cut, but it is not insubstantial.
- b. 2023 Budget Cut Folder- AD Davis shared a folder that includes several documents a Budget Tutorial, Documents outlining Administrative Costs, a list of Funds Available for Reduction, a global picture of SIAS Annual Funds in the Academic Year, and an excel tool/template for modeling potential mechanisms to cut the budget.
- c. Discussion- This amount was only given to the Dean's office recently. Shared leadership had a discussion about it during their meeting on February 9th. It is now being brought to FC. The Dean's meeting with the EVCAA is March 6th so they are moving very quickly. The biggest pot of money sits in positions. This is bad news because it means we lose lines. It is good news because if enrollments go up we can easily argue for those funds/lines to be returned. We have two open positions so if the faculty/Dean's office hold off on searching that provides about \$235,000 of the cut or about 2/3rds of the total. If we went this route we would also keep PPPA's request in high consideration for whenever we're able to search again. There are also staff positions currently vacant. In 2020 there was a strong desire to keep those lines untouched and so they aren't currently intending to reduce them. There was a strong desire to leave PDF untouched. This leaves the Scholarship and Teaching Funds (STF) which we haven't always had as a unit as one source. If you put together STF and the two vacant faculty positions it gets us most of the way to the cut. There are other places in administrative or operational costs that could be cut, but with restructuring coming this might be problematic.

- d. Discussion- FC Chair proposes allowing faculty council members to review the document and come back with more thorough discussion at the February 22nd meeting.
 - e. Clarification- STF refers to Scholarship and Teaching Funds and not Student Technology fees.
 - f. Clarification- can this information be shared? It is available to all UW addresses and can be distributed. It is a public document.
 - g. Discussion- is it on the table to cut the current searches now or reprioritize? If PPPA's desire for Interantional Law and Religion line is more important than ongoing searches? Could we cancel or swap? The Dean consulted with EVCAA on this while it is possible, it isn't recommended especially considering searches already have invites to campus. Jessica Asplund notes that administratively the lines are approved separately so it would create additional hurdles.
 - h. Clarificaton- if we failed a search would that become part of our cut? For searches ongoing this year, if they fail, the intent, as per the EVCAA, is to continue searching for them next year. They would not be a part of this cut.
 - i. Clarification- what we currently don't know is about any retirements or resignations, which might also contribute to cuts moving forward. (9:41)
7. New Business: Faculty Recommendation on Hiring
- a. Proposed Hiring Recommendation Policy Change-Current guidelines on faculty hiring indicate that "while ranking of candidates may be a useful tool in organizing your meeting's discusson, *your report does not need to explicitly rank the candidates*" on Wednesday FC Chair and VC received an email from the Dean/AD Davis suggesting that the language italicized above should be replaced with "*should not rank the candidates*" effectively proposing the ending of ranking
 - b. Chair and VC Response- this was quite a muddy issue because the Faculty Code indicates that it is the faculty who offer the recommendation on qualifications. With respect to appointments, SIAS is a department, the campus is the school, the Dean is the Chair, and the Chancellor the Dean. So it is hard to sort out process, but four concerns were raised: i) This policy was being changed without FC or DAC consultation before it was communicated, ii) The change was potentially being implemented in the middle of ongoing search deliberations, iii) The recommendation (including its style) is the purview of the faculty not the Dean's office, iv) Not ranking is actually relying on implicit ranking not explicit ranking, which may not be best practice for ensuring equity.
 - c. Discussion- Dean's office included an email exchange from last year between the Dean's office, Secretary of Faculty, and the head of the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (colloquially referred to as the Code Cops), which reiterates that the Code doesn't explicitly call for ranking, but it does give the faculty the power to determine who is qualified.
 - d. Clarification-the Dean appreciated the opportunity to explain their actions and stance on ranking. The process is not especially clear. The Dean prefers a list of faculty evaluated based on their strengths and weaknesses. The Associate Dean reached out to the Dean to see how they wanted the report prepared. Dean's office assumed this would be uncontentious because i) it was the practice they used in staff hiring in the fall ii) the Dean had only worked at institutions that did not use rankings.
 - e. Clarification-the Dean made several points about why ranking is a problematic exercise in searches, hiring, and academic evaluation in general: i) ranking presumes an ideal candidate rather than differently, but equally qualified

candidates for a role, ii) rankings lean in terms of unconscious bias and privilege in committee assessments, they empower those traditionally in power, iii) final decisions need to consider best choice for the school as a whole, iv) sometimes choices are based on personnel issues that cannot be broadly shared for legal reasons. The latter creates a tension where the Dean may need to make a decision that, for legal reasons, cannot be shared with the faculty but disagrees with their rank. Ideally, the Dean says the administration will trust the faculty assessment and the faculty trust the Dean on making the best decision based on that assessment and other available personnel information. We may need to continue to build our relationships/trust to get to that point.

- f.* Clarification- for this year we will keep existing policy language. Searches will have the choice of how they wish to prepare final reports.
- g.* Clarification this needs to be a broader school conversation about ranking. There is a 50/50 split in the schools on our campus in terms of their rank process.
- h.* Discussion- differences with SIAS is a much larger faculty where implicit distinctions are not easy e.g. an administrator with an English background assessing a biochemistry candidate. Don't rankings ensure that is clarified.
- i.* Clarification- if we move toward not ranking, we need a discussion and some training in how to do that successfully.
- j.* Clarification- if we proceed to change with ranking, after consulting with DAC, faculty, and further conversation with faculty council, we should also be systematic in thinking about diversity and equity in our search processes because ranking is only one small piece of the resulting inequities.
- k.* Clarification- as part of this discussion the relevant parts of the Faculty Code actually indicate that the faculty of a department should constitute an appointment advisory committee (the search committee), we may be out of compliance with this since we do not vote in favor of the committee. Subject of further investigation. (9:59)

8. New Business: Teaching Faculty Promotion Guidelines

- a.* Provost Memo- last June the provost forwarded a memo to everyone that clarified scholarship was an expectation of teaching faculty and noting that several promotion cases teaching faculty were using guidelines that i) used the old titles and ii) did not speak to scholarship. This created issues in soliciting external reviews.
- b.* Challenge-SIAS created new guidelines in 2021, but also gave faculty the right to use the 2017 guidelines for teaching professor promotion, which use the old titles and do not mention scholarship.
- c.* Potential solutions: i) update the terminology of 2017 to teaching professor titles and remedy the absence of scholarship in the policy, ii) require teaching faculty use the 2021 options, iii) develop new, specific guidelines for promotion to associate teaching professor and teaching professor.
- d.* Clarification- a model of how that language might work was distributed to faculty council by the Chair. Sense is that using the 2017 guidelines isn't viable anymore, but that needs to be discussed first
- e.* Discussion- could we sunset 2017 criteria after this year (2023) so that faculty can use those if they want. According to the Associate Dean, this is not viable because the Provost won't respond to those criteria.
- f.* Clarification- our existing 2021 tenure and promotion criteria do not indicate what scholarly expectations are for teaching faculty. Apparently, the 2017

document also was intended to include/discuss scholarship, but faculty felt this wasn't a fair expectation of teaching faculty at that time.

- g.* Clarification: is it possible to give a summary of the Provost's letter to faculty seeking promotion this year so they are aware of his concerns and the potential problems with the 2017 criteria
9. As May Arise.
10. Adjourn.
- a. The meeting was adjourned at 10:11.