

Faculty Council Meeting

May 15, 2023 – 9:00–10:00 am

TPS 110 and <https://washington.zoom.us/j/99106482251>

Phone: +1 253 215-8782

Meeting ID: 991 0648 2251

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	P
Jane Compson	PPPA Representative	P
Haley Skipper	SAM Representative	P
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	P
Non-Member Participant	Capacity	(P), (A), or (X)
Jessica Asplund	Director of Academic and Finance Operations	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 of Equity & Inclusion	P

AGENDA

1. Land Acknowledgment
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
 - May 4
 - May 8
4. New Business: Teaching Faculty Reappointment Process
5. New Business: World Languages
6. New Business: Haley Endowment
7. Old Business: Faculty Salary Increase
8. Old Business: Structure
9. Old Business: ICR Policy
10. Updates & Announcements
 - External Reviewer Solicitation Letters
11. As May Arise
12. 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.
 2. Approval of Agenda
 - a. The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.
-

3. Approval of Minutes
 - a. The minutes of the May 4, 2023, special meeting with EVCAA Andy Harris, were approved by unanimous consent. We will look at the minutes from the May 8, 2023, meeting next week.

4. New Business: Teaching Faculty Reappointment Process
 - a. Full Review vs. Non-Full Review: SIAS full review goes beyond what is required in the Faculty Code for reappointment of teaching faculty; the code states that “voting members . . . who are superior in academic rank or title . . . shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment.”
 - b. Review of Resources and Curricular Need: The first step in the process is for the Dean and Division Chair to review the resources available and curricular need for the position. The Dean determines the maximum length of the appointment.
 - c. Current Requirement: “Teaching professors must receive a full review during the first reappointment process that occurs after their competitive hire.”; the process also applies to teaching professors who have “not had a full review (or been promoted) in the last five years.”
 - d. Full Review consists of: appointment of a review committee; 2–3 page narrative, along with CV, activity reports, regular conference, etc., student teaching evaluations, peer review of teaching, syllabi; committee provides written recommendation; faculty senior in rank vote.
 - e. Non-Full Review consists of: CV; activity reports, regular conference, etc.; student teaching evaluations; peer review of teaching; syllabi; faculty senior in rank vote.
 - f. The issues are outdated language, outdated criteria, no formal feedback mechanism from full review, workload for committee, and for the candidate to write the narrative.
 - g. This was discussed with the EVCAA and Andy doesn’t need us to do anything more than is required by Faculty Code.
 - h. We shouldn’t add additional labor to personnel processes when we are already overworked with personnel processes.
 - i. Reappointment review is not done if going up for promotion; full review is done if not promoted or reviewed in five years.
 - j. We need better ways to give feedback.
 - k. The curricular need must be established before reappointment is triggered.
 - l. Jane Compson makes a motion to eliminate the SIAS full review for reappointment of teaching faculty; Haley Skipper seconds. All unanimous in eliminating the full review for reappointment of teaching faculty.
 - m. We need to determine whether this process was voted on by the faculty to determine next steps.

5. New Business: World Languages
 - a. Overview: “The Washington Student Achievement Council (WSAC) requires first-year applicants at all public baccalaureate institutions in Washington to meet these College Academic Distribution Requirements (CADRs), but WSAC allows each institution to determine its own minimum requirements for transfer applicants. UW is unique among the state’s public baccalaureates in requiring transfer students to satisfy these College Academic Distribution Requirements.”; The data in the Senate report focused on Seattle: “The number of transfer applicants denied entry to UW due to CADR deficiencies is small, but these students are disproportionately first-generation college students and those with identities that are underrepresented at UW. For example, for Autumn 2021 admission to UW Seattle, first-generation students were 36 percent of

the total applicant pool, but 52 percent of those denied due to either a world language or math deficiency.”

- b. The Faculty Senate removed world languages as an admissions requirement for students transferring with 40 or more credit hours; the College of Arts & Sciences and School of Social Work at UW Seattle require three years as a graduation requirement; Senate legislation states: “If desired, other schools and colleges could create a similar World Language graduation requirement.”
 - c. The number of transfer students at UWT affected by the change in requirements in Winter quarter was 169; 39 SIAS majors, 90 non-SIAS majors, and 45 pre-majors.
 - d. This change affects transfer students, but not traditional or running-start students, which creates inequities in our degrees.
 - e. There is confusion among SIAS students as to whether or not language is a graduation requirement; should we make this a graduation requirement?
 - f. We need detailed data to know how many students need to take language classes; some students may take required classes at a community college instead of at UWT.
 - g. These classes are used for recruitment to the major; this change has gutted our Spanish language and culture program and creates concerns for the faculty as there aren't enough sections for everyone to teach.
 - h. Forty-five languages are offered at UW Seattle.
6. New Business: Haley Endowment
 - a. We received seven applications for the Haley professorship: David Coon, Chris Demaske, Danica Miller, Amos Nascimento, Ariana Ochoa Camacho, Riki Thompson, and Emily Thuma.
 - b. Faculty Council needs to create a rubric and rank the applicants.
 - c. We will provide a recommendation to the Dean; there will be no formal vote.
 7. Old Business: Faculty Salary Increase
 - a. Do we want to recommend 4 percent across the board or 3 percent and 1 percent for adjustments?
 - b. We don't have data tracking of faculty salaries;
 - c. We should develop a policy before next year when we will face this same question.
 - d. IR did the calculations at UWB for its unit adjustments; they looked at the junior member of the division and assumed 2 percent per year and 10 percent for promotion; this could be a first level to help solve the deep promotion problem.
 - e. We need to develop a model that is equitable and won't create additional inequities.
 - f. After the Faculty Meeting, several faculty members voiced their support for the 4 percent across the board raise for this year, but to create a policy to address inequities and compression going forward.
 8. Old Business: Structure
 - a. Some affinity groups have provided feedback, but some have not.
 - b. The feedback that has been received has been sent to Natalie, Faculty Council leadership, and DAC leadership.
 - c. Bill and Ben are going to reach out to the Secretary of the Faculty and the Planning and Budgeting Chair to see what triggers the RCEP process.
 9. Old Business: Indirect Cost Recovery Process
 - a. What percentage should go back to the Principal Investigator?
 - b. Current language in policy: “Funds may also be used for faculty fellowship awards or other needs that serve the School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences. These could

include software, technology, and other resource purchases that are for the greater good of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences faculty, staff, and students.”; “The Dean’s office will review ICR balances at the end of each year and determine the amount available for faculty fellowship awards and/or other needs for SIAS. This information will be shared with the Faculty Council.”

- c. A lot of the ICR money is generated by faculty in SAM; this year SAM needed \$12,000 from the ICR to replace refrigerators and freezers; it will be harder to replace equipment if most of the money is given back to the PI.
- d. Should we start at 25 percent instead of 50 percent? It will allow the PI to check the box that some of the money comes back to them, but will also allow the Dean’s office to have more money available for other needs.

10. Updates & Announcements

- a. Letters to External Reviewers
 1. Steve did a lot of work on the letter related to teaching faculty so that external reviewers know how we look at scholarship using language from the Faculty Code and our guidelines.
 2. Take a look at the letters; we’ll discuss them next week.
- b. Search Request: US History & Labor
 1. This search was postponed from this academic year.
 2. We need to advise the Dean about how to proceed.
- c. Next week’s meeting may run until 10:30.

11. As May Arise

12. Adjourned

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 10:06 am.