## Faculty Meeting

June 2, 2023, 12:30-2:30 pm
UW YMCA Student Center 303 and Zoom: https://washington.zoom.us/j/99687169501
Phone: +12532158782
Meeting ID: 99687169501
Attendance: See page 7

## Agenda

1. Land Acknowledgment
2. Approval of Minutes
3. Updates \& Announcements
4. Dean's Report
5. Teaching Faculty Reappointment Discussion $\&$ Motion
6. Structure Discussion \& Motion
7. Reports \& Opportunity for Questions
8. As May Arise
9. Reading of the Votes
10. Adjourn

## Votes/Action Summary

1. Approve the May 12, 2023, Faculty Meeting Minutes as distributed. There was no discussion. The motion passed. [Yes-46; No-0; Abstain-1]
2. Approve the motion on the Teaching Faculty Reappointment Policy as amended. No objection to moving the language as amended. The motion passed. [Yes-56; No-o; Abstain-o]
3. Approve the amendment, "11. The proposal includes resources to identify and address potential needs for cultural merger or integration." to the motion regarding the development of a formal proposal to initiate a reorganization of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts \& Sciences as defined by Faculty Code 26-41. Motion introduced by Chris Beasley and seconded by Jim Gawel. The motion does not pass. [Yes-14; No-35; Abstain-5]
4. Approve the motion regarding the development of a formal proposal to initiate a reorganization of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts \& Sciences as defined by Faculty Code 26-41. Motion introduced by Peter Selkin and seconded by Scott Rayermann. The motion passed. [Yes-56; No-2; Abstain-1]

## 1. Land Acknowledgment, Welcome, and Ground Rules.

a. With a quorum present, Faculty Council Chair Bill Kunz called the meeting to order at 12:45 and the group took a moment to reflect on the SIAS Land Acknowledgment before beginning the business of the faculty meeting.
b. Bill reviewed the SIAS ground rules and the use of Zoom chat in faculty meetings.

## 2. Approval of Minutes.

a. Approve the May 12, 2023, Faculty Meeting Minutes as distributed. There was no discussion. The motion passed. [Yes-46; No-o; Abstain-1]

## 3. Updates \& Announcements.

a. We are still accepting nominations for Faculty Council Vice Chair and one position on Faculty Assembly Executive Council.
b. Faculty Council has one final meeting next Monday; we are discussing a change to the ICR policy that would allot a percentage of the ICR back to the PI.
c. 2023 SEED (Strengthening Educational Excellence through Diversity) Teaching Institute applications are due today.
d. The 2023 SIAS faculty and staff retreat will be on September 20th.
e. Promotions! Thanks to the faculty and staff that served on the committees.

## 4. Dean's Report.

a. Natalie wants to take this time to say thank you for your patience and grace; while she is still learning the culture, she finds SIAS complex, but gorgeous, and she's thrilled to be here.
b. We need to revisit our identity and mission and do the collective work as we think about restructuring.
c. UWT is special because of its history and relationship to Tacoma; we are a teachingfocused campus with an urban serving mission.
d. We should celebrate our accomplishments: Community: Holiday party, open houses, PPPA research retreat, CACstravaganza, poetry event, SAMURS, award ceremonies, Indigenous knowledge symposium, more in-person events, connecting with local organizations, and amazing new hires starting next year; Structure: 102 meetings and conversations about structure, defining our principles and making a commitment to interdisciplinarity, SBHS structure of curriculum, and SAM staffing changes;
Retention: Working to do more data informed scheduling, full advising staff, Student Advisory Council, training for chairs, leadership development training, PTL hires, and CARE session; Communication: Newsletter (any feedback is helpful), updates at the end of quarters, Dean's office hours, and UWT Advisory Council; Climate: resourced position of AD of E\&I, CARE workshop, DAC meetings, affinity groups that we hope will continue, worked to co-locate more staff, and more celebrations for promotions and achievements.
e. Thanks to Bill Kunz for taking on the position of Chair of the Faculty Council and dealing with a new dean and new EVCAA; Natalie read the poem, "To Be of Use," by Marge Piercy.

## 5. Teaching Faculty Reappointment Discussion \& Motion.

a. We currently go beyond what is required in the Faculty Code; the EVCAA suggests that we don't do more than what is required.
b. A review of resources and curricular need is done first.
c. "Teaching professors must receive a full review during the first reappointment process that occurs after their competitive hire" and 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 vs. Non-Full Review:

1. Full Review: Appointment of a review committee; 2-3 page narrative; CV; activity reports, regular conference, etc.; student teaching evaluations; peer review of teaching; syllabi; committee provides written recommendation; faculty senior in rank vote.
2. Non-Full Review: CV; activity reports, regular conference, etc.; student teaching evaluations; peer review of teaching; syllabi; faculty senior in rank vote.
e. Concerns: goes beyond what is required by code; no effective feedback mechanism from
full review; timeline falls within the same window as promotion reviews, which creates a
workload issue; promotion and reappointment often tied together since it involves the same work.
f. ORIGINAL MOTION: Teaching professor must receive a full review during the first reappointment process that occurs after their competitive hire. From the time of the first full review for a competitively hired position, full reviews are required for reappointments that initiate $5-6$ years after the previous full review. All other reappointment processes will rely on the expedited process. The promotion process shall be considered a full review.
g. Discussion or thoughts?
3. Occasionally teaching professors are hired with a one- or two-year contract; it would be a challenge to do a full review in that situation as there will be almost no data available.
4. There is a unique situation this year-teaching professor with a three-year contract, but they have been on leave for two years and have not instructed a class here.
5. Committee reports will only be redacted if committee members can be identified in the report.
6. This process should be parallel to the tenure-track process; third year review that starts in the second year.
7. Timelines are set up by personnel; reappointments are required in autumn, at least six months before the contract expires.
h. AMENDED MOTION: "Teaching professors must receive a full review during the first reappointment process that occurs after two years of instruction following their competitive hire, with the faculty member receiving a redacted version of the committee report. All other reappointment reviews will rely on the expedited process. The promotion process shall be considered a full review."
i. Approve the motion on the Teaching Faculty Reappointment Policy as amended. No objection to moving the language as amended. The motion passed. [Yes-56; No-o; Abstain-o]

## 6. Structure Discussion \& Motion.

a. There have been at least 98 discussions regarding structure this year, not counting affinity groups or discussions in Divisional meetings.
b. Meeting with UW Faculty Leadership: Chris Laws, Chair of Senate Committee on Planning \& Budgeting, and Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty.

1. This will most likely be a full RCEP (Reorganization, Consolidation, and Elimination Procedures) as outlined in Section 26-41, 3.b: "A significant change in the terms, conditions, or course of employment of faculty."
2. There has not been a full RCEP in many years, and none that they are aware of on the branch campuses, so the answer to some of our questions are unknown.
3. There is the question about whether the consultation with the "elected faculty council" would be at the School or campus level.
4. Will the new provost and new vice provost need time before launching a full RCEP?
5. Then there are the existential questions about Tri-Campus relations.
c. There will be a discussion with the Chancellor and EVCAA in mid-June.
d. UW Faculty Leadership: Gautham Reddy, incoming chair of SCPB; Cindy Daugherty, incoming chair of the Faculty Senate; Tricia Serio, incoming Provost; and Fredrick Nafukho is the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
e. Process:
6. The Provost consults with the Senate Committee on Planning \& Budgeting.
f. If the Provost initiates a full review, the Dean or Chancellor notifies the Secretary of the Faculty who then consults with the Chair of the Faculty Senate on the appointment of the External Faculty Committee.
g. Guidance:
7. The model adopted by the STEM School in Bothell is the one available pathway at this time.
8. It is believed that the process we are following, and the motion we are proposing, is the correct course of action.
h. Tenure \& Promotion Process at STEM School at UW Bothell:
9. Steps: Committee (standing or ad-hoc); Division faculty vote; Chair letter; Dean letter; Campus Council on Promotion \& Tenure; Chancellor/Vice Chancellor letter.
10. Promotion Guidelines: School-wide Tenure \& Promotion Guidelines: "Wouldn't be good for there to be wildly divergent tenure guidelines in the different divisions.:
11. Culture Statement: Address discipline specific differences, particularly in terms of scholarship.
i. Merit \& Reappointment at STEM School at UW Bothell:
12. Merit review \& Reappointment review in Divisions.
13. Dean now signs off on merit reviews and regular conference letters.
14. Some Divisions delegate authority for reviews, etc. to standing committees.
j. Faculty Council Motion:
15. Objectives:
a. Moving forward, this will become more of a Faculty Council process rather than a faculty-wide process.
b. Motion binds Faculty Council to a set of principles moving forward in its consultations with the Chancellor and/or Dean.
c. Does not guarantee that these requests would be part of a proposal, but it provides a framework:
16. Clear and transparent in our requests.
17. Benchmark for future assessment of proposal(s).
18. Moving Forward:
a. Statement that the faculty do not support the elimination or consolidation of programs, just reorganization.
b. Code protected moments in the RCEP process for consultation with faculty.
c. Vote in RCEP is with the "augmented elected Faculty Council.
d. Opportunities for requests for additional information.
19. Framework:
a. Focus on where we have consensus based on the structure survey, meetings with Divisions, ranks and titles, and feedback from affinity groups.
b. Cannot include everything that SIAS wants to do.
c. Cannot include everything that SIAS needs to do.
d. Three or four Divisions with appointment; units built around curriculum/fields of study; Permanent funding for structure: Buyouts for chairs \& vice chairs, training for Division leadership (chairs, etc.), resources for major coordinators; not an ongoing negotiation over core resources.
e. Includes interdisciplinary center, consideration of staff, explicit consideration for diversity, equity, and inclusion of historically marginalized and underrepresented faculty in the new units.

## 4. MOTION:

a. Resolved: Faculty Council should, on behalf of the faculty, consult with the Dean's Office to develop a formal proposal to initiate a reorganization process of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts \& Sciences as defined by Faculty Code 26-41. In this consultation, Faculty Council should advocate that:

1. The proposal includes either three or four new units, which will serve as the tenure and contract homes for the faculty.
2. The proposal identifies these units primarily based on curriculum and field affinities.
3. The proposal includes full, non-contingent funding for the administrative functions of the new units including all requisite course releases, discretionary funds, and other sources of administrative support for associate deans, chairs, and vice chairs in the new units.
4. The proposal includes additional resources to support the chairs of the new units beyond their existing course releases and administrative stipends.
5. The proposal includes additional resources to support major coordinators, which oversee sizable programs in the form of course releases or similar compensation.
6. The proposal includes the development of a center that could sponsor curricular development, house interdisciplinary majors, support collaborative research, and support community engagement grounded in social justice from faculty across the SIAS.
7. The proposal includes additional resources in the form of course releases and similar compensation for faculty from each of the new units to support their work for an interdisciplinary center.
8. The proposal includes explicit consideration for the role and workload of staff in the new units.
9. The proposal explicitly addresses the role the chairs of the new units will play in campus-wide policy deliberations within Academic Affairs.
10. The proposal includes explicit consideration for diversity, equity, and inclusion of historically marginalized and underrepresented faculty in the new units by ensuring the new units are of sufficient size to connect faculty from diverse backgrounds and identities, builds new opportunities for collaboration amongst faculty interested in social justice including faculty integrating research and the creative arts, develops pathways for underrepresented faculty to become leaders in the new units, and ensures curriculum anchored in equity, inclusion, and critical inquiry is meaningfully supported in the new structure.
b. PROPOSED AMENDMENT moved by Chris Beasley: " 11 . The proposal includes resources to identify and address potential needs for cultural merger or integration"; seconded by Jim Gawel.
11. We should request resources like those used in corporate mergers to bring organizational cultures together as there is likely to be conflict if Divisions are merged.
12. Some faculty appreciate the spirit of the amendment, but would support something more generic.
13. Maybe something more basic about resources to improve culture and welcome new members.
14. We are made up of many cultures, so maybe different wording would be more appropriate.
15. This would be a short-term transitional need, while the RCEP is about the operational structure; this process will take time and there might be concerns that we can't work this out within our own faculty.
16. Amendment is on the floor; Bill calls the question; vote on the amendment; the proposed amendment does not pass. [Yes-14; No-35; Abstain-5]
c. Other discussion on the motion:
17. Could we make it more than one center? There are many models for centers and one center could house multiple centers in the future.
18. Faculty Council is advocating for this motion and that's where the majority of the work will be done.
19. No one is completely sure how the process will work because of Executive Order 5 there are many questions still unanswered.
20. Faculty Assembly should be aware, but there's nothing they need to do at this time.
21. Peter Selkin moves to approve the motion regarding the development of a formal proposal to initiate a reorganization of the School of Interdisciplinary Arts \& Sciences as defined by Faculty Code 26-41; Scott Rayermann seconds. The motion passed. [Yes-56; No-2; Abstain-1]

## 2. Reports \& Opportunity for Questions.

a. Faculty Senate:

1. Class A Legislation - Clinical Practice Faculty $>3^{\text {rd }}$ consideration; Action: Approve for faculty vote
2. Class A Legislation - Faculty Senate Ex Officio Membership > $2^{\text {nd }}$ consideration; Action: Approve for faculty vote
3. Class A Legislation - Elected Faculty Council Membership $>2^{\text {nd }}$ consideration; Action: Approve for faculty vote
4. Class A Legislation - Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy Membership (?) $>2^{\text {nd }}$ consideration; Action: Approve for faculty vote
5. Class A Legislation - Voting Time Limits $>2^{\text {nd }}$ consideration; Action: Approve for faculty vote
6. Class A Legislation - Secretary of the Faculty Qualifications $>2^{\text {nd }}$ consideration; Action: Approve for faculty vote
b. SIAS end-of-year celebration today at Camp Colvos starting at 3:30 pm.

## 7. As May Arise.

## 8. Reading of the Votes.

a. Ben Meiches read aloud the roll call of the votes for the June 2, 2023, SIAS Faculty Meeting.

## 9. Adjourn.

a. The meeting adjourned at 2:27 pm.

| Faculty Attendance (total attendance: 72) | Rayermann, Scott |
| :--- | :--- |
| Alcaide Ramirez, Dolores | Reusch, Johann |
| An, Yajun | Ross, Steve |
| Bandes B. Weingarden, Maria-Tania | Selkin, Peter |
| Bartlett, Alan | Sesko, Amanda |
| Beasiey, Chris | Skipper, Haley |
| Blair, Nicole | Sun, Huatong |
| Budge, Tyler | Sundermann, Libi |
| Burghart, William | Than, Duong |
| Card, Ryan | Thuma, Emily |
| Cardinal, Alison | Ugur, Etga |
| Chaffee, Leighann | Vanderpool, Ruth |
| Chavez, Sarah | Velasquez, Tanya |
| Clarke Dillman, Joanne | Vincent, Jack |
| Cline, EC | Williams, Charles |
| Compson, Jane | Xiao, Jenny |
| Coon, David | SIAS Staff (total attendance: 7) |
| Davis, Jeremy | Asplund, Jessica |
| de Veritch Woodside, Vanessa | Chon, Ricky |
| Demaske, Chris | Holcomb, Anna |
| Dinglasan-Panlilio, Joyce | Jones, Kathleen |
| Eaton, Julia | Kissoondyal, Jon |
| Eccleston, Sara | Pitt, Tracy |
| Erickson, Ander | Tolentino, Karl |
| Eschenbaum, Natalie | Unknown (total attendance: o) |
| Finke, John |  |
| Forman, Michael |  |
| Gardell, Alison |  |
| Gawel, Jim |  |
| Hanneman, Mary |  |
| Harvey, Matthew |  |
| Heery, Eliza |  |
| Heinz, Morgan |  |
| Heller, Jutta |  |
| Horak, Peter |  |
| Jones, Ever |  |
| Kennedy, Maureen |  |
| Kim, Kelly |  |
| Krayenbuhl, Pamela |  |
| Kula, Michael |  |
| Kunz, Bill |  |
| Laux-Bachand, LeAnne |  |
| Lee, Hyoung |  |
| Lee, Jeong-Ah |  |
| Lovász, Anna |  |
| Ma, Eva |  |
| Machine, Augie |  |
| Martens, Jacob |  |
| Masura, Julie |  |
| Meiches, Ben |  |
| Miller, Alex |  |
| Miura, Cassie |  |
| Moore, Ellen |  |
| Myers Baran, Jennifer |  |
| Nicoletta, Julie |  |
| Nutter, Alex |  |
| Perone, Luke |  |
|  |  |

