

Faculty Council Meeting

January 2, 2024 — 12:30–1:30 pm

WCG 322 or Zoom: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/97666438717>

MINUTES

Faculty Council Member	Capacity	Present (P), Absent (A), or Recusal (X) ¹
Ben Meiches	Faculty Council Chair	P
LeAnne Laux-Bachand	Vice Chair	P
Cassie Miura	CAC Representative	P
Jane Compson	PPPA Representative	P
Haley Skipper	SAM Representative	P
Amanda Sesko	SBHS Representative	P
	SHS Representative	
Scott Rayermann	Lecturer at Large (SAM)	A
Anna Groat-Carmona	Dean's Diversity Advisory Council representative (SAM)	P
Ex-Officio Members	Capacity	(P), (A), or (X)
Natalie Eschenbaum	Dean	P
Hyoung Suk Lee	Chair, Committee of Chairs	P
Kathleen Pike Jones	Assistant to the Dean	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	A
Vanessa de Veritch Woodside	Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion	P

AGENDA

1. Introductions, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment, Agenda (2 min)
2. Consent Agenda: Minutes (1 min)
3. Faculty Meeting Agenda (5 min)
4. Search Waiver (5 min)
5. Dean's Office Budget Proposal (10 min)
6. RCEP Proposal Process (30 min)
7. Updates/For the Good of the Order (2 min)
8. Adjourn

1. Introductions, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment

- a. Faculty Council Chair Ben Meiches called the meeting to order and the council took a moment to reflect on the SIAS Land Acknowledgment and Ground Rules before beginning the business of the meeting.

2. Consent Agenda

- a. No objections to the agenda.
- b. No objections to the minutes of the December 12, 2023 meeting.

3. Faculty Meeting Agenda

12:30: Introductions, Land Acknowledgment, Safety Briefing, Agenda

12:35: Minutes

12:40–1:00 Faculty Affairs Workload Self-Assessment

1:00–1:30 Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion Elavie Ndura: "Washington State Senate Bill 5227: Opportunity and Compliance"

1:30–2:00 Dean's Office Budget Presentation

2:00–2:20 Search Presentations

2:20 Updates / Adjourn

Processes: We are transitioning to Microsoft Forms for virtual/remote requests instead of handling via email; some faculty have had problems with the QR codes so we are looking at other ways to handle voting.

4. Search Waiver

- a. Jeremy has updated the search waiver document (**edits in red**), which applies to non-temporary positions, including spousal hires.
 1. A committee of three faculty with expertise **broadly** related to the proposed role will be formed by the Dean or their designee in consultation with the Chair of the division in which the proposed faculty will be associated. A committee chair will be appointed from the committee members. **If the committee is not formed within 4 business days of the line approval, the Dean's office will complete steps 2 through 3 while the committee continues to be formed.**
 2. The committee chair will collect from the candidate the following materials: a. CV; b. A two-page statement describing how their teaching, service, and/or scholarship have supported the success of first generation and/or students from racial, ethnic, and gender backgrounds underrepresented in the academic field; c. At least one artifact (a publication, grant proposal, syllabus, etc.) that reflects their work; and d. Three letters of recommendation.
 3. The committee chair will also organize presentation(s) (~~research or teaching, as appropriate; online or in person~~) by the candidate open to the SIAS faculty.
 - a. **Teaching demonstrations for tenure-track, teaching-track professors, and lecturers (non-temporary)**
 - b. **Research demonstrations for tenure-track and research-track professors.**
 4. The committee will prepare a report and recommendation based on the submitted material and presentation(s). This should be shared with the voting faculty **two business** ~~three~~ days before a regular or special meeting.
 5. A vote will be held online for three business days.
 6. The committee report and faculty vote count will be submitted with the search waiver application.
- b. Jane Compson motions to adopt the Search Waiver process; Haley Skipper seconds; all in favor.

4. Dean's Office Budget Proposal

- a. Context:
 1. With an understanding that we cannot trim salary from lines, and that lines are not associated with people or academic fields.
 2. With the knowledge that it has been historically easier to make cases for additional faculty to meet student demand than it has been for additional operational or staff funding.
 3. With the expectation that remaining vacant lines will be used to hire faculty that can best support student demand and maintain curricular pathways toward completion of majors.
 4. And with intention of requesting additional funding for staff and mini-grants to support SIAS's long-term success . . .
- b. Recommendation:
 1. Cut the two highest faculty salaries from currently vacant lines and one classified staff salary, which will be a vacant line starting 1/4/24; this also cuts the PDF for the two vacant faculty lines, which we will move to STF.

2. This would make the cut \$318,108.73 (the ask is \$291,371.00); we hope to request the reallocation of the additional \$26,737.73 for mini-grants; if that isn't possible, we would ask that it be put toward next year's budget cut.

5. RCEP—EVCAA's Message to Dean

a. Natalie shared this message with the faculty on December 19, 2023: *"Thank you for sharing an update on the restructuring conversations ongoing in SIAS. I understand and respect the complexity of the undertaking and the considerable efforts made by the SIAS faculty council, faculty, and dean's office to work toward a different model for the School.*

I have consulted with Chancellor Lange and request that you submit a proposal to Chancellor Lange and me by March 1, 2024. This proposal should explain as clearly as possible the model most likely to advance the mission and effectiveness of the School, should reflect consultation with your elected faculty council, and should document the level of consultation made with faculty in the school.

Whether there is a clear preference of the faculty, or if there are different levels of preference for different models, please present the strengths and challenges of the model or models with strongest support that are most likely to advance the mission of and effectiveness of the School, based on your consultation with the faculty council, its consultation with the faculty, and your own analysis of the School's needs."

b. Considerations:

1. Need for faculty/majors/units to propose their own models, if desired.
2. Limited window for further faculty deliberation given only two meetings (1/12) and (2/2) prior to (3/1) due date.
3. Clear call for Dean's office to include model or models in recommendation so possibility of ranked or preference voting rather than yes/no binary voting.
4. Given that the RCEP won't go forward until March, can we advocate to delay transition until start of AY 25–26?

c. Hypothetical Process:

1. January 2: Decide on process in Faculty Council
2. January 2–January 23: Faculty may submit independent models to faculty—Faculty Council can facilitate
3. February 2: Faculty meeting where faculty advocates could give brief presentations in defense of their proposed models
4. February 12–18: Ranked voting by faculty and staff on Microsoft Forms, including all models for all faculty
5. February 20: Final Faculty Council meeting to discuss giving feedback to the Dean
6. March 1: Dean submits report to EVCAA/Chancellor

d. Questions this creates?

1. What constitutes "advocating" for a proposal?
2. Does Faculty Council "advocate" for a model?
3. What structure would we need for sharing/arguing for models in the Faculty Meeting?
4. What happens to the models Ben shared/sent that were just advisory?
5. Ranked voting is beneficial in some situations and problematic in others including if there are a large number of proposals, so a. "Middling" preferences sometimes win out; b. Smaller constituencies (majors/divisions) often lose voice because of numbers.

e. Discussion:

1. Any faculty member should be able to submit a proposal.
2. A proposal needs to show the number of departments, demonstrate where the curriculum will live, and a justification for the model.

3. It would be best to share models in a Microsoft Form or in Qualtrics to have everything in a similar style and everyone could see what has already been proposed.
4. Ben and LeAnne will discuss what will be sent to SHS, since they do not currently have a rep on Faculty Council.
5. The discussions should be about the curriculum, not our current divisions.
6. There have only been two proposals so far—one with the Center and one without.
7. Every faculty member has been given the opportunity to participate in this process.
8. Submissions should be contingent on advocacy at the Faculty Meeting on 2/2.
9. Ben will reach out to those who have shared other possible ideas.

6. Updates/For the Good of the Order

- a. No updates were shared.

7. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 1:33 pm.