Faculty Council Meeting
January 9, 2024 — 12:30–1:30 pm
WCG 322 or Zoom: https://washington.zoom.us/s/91299827850

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	A
Haley Skipper	SAM Representative	P
Amanda Sesko	SBHS Representative	P
	SHS Representative	
Scott Rayermann	Lecturer at Large (SAM)	P
Anna Groat-Carmona	Dean's Diversity Advisory Council representative (SAM)	A
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	A
Stephen Ross	Associate Dean of Faculty Development & Student Support	P
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. Search Waiver Update (2 min)
4. World Language Requirement (25 min)
5. RCEP (25 min)
6. Updates/For the Good of the Order (2 min)
7. Adjournment

---

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 January 2, 2024 meeting.

3. Search Waiver Update
   a. We voted on this last week, but hadn't heard back from Sarah Davies Breen at that point.
   b. Sarah Davies Breen responded that we could apply for the search waiver before going through the whole process and then send the report to OAP as an addendum to the search waiver application.
   c. She is concerned about the length of time to complete the process.
   d. This applies to non-temporary positions, including spousal hires (new edits in blue):

Once a line is approved, the Office of Academic Personnel (OAP) expects a unit faculty vote before when considering granting search waivers (in cases of PT Lecturer positions, such votes can be delegated to Faculty Council on an annual basis). To ensure that voting faculty are well informed, SIAS will follow the following practices:

1. The Division Chair and Dean's Office will collaborate to submit a search waiver application to OAP. This will allow initial review, but OAP will not approve the waiver until a faculty vote is held (step 6).
2. 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 four business days of the line approval, the Dean's office will complete steps 2 through 3 while the committee continues to be formed.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. A vote will be held online for three business days.
7. The committee report and faculty vote count will be submitted to OAP as an addendum to with the search waiver application.

b. Haley Skipper motions to adopt the Search Waiver process as revised; Scott Rayermann seconds; all in favor.
c. Ben will discuss with Jeremy about when we need a position description and rubric.

4. World Language Requirement
   a. Bonnie Becker came in Autumn quarter to discuss this with us because CADRs, which includes World Languages, are being sunsetted.
   b. World Language is currently only a SIAS graduation requirement because it is an admission requirement.
   c. How should creating a World Language graduation requirement be developed and debated?
   d. This is considered Class B legislation so it does not have to go to the full faculty.
   e. Should this be taken up by ICC or by a special task force?
   f. In the past, the full faculty voted to make it a graduation requirement, but there was push back from advising because we could lose students to other UWT Schools that do not have this requirement.
   g. It would be better to have a group that has different faculty members other than just chairs (ICC).
   h. This is an equity issue as it puts our World Language faculty at risk; we should have a task force that includes them and allies.
   i. There has been inconsistency in the past whether or not this would fall to ICC.
   j. There is a draft of a rationale for a graduation requirement from 2016.

k. The Office of Undergraduate Education would need to be involved for it to become a graduation requirement.
l. Would this be a graduation requirement for all of SIAS or just specific majors?
m. We would need to be able to do placement tests, which are on the OUE website.
n. It is a graduation requirement at UW Seattle for the College of Arts & Sciences and the School of Social Work.
o. We'll make an announcement at the faculty meeting on 1/12/24 to see who might be interested in serving on a taskforce.
p. We'll discuss this again next week.

5. RCEP
   a. Has anyone received any feedback on the messaging/process sent last week?
      1. SBHS has asked how the ranking system will work; they want to be able to talk about the models as a division.
      2. We need to figure out what would be most useful for the Chancellor and EVCAA; which models have strong support and which ones people could live with; remember this is all advisory.
      3. Maybe we need an initial vote and then a re-rank.
      4. We have not received any models so far.
   b. Should Faculty Council propose a model as part of the discussion?
      1. Can we bring the models back that were already discussed in the faculty meeting?
      2. People were confused about what they were voting on—to vote the three-department model presented down or to let Faculty Council provide additional 3, 4, and 5 department models.
      3. The faculty rejected the model that was presented, but we can use the previous model or create a new one.
      4. Most people voted it down to support seeing additional models.
   c. Status of the models sent to the faculty in December?
      1. Should we put them into the form?
      2. The form makes you drag and drop the majors and the minors into departments; you have to place everything somewhere in order to move on and then someone must advocate for the model.
      3. This can't just be about your own department; you need to justify where you've put all the majors and minors and think about the curriculum.
      4. We need to make clear that resources are finite and it's the EVCAA's purview on how to allocate those resources.
   d. Preliminary thoughts on the structure of the faculty discussion at the 2/2/24 meeting?
      1. If Faculty Council submits models, who will advocate for them?
      2. Ben will send an update to the faculty regarding the process.

6. Updates/For the Good of the Order
   a. We'll hear soon from the Taskforce on Compression.
   b. Snow is predicted for later this week; we'll make a decision about Friday's faculty meeting either Thursday evening or Friday morning.
   c. Next week we'll talk about the budget recommendation and searches.

7. Adjournment
   a. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.