

Faculty Council Meeting

November 28, 2023 – 11:00 am–12:00 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
Jenny Xiao	SBHS Representative	P
Tanya Velasquez	SHS Representative	P
Scott Rayermann	Lecturer at Large (SAM)	P
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	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 (2 min)
2. Consent Agenda: Minutes (1 min)
3. RCEP Proposal (15 min)
4. Budget Presentation—Dean's Office (15 min)
5. Search Requests Criteria (25 min)
6. Updates/For the Good of the Order (2 min)
7. 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 November 14, 2023 meeting.

3. RCEP Proposal

- a. *“When an adjournment closes the session in an assembly having its next regular business session with a quarterly time interval, and having no members whose terms of membership expire before the next regular session (for example, in ordinary clubs and societies that hold frequent ‘regular meetings’): The complete order of business is followed at the next regular session. If a question was pending at the time of adjournment, it is taken up as the first item under unfinished business (or under special orders, if it was a special order)—resuming the question at exactly where it was*

previously interrupted. Any general or special order that was not reached is also taken up under unfinished business or under special orders, respectively.”—Robert’s Rules of Order 21:7

- b. We will pick up the RCEP discussion at the next Faculty Meeting as if we never left that conversation.
- c. Faculty Council can’t take any action at this point as it is before the faculty; we have fulfilled our obligation to create the proposal.
- d. There is still some confusion about what faculty can do to have agency in the process; Ben will send out a message to clarify.
- e. Faculty need to vote to accept the proposal, reject the proposal, or postpone the decision.
- f. Faculty can propose amendments to the proposal.
- g. People may be interested in a 4-Department model, but not all will want the same four departments.
- h. The Dean, Faculty Council Chair and Vice Chair are meeting with the EVCAA tomorrow (11/29) and hope to get more clarity on resources.
- i. This is a collective decision of the faculty.
- j. The proposed model takes into account all that was asked for last June and is based on a lot of conversations and compromises.
- k. It needs to be structure that advances the school, is forward thinking, and administratively sound.
- l. It’s hard to represent a division when there are very diverse opinions.
- m. SIAS can distribute resources according to the service to the university and operational budgets for each department, but there is only so much that can be changed because of limits on summer salary and caps on chair compensation.
- n. The EVCAA ultimately makes the decision regarding resources.
- o. It’s clear by what is happening exactly why we need to restructure; we cannot fairly represent all 129 faculty.

4. Budget Presentation—Dean’s Office

- a. We need to cut \$291,371 for next year.
- b. It’s a 1.67 percent cut, so slightly less than the 1.7 percent cut we were expecting.
- c. We have ~~four~~ **three** open faculty lines and one intention to retire.
- d. We have several open staff positions, but it’s not clear if we can cut a line if we are restructuring; staff lines have not been increased since 2014.
- e. Can cut two faculty lines and one staff line and put money back into STF.
- f. There’s a pool of money available from Academic Affairs so we could cut something and then ask for it back.
- g. If we can raise enrollment and student credit hours then we wouldn’t have to cut as much next year.
- h. We can cut a faculty line that is currently a full professor and then ask to replace as an assistant professor.
- i. We need to submit our budget cuts by January 19, 2024.

5. Search Requests Criteria

- a. We did not have time to discuss the criteria.

6. Updates/For the Good of the Order

- a. Next week (12/5) we’ll discuss Search Criteria, Search Waiver, IAS Seminar.

7. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 12:03 pm.