Faculty Council Meeting
January 16, 2024 — 12:30–1:30 pm
GWP 320 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	A
Amanda Sesko	SBHS Representative	P
Margaret Griesse	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	A
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. Consent Agenda: ICC Agenda (1 min)
4. Search Waiver Update (2 min)
5. World Language Taskforce (15 min)
6. Budget Recommendation (15 min)
7. RCEP (15 min)
8. Updates/For the Good of the Order (2 min)
9. 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.
   b. Margaret Griesse is representing SHS today; they will have alternating reps for this quarter.
   c. Marc Nahmani is representing SAM today.
   d. Libi Sundermann is representing PPPA today.

2. Consent Agenda
   a. No objections to the agenda.
   b. No objections to the minutes of the January 9, 2024 meeting.

3. Consent Agenda: ICC Agenda
   a. No objections to the ICC agenda.

4. Search Waiver Update
   a. We voted on this last week, but there was a question about the rubric and position description.
   b. This applies to non-temporary positions, including spousal hires (new edits in green): Search waivers require a line / position on the search plan. The Faculty Council, the Division Chair, Dean, and EVCAA will collaborate to develop line requests, which will include a position description. The practices below will occur only after a line is approved and the funding source is identified.
   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. The search waiver application and position description will be shared with this committee upon its formation. 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. Amanda Sesko motions to adopt the Search Waiver process as revised; Cassie Miura seconds; [Yes: 8; No: 0; Abstain: 1]

4. World Language Taskforce
   a. There was some push back after last week's faculty meeting to have ICC handle this as part of our bylaws.
   b. ICC may set the graduation requirement, but it would be better to have a faculty taskforce instead of having the chairs set the policy.
   c. Ben and LeAnne worked on a charge letter for the taskforce.
   d. Augie Machine and Emily Ignacio volunteered to be on the taskforce.
   e. Should the taskforce focus only on world language or include culture as well?

f. We could align with UW Seattle and keep it as world/foreign language.
g. We already have diversity in a global context as a requirement.
h. It will be difficult for a couple of our majors to complete this requirement, if they didn't take a language in high school.
i. APCC is reviewing the CADRs, not SIAS; UW Bothell has already stopped tracking CADRs.
j. We currently have Spanish and Chinese, but what about other languages for study abroad programs?
k. The Office of Undergraduate Education handles the placement exams.
l. UW Seattle teaches over 40 languages; we want UWT to recognize the value of a language as an important element of a liberal arts education.
m. Do we have any data on how many students would need to take a world language?
n. We are trying to get the data; some high schools may have limited their foreign languages because high school graduation requirements have also changed.
o. We should see if there are any other Schools at UWT that would be interested in this as a graduation requirement.
p. Community college language enrollments, like ours, have suffered since the pandemic.
q. Scott Rayermann moves to create a taskforce to investigate the creation of a world language graduation requirement; Cassie Miura seconds; all in favor.

5. Budget Recommendation
    a. There were a few emails regarding the budget presentation at last week's faculty meeting.
    b. A lot of concern in SAM because they are already understaffed and there is a safety issue regarding the labs; many are feeling overwhelmed.
    c. This is a very difficult position to be in and it's demoralizing.
    d. If there is student demand, we will ask for new lines; we will be talking about search requests at the Shared Leadership meeting later today.
    e. We aren't cutting areas of instruction, but we can't cut part of a line; cutting the highest salaries; we didn't anticipate having these vacant lines
    f. There are some proviso funds for lab safety.
    g. We need data to support our requests, but the EVCAA makes the final decision.
    h. The alternative to this budget proposal would be to not reappoint a teaching professor; we'd have to do it when someone is up for reappointment (not based on enrollment or demand for courses); we are trying to maintain our current colleagues; some other units are cutting personnel.
    i. Cutting all of the PDF would not reaching the required amount and it's much harder to get those funds back later.
    j. We need to remember that these are lines and not specific faculty; we hope for no more tragic events.
    k. Amanda Sesko moves to approve the budget cut as presented; Scott Rayermann seconds; [Yes: 8; No: 0; Abstain: 1]

6. RCEP
    a. We did not have time to discuss the RCEP.

7. Updates/For the Good of the Order
    a. There were no updates.

7. Adjournment
    a. The meeting was adjourned at 1:37 pm.