

Faculty Council Meeting

February 20, 2024 – 12:30–1:30 pm

GWP 320 or Zoom: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/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
Etga Ugur	PPPA Representative	P
Haley Skipper	SAM Representative	P
Amanda Sesko	SBHS Representative	P
Emily Ignacio	SHS Representative	P
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	P
Stephen Ross	Associate Dean of Faculty Development & Student Support	A
Vanessa de Veritch Woodside	Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion	A

AGENDA

1. Introductions, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment, Agenda (2 min)
2. Consent Agenda: Minutes (1 min)
3. Faculty Meeting Agenda (5 min)
4. RCEP (30 min)
5. W Subcommittee Proposal (15 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 February 13, 2024 meeting.

3. Faculty Meeting Agenda

- a. Introductions, Land Acknowledgment, Safety Briefing, Agenda (5 min)
 - b. Minutes of the 2/2 Faculty Meeting (2 min)
 - c. Compression and Equity Taskforce Report (25 min)
 - d. W Subcommittee Report (25 min)
 - e. Dean's Climate Response (10 min)
 - f. Faculty Discussion on Climate (40 min)
 - g. Updates (10 min)
-

4. RCEP
 - a. We received 109 responses to the survey; Only six full professors completed the survey.
 - b. Thanks to Amanda Sesko for putting together the survey results.
 - c. The quantitative results can be shared; we'll do more anonymizing before we share the qualitative results.
 - d. Qualitative comments:
 1. Maintaining SAM as currently constituted should be a priority.
 2. Major concerns about the principles, organization, governance structure, and resourcing of the proposed third/social science department in most of the 3-department RCEP proposals (Davis, Hoover, Nichols).
 3. Concerns about resource allocation/size.
 4. Tweaks to specific models (e.g., Davis model, but with Environmental Sustainability in SAM).
 - e. RCEP Discussion:
 1. This is our final advisory discussion with the Dean.
 2. We should look at the strengths and challenges of each model.
 3. Which models "best advance the mission and effectiveness of the School"?
 4. We propose concentrating on the differences between Hoover (most preferred 3-department model), Meiches, and Williams (as most preferred 4- and 5-department models).
 - f. Why focus the conversation on the Hoover, Meiches, and Williams models?
 1. The differences between the most popular 3-department models (Hoover, Nichols) is the placement of the Asian studies minor (a relatively minor issue).
 2. The differences between Hoover, Meiches, and Williams models are very significant with respect to the construction of social sciences with implications for faculty autonomy, resourcing, etc.
 3. The survey responses show very divergent opinions on how to construct the third, fourth, or fifth department.
 - g. SAM and CAC want no significant changes in their department; many feel that the third department was just thrown together.
 - h. Will there be enough resources to build the third department? Resources should not just be determined by the number of faculty in a department.
 - h. Hoover model:
 1. Staff, CAC, SAM, and SBHS favored Hoover model.
 2. Hoover plus Davis model retains the autonomy of majors and helps to organize in a way that makes more sense.
 3. SAM didn't vote Davis high because of Environmental Sustainability.
 4. Hoover strengths: rationale is well-thought out as are curricular pathways, which benefits students.
 5. Staff overwhelmingly voted for Hoover model; advisors know the curricular pathways the best; replicates the original 3-department model and mirrors the labor that went into this process.
 6. Similar size departments; process of review and promotion straightforward; builds substructure for when there is growth.
 7. EGL will die in a 5-department model; 3- or 4-department models seem safer.
 8. Some majors have a lot of admin work (math, writing) with UWT campus.
 - i. Williams model:
 1. Based on survey data was there enough support for the Williams model to forward it? Most of PPPA voted for it, but others felt that the 5-department model was untenable.

2. The strengths of the Williams model are that it respects the integrity of individual programs, gives more autonomy, and supports already developed curriculum.
 3. PPPA's clear #1 is Williams, with #2 being Meiches; history is in both SHS and PPPA.
 4. Preference for PPPA to remain independent has been consistent.
- j. Meiches model:
1. There was a lot of support for Meiches in CAC, but it was lowest in SBHS.
 2. Some like the idea of putting Psychology into SAM; SBHS afraid of losing their well-functioning body.
 3. Psychology is very interdisciplinary and can work with the sciences or social sciences.
- k. The Dean's report will include the model or models with the strongest support of the faculty, the pros and cons of the different models; and how they will forward the mission of SIAS; this is to create a structure for the appointment and budgetary homes of people and curriculum; there will still be autonomy for the majors; admin will be created within the departments.
5. W Subcommittee Proposal
- a. We did not have time to discuss the proposal.
6. Updates/For the Good of the Order
- a. Likely FC meeting agendas:
 1. 2/27 Compression and Equity Taskforce and W Subcommittee
 2. 3/5 Teaching Modalities
8. Adjournment
- a. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 pm.