

SIAS Faculty Meeting
March 1, 2024, 12:30–2:30 pm
Milgard Assembly Room, William Philip Hall

Attendance: See page 7

Agenda

1. Introduction, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment, and Safety Briefing
 2. Consent Agenda: Proposed Minutes from the January 12, 2024 Faculty Meeting
 3. Compression and Equity Taskforce Report
 4. Writing (W) Policy Presentation
 5. Dean's Update on Climate
 6. Faculty Discussion on Climate
 7. Updates
 8. Adjourn
-

Votes/Action Summary

1. There were no objections to the minutes of the February 2, 2024 meeting; the minutes were accepted by unanimous consent.
-

1. Introductions, Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment, and Safety Briefing.

- a. With a quorum present, Faculty Council Chair Ben Meiches called the meeting to order at 12:38 and the group took a moment to reflect on the SIAS Ground Rules, Land Acknowledgment, and Safety Briefing before beginning the business of the faculty meeting.
- b. Announcements: Due date for the Founders Endowment Funds for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Works is March 25, 2024, contact Cheryl Greengrove for additional information; the Faculty Research and Scholarship Celebration will be May 10, 2024.

2. Consent Agenda: Approval of Minutes.

- a. There were no objections to the minutes of the February 2, 2024 meeting; the minutes were accepted by unanimous consent.

3. Compression and Equity Taskforce Report.

- a. Last year, units were given an option to give 4 percent raises or 3 percent raises with 1 percent for extra merit/compression.
- b. In December 2017, SIAS faculty voted against awarding extra merit; in FC and DOT deliberations last year, it was clear that we did not have a formula for identifying compression or inequity and voted for 4 percent raises.
- c. In September, Faculty Council constituted the Compression and Equity Taskforce to assist in developing a model for identifying compression; the members were Randy Nichols, Katie Baird, Rita Than, and Vanessa de Veritch Woodside.
- d. Basics of the Taskforce Model:
 1. Self-built model begins with a B benchmark salary for tenure line assistant professor (teaching line 90 percent of this):
 - a. PS Assistant = $B(1 + m)^x$
 - b. PS Associate = PS Assistant $B(1 + p)(1 + m)^y$

- c. $PS\ Full = PS\ Associate (1+p)(1 + m)^z$
 - d. Variable for promotion and annual raises
 - e. Question of relative vs. absolute comparison
 - f. Comparison for SIAS data shows significant compression in teaching professor associate/full ranks and professor associate/full ranks on the order of 1–2 million dollars assuming \$80,000 as base rate
- e. Key Questions:
1. Should the benchmark for determining salary compression be determined at the School level, as done here, or should benchmark salaries differ by divisions, by discipline, or by some other point of comparison?
 2. What base salary should be used, both for Assistant Professors and Assistant Teaching Professors?
 3. Since nearly all SIAS faculty have some degree of salary compression and funds are limited, in the event of money being available to address compression, what priorities should guide those decisions (e.g., compression as calculated in one year vs. over the course of a faculty's career, based on absolute or relative measure of compression)?
 4. Should factors other than time in rank be taken into consideration (e.g., whether faculty have received an extra-meritorious raise in the past or a retention offer)?
 5. Are there other issues related to equity that are not captured in this approach to measuring compression?
 6. How can we track any progress, or lack thereof, of addressing compression on an ongoing basis?
 7. Should we also be looking at compression and salary issues among part time faculty?
- f. Compression and Equity: Next Steps:
1. Guiding values: a. Addressing the most serious or dire need while also; b. not making the perfect the enemy of the good when we will receive \$50,000~\$150,000 to address a \$2-million-dollar systemic problem.
 2. In the event we are given the opportunity to make compression adjustments in the next merit cycle, use this formula as a basis to identify compression and generate a list of priorities guiding its application?
 3. Build on the Taskforce's work to improve this in relation to currently neglected factors and make periodic adjustments.
- g. Questions/ Comments:
1. This is not the first time that we've tried to address compression.
 2. The Taskforce did not look at salaries by name; looked at rank and time in rank only.
 3. The Taskforce tried to account for promotions and raises; there were no raises in the lean years; Faculty Assembly tried to address some compression issues last year; our current structure makes this more complex.
 4. The slides show significant compression; UWT is paid less than UW Seattle or UW Bothell.
 5. The UW is working to create an aggregated salary database, but it's unclear when it will be complete or who will have access.
 6. We should look at this periodically and track progress; could be part of the associate dean for Equity and Inclusion position.
 7. We would need more data to compare the ideal salary with the actual salary.
 8. We should deal with internal compression before looking at peer institutions.
 9. What does compression/equity look like when looking at race or gender specifically? How would that be factored in?
 10. We would need to analyze data so that we don't replicate the inequities.

11. We could create a standing committee to look at this regularly; they would need access to more specific data.
 12. Tri-Campus is looking at creating a retention policy that makes retention offers more transparent.
- h. Let your Faculty Council reps know if you have any further thoughts.

4. Writing (W) Policy Presentation.

- a. The subcommittee members were: BethAnn Hoover, Jeremy Davis, LeAnne Laux-Bachand, Scott Rayermann, Tabitha Espina, and Tanya Velasquez.
- b. Our presentation today:
 1. The process for creating this policy
 2. The current state of W courses in SIAS
 3. The policy the subcommittee developed
 4. How this policy will benefit students, staff, and faculty
 5. What steps will be involved in identifying W courses
 6. How specific majors/courses will be impacted
- c. The process for creating this policy:
 1. 2018: APCC passes new W guidelines
 2. October 2023: FC constitutes the W policy subcommittee
 3. November 2023: Subcommittee surveys division chairs/vice chairs on existing W guidelines and assessment
 4. December 2023: ICC reviews a draft form for W courses
 5. January 2024: Faculty meet/email with subcommittee
 6. January: First-year writing faculty provide feedback
 7. Jan–Feb: Subcommittee revises policy and ICC/ad hoc forms
 8. February 6: Subcommittee presents W proposal to FC
 9. February 27: FC votes to approve the W policy
 10. Class B legislation does not require a full vote of the faculty, but if there are significant concerns we will discuss them in FC
- d. The current state of the W in SIAS:
 1. The W is a *bottleneck* for many students. Some can get the 10 W credits required for graduation in their majors and others cannot because of the low number offered and/or competition from students in other majors.
 2. Hence some students choose Ws based only on what's available in MyPlan.
 3. There's a *mismatch* between W goals—meaningful major-level writing—and reality—students taking Ws outside their major just to get the credits.
 4. There's a *lack of transparency*: APCC keeps a list of W courses on campus, but SIAS faculty can individually or collectively decide a course is a W. There is no process for making a course a W or notifying your major, division, or the dean's office. Staff add a W designation to the time schedule upon request.
 5. The W can be *unpredictable*: Faculty can award the W on an ad hoc basis—giving W credits to individual students in a section or to the whole section at the point of grading—which means students may encounter more writing than they expected when registering.
- e. The proposal the subcommittee developed:
 1. Commits to the W guidelines passed by APCC in 2018, which affirm the goal of the W: to give students meaningful writing experiences and training in fields(s) related to their major. These guidelines also do away with restrictions like page requirements—majors have the autonomy to assign rigorous, academic, or professional genres (types/forms of writing) that make sense for their major.
 2. Aligns with work underway from a Tri-Campus General Education committee.

3. Sets a default course cap of 24 to observe best practices when teaching writing (as defined by the Conference on College Composition & Communication and the MLA).
 4. Majors will revisit their W offerings in light of that cap and the number of students in their major with the goal that in the next few years all students will be able to get all their W credits from their major.
 5. All majors except Writing Studies will submit one form to their division chair, who will review and submit all their majors' forms to the IAS Curriculum Committee (to be shared with the director of writing and the dean's office) by October 2024. This form will describe the major's current W courses and any new or converted W courses they plan to offer starting in Autumn 2025.
 6. Faculty will no longer award ad hoc W credits to a whole section of students; awarding these credits to individual students will be phased out and will require a form similar to our Incomplete form.
- d. How our proposal will benefit students, staff, and faculty:
1. The W will be clearer and a more meaningful graduation requirement.
 2. Students can better plan their pathway through their major.
 3. 24-student courses will make it easier for faculty to read drafts, give feedback, and engage in other W best practices.
 4. Staff schedulers will need to make fewer adjustments and advisors will have more consistent and predictable offerings to help students with their long-term plans.
 5. There will be greater transparency at the major, division, and School-level for what courses are Ws and why.
 6. There will be pedagogical/professional development support from Director of Writing Tabitha Espina.
 7. Faculty who still wish to award some individual W credits and majors who wish to teach certain courses capped above 24 will have the autonomy to do so.
- e. The steps for identifying W courses:
1. Majors will meet to discuss questions like:
 - a. How well are our W courses giving students practice writing academic or professional genres associated with our field(s)/discipline(s).
 - b. How well do our W offerings meet the needs of the # of majors?
 - c. When in our curriculum should students encounter Ws? Which courses make sense as Ws and which don't?
 - d. What courses should be converted to Ws? What new Ws do we need?
 - e. If the # of majors necessitates only one or two 24-seat W sections a year, what teaching rotation system should we implement?
 2. Majors will then submit the W form to their division chair.
 3. The division chair will review and submit all their majors' forms to ICC (shared with the director of writing and the dean's office) by October 2024 (for the Autumn 2025 schedule).
 4. ICC will send a list of the new/converted W courses to APCC.
- f. How some specific majors/courses would be impacted:
1. Some part-time hires might be needed for Biomed and Psych courses to support demand on a short-term basis.
 2. Courses capped at lower than 24 students—such as the PPPA capstone—can remain at those lower numbers.
- g. Questions/Comments:
1. Some faculty have liked the discretion to recognize the work of individual students, but that will be phased out.
 2. The W should be with specific courses, not changed depending on the faculty.
 3. Tri-campus is working on a uniform description of a W course.

4. This is important work that has needed to be done since 2018.
5. We will need to offer more W courses; how will we support this long term for faculty?
6. Most majors will not need any additional resources; Psychology and Biomed will need more sections; we will reallocate in the short-term and ask for additional faculty for the long-term.
7. This policy will only be for the School; we need to have more conversations at the campus level.

5. Dean's Update on Climate.

- a. Climate has been brought up both explicitly and implicitly many times since Dean Eschenbaum started working at UWT.
- b. The challenge is that climate means different things to everyone, including: increased workload during the pandemic; experiences of racism, sexism, and ableism; silencing, bullying, harassment, or retaliation; rudeness, unkindness, or lack of professionalism; some want these issues to be called out publicly, while others believe that would further erode the climate.
- c. In 2017, as part of an academic program review for the SIAS graduate program, the reviewer highlighted significant concerns about the climate, e.g., faculty notice a general hostility in discussions about faculty of color, with abusive faculty meetings, differential service expectations for faculty of color, and lack of respect for mentoring diverse students.
- d. The Dean's Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) was created as a result of that program review.
- e. In 2019, DAC put forward a Diversity Action Plan with many significant suggestions on how to "grow a culture of inclusive excellence."
- f. Also in 2019, the results of the tri-campus climate survey were released with some concerns about SIAS: 51.2 percent of faculty and staff from SIAS indicated they are comfortable with the climate in their program or work unit and 82.5 percent of faculty and students are comfortable with the climate in their classes, while 61.7 percent of UWT faculty and staff and 82.7 percent of faculty and students felt this way, respectively.
- g. There were delays in working on climate due to changes in leadership and the pandemic, but one of the important changes that we have made was the creation of the Associate Dean of Equity and Inclusion position in late 2022 now held by Vanessa de Veritch Woodside.
- h. Climate is something that no single person causes or can solve, it's how we perceive working together as a collective, so we need your thoughts. What are your biggest climate concerns and what are the best steps forward to address those concerns?

6. Faculty Discussion on Climate.

- a. Vanessa gave an overview of some of our recent accomplishments:
 1. Support for four faculty members for DEI-related research in Spring 2024.
 2. Affinity groups starting in Spring 2024 to foster community connections.
 3. Working on creating a dashboard to look at graduation trends across majors, divisions, and SIAS at large and how that compares with other UWT Schools and faculty and staff demographics.
 4. Creating a list of available resources at UWT, UW overall, and outside.
 5. Creating a reading circle around transformative justice.
- b. Many of these things are not necessarily what you think of as climate, but they are beginnings; you can't step outside of climate and we will bring in a consultant if that's what is needed.

- c. Faculty and staff broke up into groups to discuss climate in-person and online; each group discussion will be led by a DAC member.
- d. Discussion prompts:
 - 1. Round 1:
 - a. What does “climate” mean to you (i.e., what does the term mean in the context of SIAS)
 - b. What are the primary climate issues that SIAS needs to address?
 - c. What actions does SIAS need to take/do in order to address these climate concerns?
 - 2. Round 2:
 - a. Briefly introduce how you think of climate in the context of SIAS?
 - b. What do you consider to be the primary climate issues that SIAS needs to address?
 - c. What actions should SIAS prioritize to address these climate concerns?
- e. Climate Discussion Exit Ticket:
 - 1. Reporting Bias Incidents: <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/equity/report>; this reporting process is open to anyone affiliated with UWT campus: faculty, staff, students, and visitors; reports can be submitted anonymously.
 - 2. Complaint Resolution: <https://www.tacoma.uw.edu/fa/hr/complaint-resolution>; you may seek resolution assistance regarding issues that include but are not restricted to harassing, discriminatory or threatening behavior; violation of university policy; mistreatment of members of the public; options for resolution include local resolution, the Office of the Ombud, and the Civil Rights Investigation Office; you may also contact Sarah Davies Breen, Director of Academic Human Resources, directly at sdaviesb@uw.edu or 253.692.4305 to discuss options.

7. Updates

- a. Faculty Senate:
 - 1. Faculty Senate met on 2/8 with a variety of issues under discussion.
 - 2. Primary thing of note is the formal request (made 2/22/24) for Senate Review and comment on Executive Order No. 59 “Excess Compensation to the Faculty.”
 - 3. Faculty wishing to review the proposed amendments, as well as the background and rationale being put forward for these amendments, should reach out to SIAS Senators. If SIAS faculty wish to inform the Faculty Senate Review, they should offer their insights to Senators before Friday, 3/8.
- b. Executive Council:
 - 1. EC modified two of its meetings in Spring to no longer conflict with the SIAS meetings; apologies to our EC members for this year, scheduling for next academic year will ensure this doesn’t recur.
 - 2. The Faculty Campus Safety Ad Hoc Committee Report, led by Dr. Robin Evans-Agnew, is collecting data and will provide a report in April or May.
 - 3. Report Supporting UWT’s International Faculty by Dr. Sharon Laing identifies strategies to support international faculty as they navigate the legal and cultural challenges of working at UWT.
 - 4. Feedback on Faculty Senate’s P&T Legislation (Code 24-54):
 - a. The proposed legislation should explicitly recognize the provost’s substantive role.
 - b. Expands the rights of promotion candidates to review and response to documents.
 - c. Clarifies which individuals play the role of “chair” and “dean” across the campuses.
 - d. Requires that a chair’s summary of department deliberation must be substantive.
- c. Faculty Council:
 - 1. FC is going to start working on developing policy for the school on teaching modalities.

2. FC will revisit how to implement the teaching evaluation policy.
3. After a decision on the RCEP is announced, FC will start to discuss transition planning. Please be aware that the effect of the faculty vote against the RCEP report at the December meeting effectively precludes the use of any of the procedures developed over the summer, so we will be starting from scratch.

8. Adjourn.

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 pm.

Faculty Attendance (87):

Ahn, Ji-Hyun	Khalil, Sana
Alcaide Ramirez, Loly	Kim, Kelly
Baird, Katie	Koontz, Tom
Bandes Becerra Weingarden, Maria-Tania	Kula, Michael
Barnes, Gordon	Kunz, Bill
Blair, L. Nicole	Laux-Bachand, LeAnne
Burghart, Will	Lee, Hyoung Suk
Cabrera Silva, Angel	Li, Jonah
Card, Ryan	Lovasz, Anna
Chaffee, Leighann	Ma, Eva
Chamberlain, Ed	Machine, Augustus
Chavez, Sarah	Martens, Jacob
Cline, EC	Masura, Julie
Compson, Jane	McMillin, Divya
Coon, David	Meiches, Benjamin
Davis, Jeremy	Miller, Alex
de Veritch Woodside, Vanessa	Miura, Cassie
Dinglasan-Panlilio, Joyce	Modarres, Andrea
Eaton, Julia	Moore, Ellen
Eschenbaum, Natalie	Myers, Jennifer
Erickson, Ander	Nascimento, Amos
Espina, Tabitha	Nichols, Randy
Forman, Michael	Nutter, Alexandra
Gardell, Alison	Ochoa Camacho, Ariana
Gawel, Jim	O'Donnell, Maeve
Greengrove, Cheryl	Oswal, Sushil
Griesse, Margaret	Perone, Luke
Groat Carmona, Anna	Ravichandran, Ilā
Hanneman, Mary	Raynor, Deirdre
Harvey, Matthew	Rose, Emma
Heery, Eliza	Ross, Steve
Heinz, Morgan	Sankaran, Saumya
Heller, Jutta	Selkin, Peter
Henderson, Meg	Sesko, Amanda
Hershberg, Rachel	Sharkey, Joe
Horak, Peter	Shatunova, Olga
Howson, Cynthia	Skipper, Haley
Ignacio, Emily	Sun, Huatong
Jones, Ever	Sundermann, Libi
Kennedy, Maureen	Than, Rita

Thuma, Emily
Vanderpool, Ruth
Velasquez, Tanya
Wang, Gene
West, Carolyn
Williams, Charles
Xiao, Jenny (Yi)

UWT Staff (7):

Asplund, Jessica
Hendricks, Audrie
Hoover, BethAnn
Jones, Kathleen
Pitt, Tracy
Tolentino, Karl
Woodman, Toni

Unknown number:

1 517 755 6655
1 505 414 9009