

Faculty Council Meeting

April 16, 2024 — 9:00–10:00 am

TPS 110 or Zoom: <https://washington.zoom.us/j/97171736586>

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
Amanda Sesko	SBHS Representative	P
Emily Ignacio	SHS Representative	A
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	P
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. Consent Agenda: ICC Agenda (1 min)
4. Promotion Meeting Faculty Discussion Guidelines (20 min)
5. Teaching Modalities (20 min)
6. Compression and Equity Updates (5 min)
7. Updates/For the Good of the Order (2 min)
8. 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. One amendment to the minutes of the April 9, 2024 meeting: Strike out 3d: ~~d. We could put hybrid courses with either in-person or online courses;~~ the amended minutes were unanimously accepted.

3. Consent Agenda: ICC Agenda

- a. No objections to the ICC Agenda.

4. Promotion Meeting Faculty Discussion Guidelines

- a. Over the past year questions have materialized about:
 1. Role of the Dean's office in the dialogues;
-

2. Best practices for the conversation on promotion/tenure;
3. Question of who is supposed to “enforce” practices.
- b. We need to consider these are emerging because of:
 1. Some shift in the EVCAA’s policy for the Dean’s involvement;
 2. Questions about length, timing, and use of prepared statements in meetings;
 3. SIAS use of remote/electronic voting.
- c. Faculty Code 24-54 Procedure for Promotion specifies (subsection B): “If there are three or more eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school), **those eligible voting faculty members shall then meet to discuss the candidate’s record, and following the discussion they shall vote whether to recommend promotion.** If an initial report was produced by a subcommittee, all members of the subcommittee may choose to participate in the discussion, but only eligible voting faculty in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may be present for the vote.”
[<https://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>]
- d. SIAS is awkward in relation to the Faculty Code because the Dean is the Chair and Executive Order 1 states: the director or chair shall preside at the meetings of the department,” but SIAS is listed as a School (not a department) in Executive Order 9.
- e. Dean’s office runs the meetings, but the function is recording (per code) and faculty should set the guidelines for these discussions.
- f. Key issues:
 1. Presence, participation, quorum—do you need to be present to participate in a discussion?
 2. Length of statements/engagement—are there limits to how long you can have the floor to comment on someone?
 3. Prepared statements—should we allow prepared statements into meetings?
 4. Voting process—do we need to change voting practices?
- g. Discussion:
 1. Steve and Jessica compile notes for the report; the TP4 form requires a discussion about scholarship, teaching, and future prospects.
 2. Everyone, based on rank, is allowed to vote even if they didn’t participate in the discussion.
 3. SET has gotten in trouble for voting in the meeting when not everyone is present.
 4. Small issues can be magnified in the conversation, which doesn’t allow ample time to discuss other candidates.
 5. The meetings are meant to allow 30 minutes per candidate: 5–8 minutes for the report (should be 2–3 minutes, but we are compensating for those who don’t read the report in advance) then questions or highlights of the report.
 6. Who manages the conversations will change with departmentalization.
 7. Dean’s office can’t manage the discussion; the Dean is to do a separate evaluation.
 8. We need to have a standard practice from a bias reduction standpoint.
 9. We should transition to a more effective process now; many faculty members don’t want to be part of a promotion committee because discussions have gone off the rails.
 10. Our process is too long (11 days); it’s bad practice because time allows bias to step in.
 11. FC reps should discuss this with their constituencies and we’ll discuss again in two weeks.

5. Teaching Modalities

- a. Registrar data shows 66 percent in-person, 19 percent hybrid, and 14 percent online (all modalities) for Spring 2024, which is identical to Spring 2023 data (rounding to whole integers).

- b. The comparison to SIAS is 59 percent in-person, 26 percent hybrid, and 14 percent online in terms of seats.
- c. Students enrolled at 54.24 percent in-person, 28.10 percent hybrid, and 17.66 percent online.
- d. Registrar stated that “fill levels was an interesting question they’d get back to me on;” they have a large “uncategorized” category.
- e. Bothell and Seattle are starkly different:
 - 1. Bothell: 77 percent in-person, 17 percent hybrid, and 5 percent online
 - 2. Seattle: 89 percent in-person, 4 percent hybrid, and 5 percent online
- f. Takeaways:
 - 1. There needs to be a campus-wide conversation about why we are so different from Seattle/Bothell considering best interests of the students and curricular delivery.
 - 2. School-wide our numbers don’t differ from campus drastically (about 1/20 courses scheduled), but internally that may not be the case.
- g. Discussion:
 - 1. We should compare our numbers to other urban-serving institutions.
 - 2. We would lose students if we make changes different than the rest of UWT.
 - 3. What is driving these changes: student need or faculty preference?
 - 4. It’s more challenging to have set expectations in an online course; we need to specify what counts as engagement.
 - 5. Jeremy took a quick look at Autumn quarter: 79 percent in-person, 11 percent hybrid, 10 percent online.
 - 6. We need an internal policy by major to assess the schedule thoughtfully.
 - 7. We need a motion to ask Faculty Assembly to do this work across campus.

6. Compression and Equity Updates

- a. Current salary table has been distributed.
- b. Sarah Davies Breen confirmed that we don’t have access to demographic data.
- c. We still need to identify a mechanism for identifying years at rank/since promotion.
- d. We still need to consider anonymity in the data.
- e. Starting salary data:
 - 1. AY 21–22 average starting salary (8 positions): \$8,812.50
 - 2. AY 22–23 average starting salary (6 positions): \$8,785.09
 - 3. AY 23–24 average starting salary (2 positions): \$8,472.25
 - 4. Overall average starting salary last three years: \$8,759.69
- f. Discussion:
 - 1. It was depressing to look at the compression.
 - 2. We shouldn’t share all of the salary data.

7. Updates/For the Good of the Order

- a. No updates were shared.

8. Adjournment

- a. The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 am.