Faculty Council Meeting
April 23, 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
Cynthia Howson	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	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. Faculty Discussion Guidelines (20 min)
4. Teaching Evaluation Implementation (20 min)
5. Minutes (10 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 April 16, 2024 meeting.

3. Faculty Discussion Guidelines
   a. 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. Pre-written statements—should we allow pre-written statements into meetings?
      4. Voting process—do we need to change voting practices?

5. Ensuring equity and consistency in presentation content/scope and subsequent communication/mentoring
   b. Should we constitute a taskforce or subcommittee to develop a draft of these guidelines or try to develop norms internally to Faculty Council?
   c. How do we envision "enforcement" of guidelines versus other policies in the discussion especially if self-regulation is necessary in some spaces (i.e., full professors)?
   d. Timeline— we only have 6 remaining Faculty Council meetings this quarter
   e. Should these be departmental or school-level guidelines or policies?
   f. Discussion:
      1. Some faculty wonder why we are considering this now and not waiting until departmentalization.
      2. We have cases to discuss now and we'll have so much work to do after departmentalization.
      3. This is an ongoing issue and we have 14 promotion cases this fall; we can always modify the policy after departmentalization.
      4. Is this a conflict of interest—four members of Faculty Council are going up for promotion next year?
      5. We could have a taskforce heavy on full faculty.
      6. Is the main problem our unwieldiness?
      7. It's important that we do this before departmentalization to create norms about evaluating each other to protect faculty in departments.
      8. This is not a conflict of interest because protecting faculty is our highest value.
      9. It's good to do it before departmentalization to have some uniformity; the departments can make changes as needed.
      10. The School of Education has a document that we could modify for our needs.
      11. Everyone has a conflict of interest because we're all going up for promotion at some point, or serving on a promotion committee; we would want School-wide endorsement.
      12. We could create a subcommittee to revise the School of Education document and have a listening session with faculty at different ranks, similar to what was done with the W subcommittee.
      13. Ben Meiches makes a motion to create a subcommittee of Steve Ross, Cynthia Howson, and Haley Skipper to create guidelines on faculty promotion; Amanda Sesko seconds; all in favor.

4. Teaching Evaluation Policy
   a. Recommendation to simplify the process for peer teaching evaluation and to ensure we're implementing/following teaching policy.
   b. Propose three actions:
      1. On behalf of the faculty, task the Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion with tracking peer evaluations over the academic year.
      2. On behalf of the faculty, task the Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion with identifying trainings for peer evaluation.
      3. Adopt a simple form indicating peer evaluations were conducted in accordance with SIAS policy to be deposited with the Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion.
   c. Discussion:
      1. We should add that the observer considered the instructor's goals and classroom expectations for the class as part of the pre-evaluation consultation.
      2. Faculty will want to know what will be done with the form.
      3. There will still be a letter for the peer evaluation, this form is just to show that the evaluation was conducted in accordance with SIAS policy.
      4. We agreed on this process two years ago, but we didn't have a way to track it; this provides accountability.

5. Tracking is set up for labor and equity purposes.
6. Not answering yes to all the questions means that you are out of alignment with best practices.
7. There is concern for the additional labor; can we make the templates for the evaluation easier for the evaluator?
8. We need to have resources with multiple examples on the HUB; we need good peer evaluation training; SBHS has a very robust peer evaluation document already.
9. Do we want to have some faculty trained to be peer evaluators and have them train others? Or should that be their service to the School?
10. Many faculty members feel ill equipped to document evaluations to be sure that there isn't any negative impact down the line.
11. Newer faculty don't know who to ask to do peer evaluations; it feels like a lot to ask your colleagues to do this work for your; having a centralized space so you know who can be asked would help; some people do a lot of evaluations and some are never asked.
12. Some only want people in their discipline to evaluate them, but it can be others if you want specific things to be evaluated; one person doesn't need to evaluate everything in the classroom.
13. Chairs and mentors could do the evaluations for the first couple of years; it's easier to write regular conference letters if you've sat in the classroom with them.
14. The Dean could mandate that chairs do the evaluations.
15. We need more time to talk this over.
   d. Ben will send links to peer evaluation templates from other institutions.

5. Minutes – Staff Role
   a. There have been ongoing discussions about staff taking minutes for the faculty especially with respect to accuracy and quality.
   b. Currently the Dean delegates staff to take the minutes.
   c. None of the staff are explicitly trained or hired for note-taking duties.
   d. It is necessary to take minutes both per Robert's Rules and RCW 42.30: "The minutes of all regular and special meetings except executive sessions of such boards, commissions, agencies or authorities shall be promptly recorded and such records shall be open to public inspection."
   e. Choices Presented to Us:
      1. Staff provide minutes only including agenda, items discussed, attendees, and votes with no recording—no summary.
      2. Staff provide a hybrid of UW Faculty Senate style minutes (discussion and summation) —staff want meetings recorded to verify this and all presentations checked for accessibility three days prior to the meeting.
      3. Staff no longer serve as Dean's delegates for minutes taking—faculty may need to elect a secretary.
   f. Discussion:
      1. We will need to discuss how to proceed with the faculty.
      2. This would apply to all meetings where staff currently take minutes.
      3. This is a staff workload issue as a substantial amount of time is spent on minutes.
      4. If a transcription is not wanted, then all that's required by Robert's Rules is #1.
      5. Minutes came up in a climate conversation last week.
      6. There is a lot of emotional labor concerning the minutes.
      7. We should move to #1 as it's the most equitable.
      8. Minutes tend to editorialize the discussion.

6. Updates/For the Good of the Order
   a. No updates were shared.

7. **Adjournment**
   a. The meeting was adjourned at 10:02 am.