

Faculty Council Meeting

April 30, 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. Teaching Evaluation Implementation (25 min)
4. Compression and Equity—Faculty Years at Rank (10 min)
5. Transition Plan (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 23, 2024 meeting.

3. Teaching Evaluation Implementation

- a. Last session three steps were initially on the table:
 1. Task the Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion with tracking peer evaluations over the academic year.
 2. 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.
-

- b. We also added:
 - 1. We need to address the added labor of review.
 - 2. We need resources and templates to facilitate a stronger review process.
 - 3. Chairs and mentors potentially conducting initial reviews.
 - 4. Concerns that faculty would be resistant to using a new form/process.
- c. Goal is to extend the previous conversation with clarifying action items.
- d. Discussion:
 - 1. Tri-campus is working on legislation regarding student evaluations and will work on peer evaluations soon.
 - 2. We voted as a body to approve this policy; we should move forward with it because we don't know how long it will be before tri-campus takes up legislation.
 - 3. Some are uncomfortable with chairs or mentors doing the evaluation, but it would help chairs to see colleagues in the classroom since they have to write promotion letters.
 - 4. Since we know that student evaluations are biased, it's in our best interest to have better peer evaluations.
 - 5. We are not prescribing the substance of the evaluation, just that the form is used to make sure that the evaluations are conducted according to our policy.
 - 6. We could use a Qualtrics form to make tracking and data analysis easier.
 - 7. We should look at templates for evaluations, but that would require getting feedback from the faculty as it would most likely be Class A legislation.
 - 8. We could spend some time at the retreat looking at templates for evaluations.
- e. Ben Meiches moves that we task the Associate Dean of Equity & Inclusion with tracking peer evaluations beginning in AY 2024–25 and identifying trainings for peer evaluations; we will adopt this form beginning in AY 2024–25; Scott Rayermann seconds; all in favor.

4. Compression and Equity—Faculty Years at Rank

- a. Merit voting period closed on April 26th.
- b. Dean recommendations are due June 16th.
- c. Information we currently have:
 - 1. Current monthly salaries for all faculty.
 - 2. Average salary for hires over the last three years.
- c. Remaining questions:
 - 1. What mechanism can we use to identify time at rank/year of promotion?
 - 2. What assumptions do we want to make about promotion and tenure raises to use the model?
 - 3. We need to decide sooner rather than later; the answers will give us a sense of the allocation needed, but it won't determine the level of compression/inequity and where we recommend acting.
- d. Discussion:
 - 1. The spreadsheet that Ben shared has academic appointment history, but you have check line by line to see the dates.
 - 2. It is complicated by the title changes for teaching track faculty.
 - 3. We don't have demographic data to look at gender and race equity; this only addresses salary compression and equity in terms of dollars.
 - 4. Equity may be captured in the salaries; AHR won't support making changes based on demographics.
 - 5. We should still track the demographic data even if we can't make any changes based on it right now.
 - 6. Ben will work on going through the data and contacting people, if necessary, and bring it back to the 5/14 Faculty Council meeting.

5. Transition Planning

- a. The goal is to blueprint *how* to do the work of transition by the end of the academic year rather than complete a transition plan.
- b. Based on Ben's review, there are 35 policies or processes that need some degree of review or change in light of the transitions **NOT including the bylaws and attendant questions such as the status of the ICC**, some are simple corrections and some are at the EVCAA/Dean level, but many are questions of good governance process moving forward.
- c. Separate from existing policies, we also need to identify chairs and vice chairs and advocate for identifying their leadership needs and requesting professional development for them.
 1. Faculty Council could do all faculty-related processes independently;
 2. Taskforces and/or subcommittees divided by types of work or in progression, i.e., Structure Committee 1.0, 2.0, 3.0;
 3. Sequencing work so only "vital" changes happen moving into AY 2025–26 and then continue to work on subsequent changes over time.
- f. Discussion:
 1. Some of the changes will be easy because we've been out of alignment due to our structure.
 2. We should create communities of practice in the new departments.
 3. The bylaws will need a separate taskforce because 9 of 13 need to be revised.
 4. We hope that Mike Townsend will be available to give advice on the bylaws.
 5. UW Bothell has warned us to get the bylaws right, because it has caused problems for them.
 6. The new Faculty Council will have two members from each department and workload should be reduced because they will only consider School-wide changes.

6. Updates/For the Good of the Order

- a. The Friday, May 10th meetings with the EVCAA, will take place in WPH and via Zoom:
 1. 12:30 pm SAM
 2. 1:00 pm CAC
 3. 1:30 pm Social Sciences
- b. These are open meetings.

7. Adjournment

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