**Department of Asian Languages and Literature**

Faculty Meeting: 14 February 2020

Minutes

Prepared by Zev Handel – adjusted by fixing typos on May 5, 2020

Voting faculty in attendance: Ahmad, Atkins, Bi, Cao, Cho, Cox, Dubrow, Hamm, Handel, Iwata, Jesty, Kim, Lü, Mack, Marino, Matsuda-Kiami, Nishikawa, Ohta (A.), Ohta (K.), Pahlajrai, Pauwels, Sandjaja, Takeda, Turner, Won, Yu

Also present: Yoon (staff), Self (staff), Carlyle (student)

*Meeting called to order at 3:35pm*

**I. Approval: Minutes of previous meeting, held January 17, 2020 (Handel)**

Minutes are approved without objection.

**II. Announcement: New faculty position approved**

*Atkins announced that the deans have approved our request for another tenure-track position, beyond the Buddhist Studies professor and Vietnamese lecturer that we are currently searching for. We can choose the position. Our current hiring plan calls for a professor in either Korean or Southeast Asian, but does not rank them. We must now decide which position to advertise for and tell the deans by the end of March.*

**III. Faculty Senate Update (Jesty)**

Jesty: The proposed legislation to change lecturer titles to teaching professor titles is moving forward. My proposed amendment to the legislation, clarifying expectations for appointment, reappointment, and promotion as not requiring research, passed. The legislation will almost certainly pass the Senate two weeks from now, then it will go to the faculty for a final vote. It would go into effect this coming fall quarter.

The faculty committee on academic standards is going through the criteria for approving new programs and new courses. These standards were never approved by the faculty as a whole. If you have opinions on these standards and the process of proposing new programs and courses, please let Jesty know. This process will take a while, but it’s an opportunity to try to make some needed changes.

**IV. Chair Search (Dubrow)**

Dubrow is the internal liaison for the chair search committee, which will present possible department leaders to the deans for consideration. Christian Novetzke (JSIS), Matthew Mosca (History) and Priti Ramamurthy (Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies) are the external members of the committee. They will hold meetings on Friday, March 6 with department stakeholders: group meetings in the morning, individual meetings in the afternoon. They encourage you to participate and give useful feedback on the direction of the department. Opinions can also be sent to the committee via the anonymous on-line survey, which closes March 9.

**V. Merit Review Procedures (Atkins) – see Agenda attachments**

Atkins: The executive committee, following guidance from the last department meeting, has prepared a draft of merit review procedures and criteria to use this spring. Our goal is to discuss and vote on guidelines that can be implemented now. But note that this is a work in progress; we can revise our guidelines any time.

Mack: In the executive committee, we started with the rubric from English and modified the criteria. Our goal was to balance complexity with fairness. For now, we decided not to weight the merit of different achievements, but just to list them in broad categories. We anticipate in the future we may want to add explicit weightings and create separate lists for professor and lecturer faculty. We also wanted to make clear that Research isn’t a top-level criterion for lecturers as it is for professors.

Handel: We focused on what would distinguish High Merit from Merit. We wanted to be sure that meritorious achievements would count toward merit over a period of several years.

Ohta: Some things are missing from service, such as participating in certificate programs and acting as program or language coordinator. We should also think about separating peer teaching reviews from student teaching evaluations rather than having them in a single category. Student evaluations measure satisfaction more than quality, and can sometimes be low in cases we want to encourage, like the first time an innovative or experimental new course is offered. Perhaps in judging student reviews we shouldn’t say “high numbers” but should say something like “consistently show student satisfaction”.

Jesty: We do need to move toward a more objective, numerical metric for weighting achievements. But at the same time, a weighting will never fully replace qualitative considerations, nor should it, because each faculty member’s situation is unique. In other words, our rubric should be a starting point, not a rigid measure of merit.

Dubrow: What does “*n* years” mean in how long meritorious achievements persist?

Handel: It means we haven’t settled on a figure and it’s open for discussion. It could even differ from achievement to achievement, for example a book might be meritorious for several years but high peer teaching evaluations for only one or two years.

Dubrow: A numerical system, even tempered as Jesty suggests, might be too rigid and mechanical. An algorithmic system like that is used in the UK and seems to make people really unhappy as they strive to meet the target numbers.

Bi: I may not feel qualified enough to give a numeric score on some criteria for some people, depending on the field. So I don’t want to be forced to make a strict numeric calculation. We have to implement this in a way that we can do every year without getting swamped in calculations.

A. Ohta: I don’t think we should quantify. People are so different, and their strengths vary over time as their careers develop. Maybe we should also be valuing “collegiality”—who helps make the department work, is always willing to step up when asked to do service.

Pauwels: I propose to have faculty members send additional criteria to the executive committee if they think of more. I also am concerned about the secrecy of the merit review process and the results. It can lead to suspicion and it makes it difficult for faculty to figure out where they need to improve, or if their work might have been misunderstood. Maybe we should give evaluators a chance to talk with evaluees during the process to understand what they are doing, and let evaluees know how they can improve in future to get higher merit, by giving each evaluee feedback on the results of their merit review and the specific reasons they received that result.

Jesty: I think our endpoint should be that we have criteria that enable us to feel comfortable distinguishing merit from high merit as evaluators. I don’t think this document does it yet. It’s just a list. How do I know when the threshold crosses from merit to high merit? Both as someone being evaluated and someone doing evaluations, this document doesn’t tell me what to expect.

A. Ohta: If lecturers become teaching professors, then principal lecturers will become full teaching professors, and will be able to vote on the merit of associate professors. That means teaching faculty judging research faculty. Perhaps that speaks against using a numerical metric.

Atkins: We need a version of this in place by spring quarter for our merit reviews. (It doesn’t have to be our final word; we can revise it again before the 2021 merit reviews.) So we need to move expeditiously. How shall we proceed if we aren’t ready to vote on this today?

*The faculty by unanimous consent decided to refer this rubric back to the executive committee. The committee will create a revised version, taking into consideration today’s discussion and any additional criteria that are sent by email to the executive committee. We will plan to vote on a final version at our next meeting in March.*

**VI. Department Colloquium (Mack)**

Mack: Monday, March 9, 3:30-5:00pm will be the first colloquium of the year, given by Jesty. There will be light snacks and drinks.

**Meeting adjourned at 4:24pm.**