



Department Faculty Meeting
Friday, December 10, 2021, 3:30-5:00pm
Location: Zoom, <https://washington.zoom.us/j/98953550694>

Minutes FINAL 2022.1.4

I. Call to Order

II. **Vote:** Approval of Minutes (November) (*standing item*; Handel) 3:30-3:35
Request for corrections or objections. No objections. Minutes approved.

III. **Update:** Brief Announcements (*standing item*; Handel) 3:35-3:45

1. Office staffing and hours

Can't expand hours this month but hoping to open office for normal hours on Jan. 3. If you need something outside of the open hours you can knock on the door or send an email to request access. Gowen will be locked over winter break. Faculty have keys but TA's don't have keys but they can request a key if necessary.

2. Nazry Bahrawi's arrival

Will be arriving in about two weeks.

3. FERPA updates – *email reminder will follow* (<https://registrar.washington.edu/staffandfaculty/ferpa/>)

Registrar has noticed an uptick in violations of FERPA. There is a 20 minute video refresher on FERPA linked through the registrar website. We can send student info (including grades) to people inside UW with a need to know. For example, you can send something to a UW advisor using email. But it's not recommended. Better to share things through shared drives.

4. Winter quarter teaching

- Email from Provost Richards on December 1 about information to include in syllabus
- Time schedule office delays for change requests

Winter quarter the same as autumn quarter. Provost wants information in all syllabi about modality of instruction. There is also a registrar page that has language for things like disability accommodations. Religious accommodation language is the one thing mandated by state law.

Time schedule office is understaffed. Not handling requests for changes until all courses have gotten into classrooms. Change requests are unlikely to be addressed until after the quarter starts.

5. Gowen Hall closure over winter break (instructors have keys; TAs can coordinate with staff)

6. Lunar New Year celebration (January 28?)

Didn't have this last year. Looking doubtful about whether we can have one this year. Probably won't be allowed to have food in a UW space. If we do do something, it won't be a potluck. Has been hard for faculty to socialize and for faculty and grad students to socialize. Chair will provide some department funds if programs want to plan some kind of event to get faculty and grad students together.

7. Update to [Graduate School Memo #12](#): We need a policy on graduate faculty membership. Grad school is requiring every unit on campus to create a policy for how and when we will select people to be members of the graduate faculty. Will work on that with GEC and the proposal will come back at a future meeting.

IV. **Update:** Korean search (Cho) 3:45-3:50

Since last fac meeting: have done zoom interviews with candidates on the long list. Committee has created short list with 3 candidates. Currently setting up remote campus visit schedules. Looks like they will be similar to the visits last year. Visits will be in last half of January.

V. **Discussion:** Korean search - potential conflict of interest (Handel; Appendix 1) 3:50-4:00

One of the candidates has a PhD from UW. What should we do when we have job candidates who were formerly students? Department has not developed a policy but we should. The English department requires complete recusal of someone from a search committee if they ever sat on a PhD committee for a candidate. That level of stringency is not required but we should develop something. Should be thinking about a system that will work into the future. The committee has had a meeting with Chad Allen about the issue. They provided a range of options to consider.

Faculty member: Chad said this was not a serious case because of a few factors: candidate is already working elsewhere, search committee faculty was late joiner to their committee, and was in a different department. But they've decided to set a good precedent. Search committee member thinks it's best to recuse themselves from job talks and faculty meetings with candidates. Will have a check-in and check-out meeting with each candidate. Will participate in social half-hours. Will watch recordings of job talks and faculty Q&A time.

Faculty member: Is this the best policy? Should we really let the committee members decide how/when to recuse themselves? Shouldn't the policy be created by someone else? How is this going to work moving forward, when there are a lot of people that we know in the field? There are other problems that might come up like knowing someone from hometown, being a former peer.

Faculty member: Thinks search committee chair should be present and asking questions as the main person in the program doing the hire. Procedure doesn't make sense.

Faculty member: Agrees with that point. Will be more beneficial and more informed discussion if all committee members are participating. That will benefit us all.

Faculty member: Thanks the committee for thinking about this seriously. How we discuss searches is something that gets out and is discussed. Better to be overprotective than underprotective. Better to have too much integrity than too little. But personally feels it wouldn't be too bad for all committee members to be at the job talks. But this is less of an issue now that the decision is a departmental decision at this point: it's the department that is going to make the decision from the short list. Thinks plans described sound appropriate, if very cautious.

Faculty member: This seems overly restrictive and risks undermining the integrity of the search in other ways, by making it less thorough and informed.

Faculty member: The search committee has discussed the issue at length. This is the decision the committee chair thinks best.

Faculty member: Think about it from the other candidates' perspective. It deprives candidates of the opportunity to meet the committee chair. Doesn't seem fair to do that. Shouldn't this be a department decision, rather than a decision by the committee? Thinks it should be a collective decision. Can't imagine the procedure is necessary.

Faculty member: Agrees that it's a department decision. At this stage the search is a departmental endeavor. The committee chair will have check-in and check-out meetings with all the candidates, which will give them a chance to interact. This case is less serious than internal hire-type cases.

Faculty member: Isn't this a case of developing rules that unfairly punish "innocent" faculty and programs for past problematic behaviors that haven't yet themselves been properly addressed?

Faculty member: The other committee members did not pressure the committee member concerned: it was their decision. The candidate in question was on everyone's long list without knowing about any prior connections.

Chair: Needs to think about the right mechanism for addressing this.

Faculty member: Not just this one case. Will affect future searches. Need to think about more fair searches in the future. Important to have guidelines that will work into the future.

VI. **Discussion:** Future direction of department hiring (Handel) 4:00-4:15

Disciplinary core of the department has been changing. Do we have a vision for the direction the department is moving as a whole?

Faculty member: The 5-year hiring plan focuses us on what we want to do next. We haven't really thought about the overall direction of the department. Do we want to be a dept where any humanist discipline OK? Do we want to be more language focused? Do we want to include any discipline? What is going to keep us together moving forward?

Faculty member: Important to discuss this. Hopes discussion will include how to value premodern subject areas, outside of the contemporary-focused incentives generated by ABB.

Faculty member: We should get more feedback and hear everyone's perspectives. Sense that the world is getting expansive. Disciplines are opening up and overlapping, whether we like it or not. Doesn't see a problem with being open. Expansiveness is going to benefit the department and its students more than restrictiveness. Our identity will be "we do a bunch of things." Doesn't want the department to fall further behind: sees the department as very traditional, maybe even regressive. Especially for students, willingness to engage with broader trends will probably serve us well.

Chair: let's continue to discuss.

Faculty member: Issues are underlying our hiring plan, so things are interconnected with the present.

Faculty member: Maybe we can have some ways to gather ideas and opinions anonymously so that everyone has a chance to speak.

Chair: Maybe faculty can propose some questions that they think might work.

VII. Discussion: Five-year hiring plan (Handel; Appendix 2) 4:15-4:40

Chair: Shares the results of the straw poll. [attached] Chinese texts and Korean language were tied. Chair did not take part in the survey. The other four positions were pretty far behind the first two. Plan to keep those positions on the list, but unranked behind the other two, and we will revisit and rank them in future years.

Has prepared two motions, one with the Chinese text position at the top, and one with Korean language as top. Invites comments.

Faculty member: Insofar as one is teaching faculty and one is tenure track, would it be possible to say we don't rank them and ask for both of them?

Chair: Yes, we can do that. But there are going to be few positions college-wide because of low retirement numbers. If we don't rank them, the College would end up deciding for us if they grant us one. Which is OK but we should do it with eyes open.

Chair conducts Zoom poll to see which of the two positions is higher priority. Not a vote, just a poll. Results: 23 participated, 14 for Korean language, 9 for Chinese texts.

Chair asks whether we should make a formal motion and vote, or whether they can move forward with the results the poll provided.

Faculty member: Should we have the program reps present the positions?

Chair: Yes we can do that. Invites program reps to speak.

Faculty member: Better to do a separate binding vote.

Faculty member: Thinks maybe not.

Faculty member: Is it required to have a faculty vote?

Chair: No, not required. We have our own procedure. But chair would like a vote to guide their decision. Suggests we move to the vote on Catalyst.

The motion lists the Korean position first and Chinese texts second.

Faculty vote: 26 eligible voters, 25 cast ballot. 18 yes, 6 no, 1 abstain, 1 not voting

Motion passes. Chair will base the hiring plan on the motion.

We will return to the plan next year too.

VIII. Discussion: Distance Learning (DL) course designation policy (Handel; Appendix 3) 4:40-4:55

All course change proposals go to the college curriculum committee and then go up to a University curriculum committee. Getting a DL designation on a course is the same as any other course change proposal. The College is basically hands-off. They are leaving it up to departments to make decisions. Not clear what is happening at the university level. There is some movement in the Faculty Senate to develop some more types of course, like hybrid, and to firm up requirements for various types but that is a few years down the road.

The department has not had a conversation about how to handle DL proposals. Chair has asked other humanities department chairs. Most concrete response was from linguistics: they have decided to leave it up to the individual faculty. Also asked individual faculty to do the work of getting the courses approved. Chair has not found any other departments with policies. Dean gave advice: because the DL designation is merely permission-giving, might consider erring on the side of DL for everything. But not clear what will happen with designations so it's best to keep an approx. 3 year time horizon in mind: not worth worrying about courses not being taught in that timeframe.

UEC current guidelines are included as appendix but we should discuss further.

Faculty member: Likes linguistics department approach. But our department is probably more diverse than theirs is. We are operating in the landscape of personal preferences, so there's going to be variety. Likes the department giving feedback, submitting them and seeing what the results are.

Faculty member: If a course is approved with DL designation, an individual faculty member couldn't decide to offer it by themselves. That process would be overseen by the program and chair. If the department wants to get in the business of what's optimal in an online environment there's a lot of value in having oversight. But the question of "what happens if everything goes online" is something of a red herring. Actually offering DL courses would be part of a program process, signed off on by the program coordinator and chair.

Faculty member: That's correct. But for the application process, there needs to be a syllabus included and the fact that DL is a separate designation indicates there should be some difference between DL syllabi and normal ones.

Chair: There was something that was distinguishing these two types of course.

Faculty member: Everyone has now taught online, which is different from how things were when the DL distinction was originally made. But maybe now that everyone has experience with remote instruction, what is the difference? How did we feel about the kinds of courses we were teaching remotely? What's the best way to do it? Favors autonomy for professors who want to try distance learning.

IX. Update: Modality for winter quarter faculty meetings (Handel) *4:55-5:00*
[Time did not allow for discussion of this item.]

X. Adjournment

Attendees: Zev Handel
Kaoru Ohta
Kirk L. Van Scoyoc
Jennifer E Dubrow
Paul S. Atkins
Youngie H Yoon
Joseph Marino
Heekyoung Cho
Ted Mack
JungHee Kim
Desiana Pauli Sandjaja
Izumi Matsuda
Amy Snyder Ohta
Christopher Kyle Chesbro
Justin Jesty
Liping Yu
Itsuko Nishikawa
Ping Wang
Bich-Ngoc Turner
Fumiko Takeda
Chan Lu
Eunyoung Won
Nyan-Ping Bi
Davinder L Bhowmik
Yuqing Cao
Chris Hamm
Jameel Ahmad

Yen Kim Nguyen
Akiko Iwata
Heidi R Pauwels

Appendix 1: Potential Conflict of Interest in Faculty Searches

[Faculty Code 24-50](#)

[N]o faculty member, teaching assistant, research assistant, department chair, dean, or other administrative officer shall vote, make recommendations, or in any other way participate in the decision of any matter which may directly affect the **employment**, promotion, academic status or evaluation of a student with whom he or she has a conflict of interest.

...

A conflict of interest exists when a person participating in a decision has a **substantial connection or interest** related to individual(s) affected by the decision that might bias or otherwise threaten the integrity of the decision process or that might be perceived by a reasonable person as biasing or threatening such decisions. This includes familial, romantic, or sexual relationships and financial conflicts of interest. **This may also include some professional relationships**. No list of rules can provide direction for all the varying circumstances that may arise; good judgment of individuals is essential.

[emphasis added]

The Department Chair and the Search Committee met with Chad Allen, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement on Monday, December 6, to discuss the issues of a potential conflict of interest and the potential appearance of conflict of interest. We would like to discuss this issue with the department faculty as a whole before proceeding with on-site interviews, talks, and meetings.

Appendix 2: Five-Year Hiring Plan ([Google Drive folder](#))

- The raw results of the straw poll are [here](#).
- An analysis of the results of the straw poll, with vote totals ranked and weighted, is [here](#).

Summary of results:

- Positions D (Assistant Professor, early Chinese texts) and E (Assistant Teaching Professor, Korean language) are tied for the top ranking.
- The remaining positions are farther behind, with none having a clear edge for third priority.

The Executive Committee discussed the results on December 7, 2021, and drafted the following two motions for consideration. They are identical except for the order of priority of the top two positions.

1. “The Department faculty recommends that our hiring plan for the next five years prioritize the positions of assistant teaching professor of Korean language and assistant professor of ancient Chinese texts, in that order. Beyond these two positions, we reaffirm longer-term interest in four tenure-line positions, while recognizing that ongoing flux in our department may lead us to revise the specific proposals in future iterations of our hiring plan: Sinophone literature and Hindi language/literature (both carried over from last year’s hiring plan), South Asian media/culture, and Japanese/Korean linguistics.”
2. “The Department faculty recommends that our hiring plan for the next five years prioritize the positions of assistant professor of ancient Chinese texts and assistant teaching professor of Korean language, in that order. Beyond these two positions, we reaffirm longer-term interest in four tenure-line positions, while recognizing that ongoing flux in our department may lead us to revise the specific proposals in future iterations of our hiring plan: Sinophone literature and Hindi language/literature (both carried over from last year’s hiring plan), South Asian media/culture, and Japanese/Korean linguistics.”

For reference, this is last year’s motion, passed at the faculty meeting held on December 11, 2020:

“The Department faculty recommends that our hiring plan for the next five years prioritize the position of assistant professor of Korean language/literature/culture carried over from our previous hiring plan. We also affirm the importance over the next five years of additional positions in our South Asian and Chinese programs. We propose hires in modern Hindi language and literature and in modern Sinophone literature, without prioritizing one over the other, while recognizing that ongoing flux in these programs may lead us to revise these specific proposals in future versions of our hiring plan. We also affirm the need for further strengthening of the Korean program beyond the currently proposed hire, which may lead us to include another faculty position in Korean in a future iteration of our hiring plan.”

Appendix 3

Among the options we can choose for applying for DL designations:

- 1) Impose no restrictions at the department level. Send requests up and see what happens at the College and University level. Applying for a DL designation would be up to individual faculty. This would enable us to get DL designations as quickly as possible for maximum flexibility. We can decide later if, when, and how to offer them.
- 2) The faculty decide on a set of standards to apply to DL courses, including a justification for remote delivery and modification of course structure, assignments, and/or assessment to adapt to the all-remote teaching environment.
- 3) Any degree of restriction or oversight between #1 and #2.

It is up to us to decide what we want and what role, if any, the Undergraduate Education Committee should play.

Current guidelines from Undergraduate Education Committee on proposals for adding a Distance Learning (DL) designation to an existing course

- 1) Should have most of the DL format worked out. Proposals must demonstrate how student challenge and engagement will be maintained in a fully remote environment: generally speaking, remote versions of in-person classes are not enough. The instructor should have concrete plans to actually teach the course in DL format sometime in the next 2-3 years.
- 2) Should explain why 100% remote instruction is necessary/ideal. Courses that are taught partially remote are classified as hybrid.
 - a) Justifications should not reference Covid or other possible emergency situations: such emergencies will be handled on an emergency basis, as Covid was.
 - b) Justifications should focus on student benefit. For instance,
 - i) the class is more effective in DL format, or,
 - ii) UW students benefit from sharing a class with students from other places.
 - c) Increased enrollment will only be considered a valid justification if the viability of the course is at risk due to low enrollment (as sometimes happens with summer courses, for instance).
 - d) Instructor disability may be a sufficient justification for distance learning but such situations should be handled through the chair and HR.

Appendix 4: Analysis for survey results for 5-year hiring plan

- B: Assistant Professor - Hindi language and literature (was in last year's plan)
- C: Assistant Professor - Sinophone literature and culture (was in last year's plan)
- D: Assistant Professor - early Chinese Texts
- E: Assistant Teaching Professor - Korean language instructor
- F: Assistant Professor - South Asian media studies
- G: Assistant Professor - Korean/Japanese or East Asian linguistics
- H: Assistant Professor - Divisional hire in Digital Humanities

| | First- choice rankings | Second- choice rankings | Third- choice rankings | Raw Totals | Weighted Totals (3 / 2 / 1) | Weighted Rank | |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------|----------|
| B | 3 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 6 | B |
| C | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 3 | C |
| D | 7 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 31 | 1 | D |
| E | 7 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 31 | 1 | E |
| F | 2 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 4 | F |
| G | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 4 | G |
| H | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 | H |
| Total | 21 | 21 | 16 | 58 | 121 | | |