



Department Faculty Meeting  
Friday, October 15, 2021, 3:30-5:00pm  
Location: Zoom

*Minutes (FINAL version of 2021.11.08)*

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Vote:** Approval of Minutes (May and June) (*standing item*; Mack) 3:30-3:35

Faculty member in charge of taking meeting minutes 20-21 sent an email asking for corrections/additions. No replies to that email. Invited objections/corrections. None raised. **Minutes passed by unanimous consent.**

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

1. Office staffing and hours
2. COVID situation on campus
3. Chair's Advisory Council
4. Gowen Hall safety and emergency preparedness

Chair: Introduced new graduate program advisor. Temporary for now. Will advertise permanent position with HR approval. Hiring for front office position looks good but may take a few more weeks. Once everyone's in place will think about how to reopen office for full office hours.

About Covid, hasn't heard anything from admin about how things are going. Has looked at UW dashboard, which is imperfect tool but can show some things. There was a spike in positive tests in the first week but the numbers have come back down recently. Hopefully indicates that it is not spreading on campus. Looks hopeful for now.

Chair's advisory council. A new body. Wanted opportunity to open lines of communication with people in the department. Includes teaching professors, undergrad majors, and grad students. They're going to meet once a month and talk. Yen and Fumiko are going to sit on the council, along with one undergrad major and two grad students.

Last point. We're all coming back after a year away. Good to reacquaint ourselves with building safety. Evacuation routes, etc. There are documents in the office that explain emergency plans for the building.

Everyone should take a look at them. For Gowen, key pages are 15-16: how to get out and where you should go. In health and safety document, guidance on what to do in an earthquake, fire, etc.

Faculty member: Where are these documents?

Chair: Documents are both linked in the department rules and policies that Chair sent by email a few days ago. [Links provided in chat.]

[https://asian.washington.edu/sites/asian/files/documents/asian\\_health\\_and\\_safety\\_2020-2021\\_final.pdf](https://asian.washington.edu/sites/asian/files/documents/asian_health_and_safety_2020-2021_final.pdf)

<https://asian.washington.edu/sites/asian/files/documents/fsep-gowen.pdf>

Faculty member: The University is not going to be a big help in the first few days after a disaster so we should aim to be self-reliant, should we need to, esp. in the event of a major earthquake.

Chair: Good point. Will look into getting some emergency supplies in place.

#### IV. **Update:** Korean search (Cho; Appendix 1) 3:45-3:50

Explanation of process to get search started. Discussions started in May, job advertisement finally approved for posting on Aug. 30. Job ad was posted to 5 venues. Deadline for submission of application materials was Oct. 15 (today). Aim to complete search by the end of winter quarter. Plan to have zoom interviews in mid-November, create short list by end of November. Will have update at next faculty meeting.

#### V. **Update:** Graduate Admissions and Education Committee (Mack) 3:50-3:55

Update on committee goals. Primary task is to encode graduate degree requirements into the new system. Will talk to each program via program coordinators to ensure they have the most up to date versions of the requirements. Will call meeting of grad faculty to discuss if there are ways to create uniformity across programs. Finally, will encode the requirements for the new system. Also planning to develop a proposal for a new track for students who don't fit into the existing tracks. Faculty who would be served by a new program should contact committee to get involved in the process. Please contact for more information if desired.

#### VI. **Discussion and Vote:** Delegation of Authority (Handel; Appendix 2) 3:55-4:05

We will cast ballots using our new confidential voting mechanism on Catalyst WebQ at this link.

Chair: New voting system for conducting ballots remotely. Link is put in chat and faculty can click to the Catalyst survey page. The Catalyst tool is set up to allow confidential surveys. Voting results can be tracked anonymously. Results can also be made public anonymously.

Significance of the motions. [Included in appendix.] The first means that faculty would not have to be brought together to vote on hiring temporary faculty, which might have to move forward very quickly. Typically something departments delegate. Also applies to renewals of part-time, temporary faculty. The second motion means that faculty would not have to vote on competitive counter-offers. The faculty code requires an advisory vote of the full department faculty. Problems include timing, and also the potentially divisive issue of the salary of the faculty in question. Chair researched how other departments do it and there is some variety in how departments delegate.

We can vote on the motions as they stand or revise them. We need to vote on them by next faculty meeting.

Chair motions to vote on motions as written. Seconded. Vote will be open until 5:00. Chair shows responses/votes, labelled by id numbers.

Faculty member: Already voted accidentally, thinking it was a test.

Chair: Can verify that correct vote was recorded for that faculty member after the meeting.

Faculty member: The ID number that individuals get when they vote do not match the ID numbers on the ballot report.

Chair: Will look into how to verify votes. **Both motions passed.**

Faculty member: Suggest that the voting deadline shouldn't be left open so long because then we won't know whether motions pass until after the meeting.

Chair: Will look into best mechanism. Want to simulate the process of collecting and counting ballots and having the result there at the meeting.

VII. **Discussion:** COVID, return to campus, teaching, safety, etc. (Handel) 4:05-4:20  
Share: questions, concerns, ideas, or information; preliminary planning for Winter Quarter

Chair: Invites comments, thoughts, experiences.

Faculty member: Teaching blend remote/in-person. Two things to share: polled students about how they're feeling. Heard a lot of anxiety about being back in class. Second thing was that they bought a personal voice amplifier—the department has offered to reimburse faculty.

Chair: How are 1<sup>st</sup> year language classes going? With pronunciation.

Faculty member: Using transparent masks when teaching in-person. Using a lot of videos for remote teaching situations. Hybrid model has been working well. Plans to survey students. TAs also feel good. Have had several Covid cases. But they only got EHS notification about half the time. They knew they had Covid because students emailed them, but didn't know they should contact EHS too. The reporting mechanism depends on students making the initial report of a positive test to EHS.

Faculty member: Students have emailed them when they are sick and can't attend. Has set up zoom in their classrooms to allow them some sort of access to the classroom, though they can't participate. Most of the students appear very motivated.

Faculty member: Uses same method. Has non-matriculated students who are not in Seattle. Turns on zoom in class and uses a wireless headset for people participating remotely.

#### **VIII. Discussion and Vote:** Courseload reductions (Handel) 4:20-4:40

This revised proposal is intended as a motion for a possible vote. It is available on Google Drive for consultation before and during our discussion. We can amend it before voting.

(I will share a giant spreadsheet of our approximate SCH totals over the last five years on request.)

Chair: In first meeting with Dean, they raised the issue of workloads for lecturers being too high. Has been working on this for a year and is hoping that it's something that will move us in the right direction. This is not the final step: more adjustments can and probably will be made. This transition is not like flipping a switch: the transformation may take several years for our programs to adjust to. Not all programs will be able to reduce course load at the same rate or in the same way but the intent is to move towards the goals delineated in the plan. Finally, the current draft for course load reduction is not rigid: it is meant to be flexible. Because we don't have the data to model the outcome of implementing the plans, we will/should continue to adjust the plan each year as needed. Invites discussion. Options at end of discussion include voting, delaying, making adjustments. Now is the best time to implement, November is still possible, but beyond that would mean putting it off for a year.

Faculty member: Appreciates that the numbers in the proposal are soft guidelines but is wary that once numbers are there they tend to get locked in. The idea of 35-person class is new. 30 is generally the

largest size for content classes now. Wary of putting in numbers that are higher than what we typically teach. Suggests the number should be 30, to conform with what we teach now.

Faculty member: Japanese is a high demand major. Used to have caps of 35 and gradually it started to drop. Thinks it would be a safe thing to do in the first year, except in the case of seminars and advanced courses. Main concern with cutting course loads is that we don't strand students. Might want to add a pan-asia option for content courses in the Japanese program so that some of the interest in Japanese can be channeled towards other programs. That would require the whole department but it's a thought for future.

Faculty member: Most of own courses are very small, around 5. Does have a 35 person course this year. The difference between 30 and 35 can mean the equivalent of a whole small course. Moving from 30 to 35 would counterbalance the loss of one course in cases like this.

Faculty member: Understands that the goal of course load reduction for teaching faculty is conceived as workload reduction, whereas for TT faculty it is workload shift.

Chair: Yes, basically true. The idea is that teaching faculty have simply been working too much and need a workload reduction whereas, for research faculty, it's to allow shift from teaching workload to research workload.

Chair: Suggest we can move to vote, or that we can suggest amendments.

Faculty member: Proposes an amendment to change the stated requirement from 35 to 30.

Faculty member: Doesn't think it's a good idea to take it down to 30 across the board. Maybe language can be added to make clear that 35 not a hard and fast rule.

Chair: Language is already there stating it is not a hard and fast rule.

Faculty member: Better to leave at 35. Might be uncomfortable to push faculty to teach larger classes than they currently do. But that is the trade-off we have been discussing. Teaching larger classes is the way to keep SCH up.

Faculty member: Concerned we're not taking diversity of programs into consideration. There may be people whose teaching fits the model of one large class and some smaller classes. But what about people who teach lots of mid-size classes, around 25 students. Proposes a range, like 25-35.

Chair: Wants to see each of us raising a cap on one of our courses and see what happens. And also wants to see people think creatively about how to keep SCH's up. Says they would be comfortable with a range of 30-35. Edited text of proposal, deleting 35 and replacing with 30-35.

Faculty member: Suggests language that says "in practice when cutting a course from loads, please work to cut a lower enrolled course."

Chair: Prefers to leave the minutiae of planning to the programs.

Faculty member: Proposes voting on the two halves of the proposal (teaching faculty and TT faculty) separately. Language teaching scheduling is very complex and language programs need to be able to start working on it. Hopes to at least have vote on teaching faculty reduction.

Faculty member: Moves to vote on the proposal with the range of 30-35, instead of 35. Motion is seconded.

[Final draft attached below.]

Chair: Uses zoom poll to take vote on proposal. **Motion passes (23-0).**

IX. **Discussion:** Five-year hiring plan (Handel; Appendix 3) 4:40-5:00

Initial presentations of proposals by faculty and programs; feedback from colleagues.

We will have further discussion at the November meeting to finalize the plan for December submission.

Chair: only got one proposal in response to request for proposals from the Chinese Program.

Faculty member: Introduces Chinese Program proposal for new faculty hire. [Draft attached below.] Context is the imminent retirement of a senior faculty member from the program. Proposal is for asst. professor in early Chinese texts, preferably with research focus on excavated texts like oracle bones or bronze inscriptions. Will help develop a cohesive Chinese curriculum.

Chair: Need to discuss in more depth at the next meeting. The hiring plan needs to be more than just a few positions.

X. **Meeting adjourned**

**Attendees:**

Ahmad

Atkins  
Bi  
Bhowmik  
Cao  
Cho  
Dubrow  
Hamm  
Handel  
Iwata  
Jesty  
Kim  
Lu  
Mack  
Marino  
Matsuda-Kiami  
Nguyen  
Nishikawa  
Ohta, A.  
Ohta, K.  
Pauwels  
Sandjaja  
Scoyoc  
Takeda  
Turner  
Wang  
Won  
Won  
Yoon  
Yu

## **Appendix**

### *Delegation of Authority*

#### A. Annual renewal of authority to recommend certain appointments and renewals

##### Motion (no changes from the version that was adopted in October 2020):

“The members of the faculty of the Department of Asian Languages and Literature delegate to the department chair the authority to recommend to the dean appointments and renewals of appointments of (1) affiliate faculty; (2) research associates; and (3) part-time lecturers (both annual and quarterly). The chair will consult with appropriate faculty members as necessary or desirable in each individual case.

In the case of spousal or other appointments that present a conflict of interest for the chair, the associate chair will exercise this authority.”

#### B. Biennial renewal of authority to recommend competitive counteroffers

##### Motion (changes from the version adopted in October 2019 are highlighted in yellow):

“The members of the faculty of the Department of Asian Languages and Literature delegate to the department chair the authority to recommend competitive salary offers to the dean. The chair will consult with **appropriate** faculty members as **she or he deems** necessary or desirable in **eachany** individual case.

In the case of spousal or other appointments that present a conflict of interest **for the chair**, the associate chair will exercise this authority.”



## Asian Languages & Literature

### Proposal on Courseload Reductions

Version 4: October 15, 2021

This proposal was discussed and approved by AL&L faculty on October 15, 2021

The proposal is intended to be flexible and there is a presumption that it will be amended as needed on at least an annual basis.

### Contents

- I. [Background](#)
- II. [Goals](#)
- III. [Challenges and constraints](#)
- IV. [Preliminaries](#)
- V. [Proposal](#)
  - A. [Tenure-line faculty loads](#)
  - B. [Instructional-line faculty loads](#)
  - C. [Monitoring, support, and enforcement](#)
- VI. [Additional notes and questions](#)

### I. Background

There is no standard course load for faculty at UW or within the College of Arts & Sciences. Departments have a great deal of autonomy in setting course loads.

Across the twelve departments with the Humanities Division, course loads vary within the following ranges:

- Tenure-line faculty: **between 4 and 5 (AL&L, Classics, and Scandinavian have 5)**
- Instructional-line faculty: **between 6 and 9 (Linguistics has 9)**
- While some programs have “clean” loads, most have variable or contingent loads, typically characterized as “4-plus”, “8-minus”, etc. There means there is a default or baseline load that is modified by individual factors. The baseline load is what is specified in hiring contracts.

*AL&L is at the high end of both of these ranges, and is an outlier in the Division.*

## II. Goals

*Instructional-line faculty:* The goal of courseload reduction for instructional-line faculty is **workload reduction**. Our teaching professors are currently asked to do too much overall.

*Tenure-line faculty:* The goal of courseload reduction is to **shift workload** from teaching to research. Research production is a required component of tenure-line faculty work and is essential for tenure and promotion. A five-course load makes it difficult to devote sufficient time to research production.

**Timeline:** Curriculum planning in Autumn 2021 to implement lower courseloads in Autumn 2022

## III. Challenges and constraints

1. The ability of the department to request and receive additional resources from the College (faculty positions, TA funding, etc.) depends *in part* on our ability to sustain Student Credit Hours (SCH) and numbers of majors that put us “in the black” under the College’s ABB budgeting formula. However, it is difficult for us to predict or control with precision how courseload reductions will impact the department’s overall ABB status. *Some loss of SCH is to be expected and can be tolerated.*
2. Our current curriculum is designed around our current teaching loads. Without increased staffing, it will be difficult to meet some essential programmatic needs while implementing reduced courseloads. These needs include offering courses required for degree completion, offering courses needed by FLAS recipients, and offering an unbroken language curriculum from beginning through advanced levels. *A period of transition is to be expected; not all faculty will be able to take full advantage of reduced courseloads immediately.*

## IV. Preliminaries:

1. These proposals do not attempt to equalize workload across the department. That is a longer-term, ongoing project that extends well beyond courseloads. However, it is hoped that courseload reductions will be a helpful step on the path toward greater workload equity.
2. Service is a required component of all full-time department faculty. Therefore, regular service roles are not in and of themselves justification for reducing courseloads.
3. Not all programs or faculty will necessarily be able to take full advantage of courseload reductions in the first year they are implemented. Programs are encouraged to develop multi-year plans, which may include rotation of teaching assignments or reconceptualizing major/minor requirements and language-course sequencing.

4. Any proposals we adopt will be subject to evaluation and revision each year. If we are to succeed, this must be a collective effort in which we all do our best to keep individual and program SCH levels from dropping too far. If the department falls short of its obligation to serve a sufficient number of students, all of our courseloads will have to go back up.

## V. Proposal

### Va. Tenure-line faculty

Tenure-line faculty in the department will have a **teaching load of “5-minus” courses**. The contractual and baseline load is 5 courses. The minimum regular courseload is 4. Programs will strive to make it possible for tenure-line faculty to have a load of **4 courses** while meeting program and departmental needs. (Typically, this means between 220 and 250 minutes per week per course, and 20 credits per year.)

When teaching four courses, tenure-line faculty members will strive to surpass 80% of their five-course SCH levels (averaged over the last several years), and will work toward these goals:

- An enrollment of **30-35** or higher in at least one course
- Total enrollment of **90** or higher in all four courses

Faculty members who do not make progress toward these goals over a reasonable period of time may be asked to teach five courses.

We will continue with the current expectation that tenure-line faculty will offer no more than one 500-level course each year, and will not offer more than one undergraduate course with an enrollment under 10 unless it is required for programmatic needs (such as major requirements, language sequences, etc.)

### Vb. Instructional-line faculty (teaching professors and temporary lecturers)

Instructional-line faculty in the department will have a **teaching load of “8-minus” courses**. The contractual and baseline load is 8 courses. The minimum regular courseload is 6.

Programs will strive to make it possible for teaching professors to have a load of **6 or 7 courses** while meeting program and departmental needs. (Typically, this means between 220 and 250 minutes per week per course, and 30-35 credits per year.) The expectation is that faculty teaching 7 courses will meet one of the requirements below, and faculty teaching 6 courses will meet two of them.

- Three separate course preparations in any one quarter (e.g. Lg 101, 201, 301)
- Supervision of one or more TAs in *each* quarter of the academic year
- Service as Program Coordinator (which is normally a tenure-line faculty position)
- Teaching a total enrollment for the year of **120** or more (approx. six full language courses)

It is expected that some faculty members will regularly teach 6 courses with higher average enrollments and/or TA supervision; some will regularly teach 7 courses with lower average enrollments or no TA supervision.

As a further mechanism for reducing the workload associated with teaching, **instructors and programs are encouraged to explore hybrid models of language teaching that meet synchronously four days a week** (200 minutes) instead of five days a week (250 minutes) as long as this can be done in a pedagogically effective way commensurate with 5 credits.

Programs in which reduced number of courses cannot be achieved at current staffing levels are encouraged to creatively explore teaching schedules and course structures that reduce workload as a temporary measure.

### **Vc. Monitoring, support, and enforcement**

Individual faculty and their programs are expected to make a good-faith effort to meet our department goals each year. This includes taking student enrollments into account when planning curricula and teaching schedules, and striving to increase enrollments through publicizing course offerings.

We understand that each faculty member's circumstance is unique, and each program's challenges and constraints are different. We recognize that there are many pathways toward successfully reducing overall workloads while keeping up department SCH levels, and therefore flexibility is important. The department will encourage and support creative proposals. This policy will be open to ongoing revision as circumstances require.

The department chair, in consultation with other faculty and staff as needed, will monitor overall SCH levels and the course offerings and enrollments of individual faculty. The chair and relevant faculty will offer support and advice to help colleagues make progress toward enrollment targets. If necessary, the chair will request that faculty members teach more courses, up to their contractual baseline.

In the event that the department as a whole is unable to sustain SCH levels that ensure access to needed College resources, the chair will work with the faculty to revise this courseload policy so that the overall interests of the department do not suffer.

## VI. Additional notes

1. Some programs calculate workloads by classroom hours or by credits rather than by number of courses. The general equivalence is one “course” is equal to four or five “hours” a week (220-250 minutes). Thus an annual courseload of six would be equivalent to teaching 10 classroom “hours” (440-500 minutes) a week. The courseload proposals here may be translated into other metrics as needed.
2. For any individual faculty member, courseloads might vary from year to year. If there are systemic unbalances within a program, a rotation of courses taught across a set of faculty may be considered as an appropriate remedy.
3. Individual faculty may voluntarily exceed the courseload levels specified in these proposals. “Banking” courses to count against courseloads in future years can only be done under special circumstances, in consultation and with approval of the chair.
4. Co-taught courses (whether with faculty in our department or other departments) will count as a full course, but SCH will be calculated proportionally for each instructor.
5. Courses taught outside the department but within the College of Arts & Sciences **do** count toward courseload and SCH calculations. Courses taught outside the College (e.g. Foster School of Business) will only count with permission of the chair on an exceptional basis.
6. Withered and joined courses are considered single courses. If two course numbers mostly meet together (same time and place), they are one course. Examples: Chinese 342/442 is a single course. Sanskrit 202/522 is a single course.
7. In no case can courseloads be distributed in a way that violates university policy: see the [Instructional Responsibility Policy](#). Among other things, this means that each faculty member must teach at least one course each quarter unless they have been granted teaching leave for that quarter (for example, as part of a grant or a hiring incentive package).
8. These proposals will not take effect retroactively.

## **Assistant professor position: Early Chinese Texts**

### **Brief Description**

Assistant Professor tenure-track position in Early Chinese Texts, preferably with a research focus on excavated texts and OBI/BI (Oracle Bone Inscriptions/Bronze Inscriptions), with teaching experience in Classical Chinese and an interest in developing courses of broad appeal to undergraduates as well as graduate students.

### **Background: The Past and Future of the Chinese Program**

University of Washington has long been a leader in Classical Chinese studies. In the 1960s and 1970s, world-renowned linguists and paleographers such as Li Fang-Kuei, Paul L-M Serruys, and Jerry Norman worked with students who themselves went on to become leading researchers in the field of early Chinese writing and Chinese historical linguistics. The names of W. South Coblin, Ken-ichi Takashima, Ting Pang-Hsin, and Gilbert Louis Mattos are familiar to many of us who have benefited from their scholarship through, for example, incorporating a phonological and linguistic angle into studying literature. Over the decades, the Chinese Program at the University of Washington has continued to dedicate itself to the teaching and research of Chinese language and literature, building a rigorous curriculum and training graduate students who are productive members of the academic communities around the globe.

In the past five years, the department has seen the retirements of Professors David R. Knechtges and Anne Yue-Hashimoto, decimating its capacity to offer training in early Chinese literature and linguistics. For example, we are no longer able to offer courses on the Han Dynasty (207 b.c.e. – c.e. 220) *fu* poetry, Oracle Bone Inscriptions of the late Shang (ca 1250 – ca 1046 b.c.e.) (first discovered in 1899), and Bronze Inscriptions of the Western Zhou (ca 1046 – 771 b.c.e.). Aggravating the loss is the imminent retirement of Professor William G. Boltz, another long-term member of the Chinese program. Professor Boltz's courses on Classical Chinese, early Chinese texts, and other related topics have provided essential training to undergraduate as well as graduate students, exposing them to rigorous research methodology in textual and linguistic criticism. This training has ensured a kind of research that takes into account the complex history of the Chinese language and the heterogeneous characteristic of early texts.

*It's time that the Chinese program re-evaluated our current curriculum capacity and added a member at the research professorial rank in order to sustain our excellent track record and secure future growth.*

This will be the current priority of the Chinese program. Because the singularly most striking feature of the Chinese language is its continuity, a responsible and robust curriculum should, accordingly, reflect

the “oneness” of the Chinese language and literature. Lying at the heart and root of all Chinese and, arguably East Asian, humanistic outcomes, is the influence from the Classical Age or Early China.

### **Background: Early China and Early Chinese Writing**

China has over three thousand years history of writing, beginning with the oracle bone and bronze inscriptions from the Late Shang. The discovery of the earliest Chinese writing in 1899 and bamboo/silk manuscripts in recent decades have caused linguists and historians to rethink received wisdom about Chinese language and literature and a past that has shaped the identity and cultural memory of one of the world’s oldest civilizations. Valerie Hansen divides premodern China into three periods, the first of which she calls, aptly, “inventing China,” i.e., from the late Shang (ca 1250 – ca 1046 b.c.e.) to the end of the Han (207 b.c.e. – 220 c.e.). By the turn of the third century, the Chinese-speakers had established their empire and dominated the none-Chinese-speaking groups or driven them to the fringes of the empire. It was also by this time that a literary and textual tradition had become firmly established with a uniquely powerful writing system. While Egyptian hieroglyphs and Sumerian cuneiform are no longer in use, the Chinese characters invented in the 13th-century b.c.e. or earlier have been in continuous use down to the present day, and in the first millennium c.e. was adopted to write other Asian languages such as Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese. An understanding of the development of the language and writing system, therefore, has important implications for the history of East Asian linguistic, literary, and cultural interactions over thousands of years.

A specialist in Chinese texts at this early stage—when China was being “invented”—is not only necessary but also instrumental. This new hire will fill key portions of the curriculum gap created by the three most recent retirements and, more importantly, accentuate the strength of our current teaching and research faculty. We will be able to offer a cohesive curriculum that instructs the Chinese language and literature through their evolving dynamism. What do early philosophical texts have to do with contemporary martial arts movies? How do medieval nature poets contribute to the orthography of Chinese and amplify its signifying dimension? Why and how should classical texts be used in instructing modern and contemporary Chinese? The meaningful connections this position would establish with the rest of the faculty are many and multi-faceted.

### **Duties**

The specialist would offer courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, including instruction in the Classical Chinese language. Specific courses might include a 200-level Chinese Civilization course for undergraduates; a reading course for graduate students on excavated texts; a graduate seminar on Chinese Classics co-taught with Wang Ping (medieval Chinese literature and intellectual history); a

graduate seminar on philosophy and aesthetics in Chinese fiction and film co-taught with Chris Hamm (Late-Imperial and Early Modern literature); an upper-level undergraduate course on the Chinese writing system co-taught with Zev Handel (historical linguistics); an upper-level undergraduate course on strengthening contemporary Chinese language skills through classical texts co-taught with Lü Chan (Second Language Reading and Immersion Education).

### **Collaboration and connection with other units at UW and in Seattle**

Classical Chinese remained the standard written language up until the beginning of the last century. Many programs around the university require the use of Classical Chinese text material. Therefore, a strong foundation in Classical Chinese language skills is essential to those programs. Our department has long provided a key service in teaching Classical Chinese. We will strive to continue our contribution with this new hire—a specialist in Classical Chinese.

The new hire would find opportunities to form an intellectual rapport with Wang Haicheng in Art History. This will open up new possibilities for the training of our graduate students and appeal to those who would like to have an archeological perspective in their research of the texts. The new hire can, in addition, revitalize our collaboration with the Seattle Asian Art Museum to enhance graduate-level research and invigorate undergraduate teaching. Through the new hire, we hope to join forces more effectively with UW's existing Textual Studies Group. Globally, the new hire could build a bridge between the scholarly communities in East Asia and North America by initiating collaborative research and instructional projects at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.