



Department Faculty Meeting
Friday, April 8, 2022, 3:30-5:00pm
Location: Zoom, <https://washington.zoom.us/j/96090682314>

Minutes FINAL 2022.05.03

I. **Call to Order**

II. **Vote:** Approval of Minutes (March) (*standing item*; Hamm) 3:30-3:35

Motion to approve. Seconded. No objection. Minutes approved by unanimous consent.

III. **Update:** Brief Announcements (*standing item*; Hamm) 3:35-3:40

1. Salomon Lecture, Wednesday, Apr. 20, 2022

Zoom only. Have to register. Can register using link on website.

2. Japanese Spring Mixer, Friday, Apr. 22, 2022

In the Smith Room, Suzallo Library. Registration not required.

3. Markus Lecture, Monday, May. 9, 2022

Sharalyn Orbaugh, University of British Columbia. "Japanese Propaganda and the Power of Love."
First in person Markus lecture in 3 years. Signature department event: please attend. Should register.

4. Convocation, Friday, Jun. 10, 2022, 3:30-6:00

Also planning to hold this in person. More information forthcoming.

5. Circulated announcement from Scandanavian Studies about their Nobel Prize course. It's a good opportunity to represent the department. Please consider.

IV. **Update** (Hamm) and **discussion** (Wang): Sexual harassment and department safety 3:40-4:00

Chair: Has 4 items to share before Ping speaks.

1. Dept. web page: new page of resources on sexual harassment and safety. There's also a statement on sexual harassment signed by Chair and others. Provides guidelines both to people who want to

report sexual harassment and for people who might be handling reports. Please read the page carefully.

2. Training course: required online training course. University-wide. You can take it anytime you want. It is required, though the deadline is to come.

3. Next steps: what can we do further? That question is something we as a body should decide together. Chair has said addressing these issues will be their first priority when they return from sabbatical.

4. Status of Bill Boltz. Many people have shared concerns about their continuing affiliation with the department. We will discuss some of these issues later in the personnel meeting to follow.

Faculty member: Will share statement and invites everyone to share ideas and feelings:

Since the Seattle Times' March 6th report on a sexual harassment case that involves one of our faculty, much has happened. There have been conversations among those of us who feel strongly that, at this moment of moral crisis, we can no longer look away and not make clear where we stand on the issue of sexual harassment. We believe we can't afford to miss this opportunity to initiate real change and make things right for those who have spoken up and not necessarily been heard and those who will never speak up because of how hard it is to report sexual harassment and how little support this department in the past offered to those few who did report. We need to change this environment for our moral conscience and for our collective well-being.

We understand change won't be easy. We all are children when faced with complex and difficult matters such as sexual harassment. Unfortunately, we don't have parents or reliable authorities to guide us through the treacherous waters. We only have each other to rely on to head in the right direction. We believe there are a few specific simple measures we can take to get started on what will be a long process. For a better collective future, we propose:

To initiate conversations and conduct open dialogues about matters of sexual harassment, power harassment, gender/race discrimination, and work-life balance. We call for the department's support for hosting Talk Retreats where faculty and staff can come together, share concerns and lend support to each other, so that we can truly hear and understand each other. By doing so, we aim to break the culture of silence that has dominated and plagued this department for decades.

To implement comprehensive training sessions for graduate students and TAs about sexual harassment, educating them about self-protection and encouraging them to speak up.

Faculty member: In relation to the second point, not only are grad students and TAs people we need to protect but they're also in positions of authority. Does the sexual harassment training include graduate students?

Chair: Don't have full answer. Our graduate student training includes some material about sexual harassment. Doesn't know what is included at university level training for grad students.

Faculty member: the UW website says "all UW personnel" have to take the training so it should include graduate students. Our departmental training does include some points about sexual harassment and how to report it but it should definitely be developed more.

Faculty member: Looked up the Title IX online training. There's an employee course and a student course.

Faculty member: The first point was so important. Hopes the department can have a retreat. Hopes we can have discussions of power.

Faculty member: Thank you for the statement. Has been painful, but is very glad the Seattle Times article came out. Feels we are reaching a societal turning point. Feels that historically it has been ignored by university administrators. Title IX is a relatively recent law, but is encouraged about changes afoot at universities nationwide. Disappointed by the Seattle Times article in that it indicated the university did not take the report of sexual harassment seriously. We and the university need to take it more seriously. It will be a big shift and it will take time. Having department sponsored retreats where we can talk more informally would be great. Having more training would also be good.

Faculty member: Addressing sexual and power harassment issues is one thing. But there is another layer: how do we build a better community and culture among ourselves. How can we get to know each other better, intellectually and socially, so that we can create a better atmosphere in future. Opportunities to interact with each other are becoming fewer and fewer.

Faculty member: One thing to add: students have a lot of power in reporting and evaluation too. We should be aware of student power too.

Faculty member: The issue just raised is important. Wants whatever we do to protect everyone who might need it. Need to come up with genuinely workable ways to work—things that will work for everyone.

Faculty member: Hopes that as we work on these we will collaborate with other departments and be in contact with Faculty Senate and university leadership. Most critical decisions about how these

cases are handled happen outside the department: we need to try to change policy at the university level too in order to make change.

V. **Update (Hamm) and discussion: 2022-2023 hiring 4:00-4:10**

Chair: Because two of our teaching faculty are retiring, we will be missing teachers in Hindi and Chinese. Chair submitted a request for bridge funding for temporary hires in modern Chinese, Classical Chinese, and Hindi. The deans have approved bridge funding (2022-23) for a full-time position in modern Chinese position and a half-time position for 1st year Hindi. In terms of permanent positions, the dean has said we can probably expect approval for our top hire that we had in the hiring plan we submitted last autumn: a Korean teaching professor position. In addition, the dean is prepared to offer a search for a full-time position in modern Chinese, and asks that we vote on prioritizing this position as an addition to our hiring plan . We can discuss and then have a motion

Faculty member: Motion to approve the hire in modern Chinese.

Faculty member: Doesn't see how we can do without the position. Must replace the lecturer who is leaving.

Faculty member: Hindi has been a core language in the department. But the commitment from the college seems to be less. Why?

Chair: Sympathizes with the question but doesn't have an answer to it. Request for bridge funding was submitted but this is how the college responded.

Faculty member: Had same question. Can we add the Hindi lecturer to our hiring plan as the top next hire? Could we possibly downgrade the request for the tenure-track position in Chinese literature that is the next up on our hiring plan?

Chair: We are scheduled to reconsider the hiring plan in fall. We can do that earlier if we want. The hiring plan is slightly separate from the current issue: this is an emergency funding offer and the deans are asking whether we support it. We can't add the Hindi position to our response to this particular request: it's just a request for faculty stance on a modern Chinese teaching professor position.

Faculty member: Great empathy for the loss of faculty. Thinks the reason for the university position on Chinese/ Hindi is because of enrollments. Wants to communicate to the deans that we also need the Hindi position to maintain the integrity of our programs.

Faculty member: Not only a matter of our programs. We're one of only 3 programs in Hindi west of Mississippi. Is it just about numbers? Or is it about the quality and value of the education? The university seems to be making decisions just on the basis of money coming in, ABB.

Chair: The dean did say that enrollment numbers were part of their decision not to fund a teaching professor to teach 2nd year Hindi.

Faculty member: South Asia program is pursuing funding from South Asia Center too.

Faculty member: The half-time position creates a problem because people aren't going to relocate for a half-time position. Also the program needs someone who is fully committed, including developing teaching materials and to developing the program.

Faculty member: Question about procedure. Does the dean's office have a cutoff? What is the expected number of students enrolled? Are there any criteria?

Chair: Can't answer the question but recognizes the point.

Motion language: "I support prioritizing a full-time hire in modern Chinese language as an addendum to our current hiring plan." 23 approve. 0 no. 0 abstain.

VI. Update (Hamm) and discussion (Pauwels): Annual merit reviews 4:10-4:20

Chair: Annual process. Review committees make recommendations of merit/non-merit. The subsequent meetings recommend finer gradations of merit. The 2% raise goes to all meritorious faculty. If there is extra merit beyond 2%, it should go to a select group of faculty. If the department gives the additional merit increase to all faculty equally it is likely to be rejected by H.R. Merit reports should consider 3 years of activity. Review committees can submit a narrative report, or a bullet-point format. Proposes we hold further discussion till our next meeting.

Faculty member: Just wanted to ask us all to take the merit determination seriously and that the committees, even if not recommending extra merit, will provide us with the information so we can vote meaningfully on it. I was going to ask whether each committee's presentation would please start by flagging "outstanding" merit in whatever category before also mentioning the other "regular" merit. This does not require voting on a new policy.

VII. Update (Hamm) and discussion: Non-Anglophone data humanities search 4:20-4:25

Chair: will postpone this to May.

VIII. Update: Ad hoc committee on department climate and communication (Bhowmik) 4:25-4:30

Faculty member: Speaking on behalf of the committee. Currently gathering input through the survey. It's closing at 11pm Monday April 11. Committee has been following a workflow established by the Chair. The consultant they've been working with helped them wrap up the written guidelines. There will be context and a preamble to the guidelines themselves. After receiving input, they will be revise the proposal. Then the proposal will be brought to the faculty meeting in May.

Faculty member: Question: will the guidelines be binding? Will they be enforced?

Chair: Believes that the question of manditoriness is going to be discussed by the committee.

Faculty member: We need to know whether they are going to be enforced if we're voting on them.

Faculty member: There are some critical problems that have been raised in relation to the way this committee was constituted. There's a question about the legal basis of its work. The Chair can assemble advisory groups and can call them "committees" if they want, but this body is different because it's being charged with developing policy. We need to follow the law. Also, the motivation and goal for forming the committee remains murky. The Charge Letter makes no mention of past incidents that the committee is meant to address. But the Chair contradicted that in the last faculty meeting and made reference to past incidents the committee's work is meant to address. It appears, then, that the Charge Letter contains false information.

Chair: Valid concerns. Another faculty member has also expressed similar concerns to the dean. The dean replied that the Committee was legally constituted.

Faculty member: The deans are hardly known for following rules. Please share those correspondences with the rest of the faculty: they are clearly of concern to the full department.

Chair: Will need to check with the dean before sharing any of the information.

Faculty member: Why? You are claiming the response as justification for department policy on the issue. You can't not share them with the faculty.

Chair: Understood. Need to think about the issues first though and can't do it now anyway.

Faculty member: Will let it rest for now. But finds the response problematic, given the secretive and nefarious way the committee has been formed and pursued its work thus far.

IX. Adjournment to Personnel Meeting 4:30

Attendees: Ahmad, Atkins, Bahrawi, Bhowmik, Cao, Chesbro, Cho, Dubrow, Hamm, Iwata, Jesty, Kim, Lu, Mack, Marino, Nguyen, Nishikawa, Ohta, A., Ohta, K., Pauwels, Sandjaja, Van Scoyoc, Takeda, Turner, Wang, Won, Yoon, Yu

