

Department Faculty Meeting
Friday, June 3, 2022, 3:30-5:00pm
Location: Zoom, <https://washington.zoom.us/j/98346812452>

Minutes

Call to Order

II. **Vote:** Approval of Minutes (May) (*standing item*; Hamm)

Motion to approve minutes that were previously circulated.

Faculty member: Affirms that content of the circulated minutes was accurate. But has concern about statements made in the context of that meeting. Feels that statements made were not accurate about the Chair and DEI issues relating to the Takahashi fund. Should have made objection known during the prior faculty meeting but is making objection now. Requests that emails related to the issue be attached to the minutes.

Faculty member: Feels that if there are concerns about their statement in the previous faculty meeting they should have a chance to answer those concerns directly. Please be more explicit about what the problems were with the prior meetings' statements. Also, we can't attach long emails to the minutes now because faculty will not have had time to read them. Would have been better to circulate these concerns beforehand so that all faculty members could familiarize themselves with them.

Faculty member: In all their time at UW, have never seen accusations like those made in statements at the last faculty meeting.

Faculty member: That may be true but that does not say anything about what quality about the statements you find problematic.

Faculty member: They are accusatory about chair's stance on DEI issues and ad hominem.

Faculty member: The question of how DEI issues relate to our professional conduct was articulated by the chair himself at our departmental reception at the start of the year. It doesn't get much more official than that. Holding the chair's actions to those same standards is not ad hominem.

Faculty member: Requests that the email exchange under discussion in previous meetings' minutes be released to Asiafac.

[Faculty members who were on the email exchange consent to having email thread shared. The chair was not present and could not give consent.]

Motion to approve minutes as circulated by email. Vote to approve by voice. All in favor say "aye." Meetings are approved by some number of "ayes." No "nays" requested.

III. **Update:** Brief Announcements (*standing item*; Hamm)

1. Title IX course reminder

Please complete the course before the end of the term.

2. Convocation

We will be joined by representatives as special guests from the Japanese consulate.

3. Chinese Teaching Professor search

Circulated by email yesterday.

4. Additional announcements

None.

IV. **Announcement:** Pedagogy workshop (Won)

[Announcement circulated by email:] As you all received an email invitation for the upcoming workshop, it will be held on the 18th of June, from 9 to 11 AM Pacific Time. The speaker will discuss the benefits and challenges of online teaching, particularly in hybrid courses, and share her experience with her own online proficiency-based Spanish course. The topic is of interest to many of us, especially language teaching faculty. The target audience is college level language instructors, but it is also open to K-12 teachers (2 clock-hours provided).

V. **Update:** UEC (Jesty)

[Motion circulated by email:] I am attaching the current course/program proposal guidelines, with my proposed changes indicated in track changes. It's a pretty limited change, on p. 6 of the document. I have pasted it below for easy reference.

In addition to changing the course/program proposal guidelines, I will propose we add a statement to our department's "bylaws" stating that "Neither the Undergraduate Education Committee nor any similarly titled committee shall be involved in departmental curriculum review until it's exact role is defined in writing and has been approved by a vote of the full faculty."

Thank you for your attention. All best wishes,
Justin

4. The program coordinator sends the Proposal Form to the Associate Chair with their approval.

5. ~~The Associate Chair sends the Proposal Form to the chair of the Undergraduate Education Committee or, f~~For 500-level courses, the Associate Chair sends the Proposal Form to the chair

of the Graduate Education Committee. The Committee Chair seeks evaluations from committee members.

6. The Associate Chair ~~conveys reviews~~ suggestions and revision requests ~~from the committee, and conveys them~~ to the faculty member ~~along with any additional suggestions~~. The Associate Chair cc's the Program Coordinator (Anna Schnell).

7. The faculty member revises the proposal and sends the revised Proposal Form to the Associate Chair. The Associate Chair works with the faculty member to finalize the proposal, requesting additional assistance from the ~~UEC or~~ GEC if needed.

8. When the Associate Chair is satisfied, they forward the final Proposal Form to the Program Coordinator (Anna Schnell) along with their explicit approval.

Motion to consider, not seconded.

Motion to table, seconded. Vote by voice motion to table passes.

VI. **Discussion:** Faculty meeting agendas (Atkins)

Motion to vote:

"Agenda items for each faculty meeting shall be solicited by the chair no later than two weeks before the meeting. Any agenda item proposed by any voting faculty member at least one week before the meeting shall be added to the agenda. At the beginning of the meeting, the agenda shall be approved as written or as amended by a majority of the voting faculty members present."

Faculty member: Thinks it's better to trust the chair's judgment and not restrict them with too many rules that are not really addressing a problem. Has always had positive experiences with the chair. But it's an important issue: best to postpone the discussion to a later date.

Faculty member: Thinks this is important but doesn't think proposal is practical: we need a mechanism for prioritizing items when there are too many items to fit into a meeting.

Faculty member: Doesn't see much of an issue. Should trust the chair's decisions.

Faculty member: Issue is basic to self-organization and needs to be discussed. We should not be attending to successful/positive cases, but negative ones. We should not be discussing qualities of individual chairs but should have rules that are appropriate for any chair.

Chair: Calls for a second to one of the motions.

Second for the motion to table the discussion on the setting of faculty meeting agendas.

Faculty member: Is there any procedure for showing which agenda items are being proposed? Otherwise it's hard to know why an agenda item is rejected. Makes sense to have grounds to compare different items.

Faculty member: There is nothing in the by-laws right now requiring that kind of information to be shared. So there's no way to know why a proposal might be rejected.

Chair: Calls voice vote on motion to table. Majority ayes, a single nay. Raised hands vote. 21-1. Motion to table passes.

VII. **Discussion:** Department committees (Atkins)

"No standing or ad hoc departmental committee shall be created or disbanded without the consent of the faculty, as expressed by a majority vote at a faculty meeting in advance. Blanket permissions may be given to establish ad hoc promotion and merit committees."

Faculty member: Motion to consider. Creating committees should be discussed by us. Faculty should have a voice in the process.

Faculty member: Move to table. Just as previous chair was able to create and disband committees, this chair should be too. Also, we are free to propose committees in faculty meetings.

Faculty member: Feels there is concern about too much power being invested in the chair. Wants to point out that the executive committee doesn't have any formal power, either. We should discuss this because it affects many of our department procedures and bodies. But thinks we should put the discussion off until next fall.

Faculty member: Suggests the chair should form a committee to do the by-laws over the summer for those interested in working on that.

Chair: Own perspective is that we don't really have by-laws right now. What are listed on the website as by-laws are fragmentary.

Chair: Calls vote on motion to table. By show of hands. Passes, 21-yea, 1-nay.

VIII. **Discussion:** Department website (Bhowmik)

What is on our website is something we control. We can remove Bill Boltz from our departmental website. Points out that graduate students are watching and feels that we should act. JSIS China Studies unit has already removed Bill Boltz from their website. Believes we should follow suit.

Motion to remove Bill Boltz from the department website.

Faculty member: Does not mean expunging him from everything, but removing his listing in the faculty list and removing his individual page.

Faculty member and chair seek clarification on exact motion.

Faculty member confirms that the proposal is to remove his listing in the faculty list and to remove his individual page. [Motion language below.]

Faculty member: Example of Princeton trying to fire professors based on sexual misconduct charges. Feels this is the minimum we can do as a department. Supports this proposal.

Faculty member: Is there precedent in the university to do this?

Chair: Faculty member reported that JSIS has removed Boltz's pages from their website.

Faculty member: Believes this is following through on actions in a way that is consistent with our actions so far.

Faculty member: Had students in her office just recently who told her that this incident had made them question whether they had a place in academia, whether they belonged here. So this really is the minimum we can do, and we should do it.

Faculty member: Confirms that JSIS website has removed the pages.

Vote called.

Link to motion and vote in Catalyst: That Bill Boltz be removed from the Departmental website at two places, the faculty list and his individual pages. The specific links are below:

<https://asian.washington.edu/people/faculty>

<https://asian.washington.edu/people/william-boltz>

Results of voice: 21-0-4

Faculty member: Thanks to Chris for stepping in at a difficult time of year. Thank you for managing everything and keeping us sane.

IX. Adjournment to Personnel Meeting

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