



Department Faculty Meeting Minutes
Friday, March 10, 2023

In person Attendees: Davinder Bhowmik, Heekyoung Cho, Zev Handel, Akiko Iwata, JungHee Kim, Ungsan Kim, Yen Kim Nguyen, Kaoru Ohta, Liping Yu, Yan Zhu

Zoom Attendees: Jameel Ahmad, Paul Atkins, Chris Hamm, Nobuko Horikawa, Ted Mack, Joe Marino, Izumi Matsuda-Kiami, Itsuko Nishikawa, Amy Ohta, Heidi Pauwels, Pauli Sandjaja, Bich-Ngoc Turner, Kirk Van Scoyoc, Ping Wang, EunYoung Won

I. **Call to Order**

3:33

Vote: Approval of Minutes (February) (*standing item*, Handel)

February minutes unanimously approved.

Chair: Hands over the discussion of Voting Procedures to Linda.

II. **Discussion and Vote:** Faculty Meeting Voting Procedures (Handel and Callecod)

- Appendix 1: Proposed procedures (selected from “Simplified Robert’s Rules of Order”)

Linda: Reminds faculty that what we discussed at the previous faculty meeting is the Simplified Robert’s Rules of Order and that she would be soliciting feedback on highlighted items.

Faculty member 1: Proposes a speaker speaking a second time ask first if anyone else has something to say.

Linda: Asks if this would be a hard rule or implied.

Faculty member 1: States it would take up more time.

Faculty member 2: Points out that few people speak and there are barriers that prevent participation. The more junior the faculty member, the more the barriers. Chair may be more likely to remember to ask if others have a comment than faculty involved in the heat of discussion.

Linda: Asks if noting an example or supplying a footnote would help.

Faculty member 3: Proposes we ask those who seldom participate and states our priority is to move high priority things along.

Faculty member 4: States the one person, one comment strategy is a good initiative and breaks barriers. Also agrees with Faculty member 3 that we prioritize important and consequential decisions.

Chair: States we have had one person, one comment in personnel meetings and it's worked well there, but it takes a lot of time. Faculty Member 4 brings up consequential decisions but who decides what is consequential? If someone asks that we allow for everyone to comment then I would say yes. Otherwise, doing it as a matter of course would take up a lot of valuable time.

Linda: Senses desire to move along but hearing concern for inclusion.

Faculty member 5: Likes Zev's suggestion.

Linda: Clarifies motion is to approve the procedures for discussion and voting at faculty meetings as presented in Appendix 1 of the agenda.

Vote tally: 18 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention
Motion Passes

III. **Discussion:** New Course Proposals and Course Change Proposals (Atkins)

Chair: Asks how we should go about returning to previous discussion.

Linda: Suggest Paul jump in and open up discussion.

Paul: States he's ready to open discussion and if necessary, he has a motion.

Faculty member 1: States they think we shouldn't presume we will vote.

Paul: Shares slides that underscore that the faculty controls curriculum and that faculty may delegate its powers to a committee. Paul states it is important to have a procedure in place that does not conflict with the faculty code. Finds problematic that the Associate Chair and Chair have final say.

Faculty member 2: Asks what the distinction is between Associate Chair and Chair and faculty member.

Amy (as chair of UEC): Paul stated that work flow goes from program to Associate Chair and Chair. In fact, the flow goes from program to entire faculty for comments. Revisions are then made before proposal is sent up outside the department. If there is no program consensus the proposal goes to Chair. The Undergraduate Education Committee comments on proposal. Input from the rest of the faculty is optional.

Chair: Stated that he served as Associate Chair for three years under Paul and had taken Paul's previous procedures and modified them.

Faculty member 3: Appreciates Faculty member 1's point of having all-faculty review, which makes process very transparent.

Faculty member 4: Thanks Faculty member 1 and Undergraduate Education Committee's creation of workflow. Believes Chair signing off the course proposal has gone through departmental procedure.

Faculty member 5: Also thanks Faculty member 1 and committee. Would like to know if faculty members have the right to determine what they teach.

Faculty member 1: States faculty can teach the way they want to teach but they can't create any course. Everything course change and new course proposal has to go through a vetting process. We have a lot of academic freedom but course proposals are made through programs. They also have to be approved at higher levels outside the department.

Faculty member 6: Explains they don't have experience creating course proposals. Procedure-wise, how is consensus voted on? If there is no consensus then what? Paul is proposing we send it to a faculty body. I would like to ask Paul what group? What about graduate courses? In general I'm in favor of more robust review before a course proposal goes out of the department to ensure it isn't rejected.

Linda: We are running five minutes over. Be brief.

Faculty member 4: Urges continuation. Amy's response raises more questions. The term "consensus" is problematic.

Faculty member 5: Wonders where authority lies? I don't think it is entirely with the individual faculty member.

Faculty member 7: Agrees we need more discussion about whether decisions at the program level are based on "consensus" or "majority".

L: Is there a motion?

Motion to continue discussion of **department policy on course change and new course proposals** at the April meeting.

Chair: Agrees to post the current policy on Google Drive and solicit comments for consideration by the Undergraduate Education Committee between now and the next meeting.

Vote tally: Yes 21, No 0, Abstention, 1
Motion passes

Chair: Given the time, proposes we skip item IV. It can be dealt with by email.

IV. **Discussion:** Department web site orange banner (Mack)

- <https://asian.washington.edu/>: “Statement on Sexual Harassment and Ensuring a Safe Department Environment”

V. **Discussion:** Bringing Khmer to AL&L (Handel, Sandjaja, Bahrawi)

- Appendix 2: Excerpt of minutes from December 8, 2017 faculty meeting

Chair: Because of Title VI grant funding, some languages the Department doesn't teach are taught in JSIS. Celia Lowe, chair of the Southeast Asia Program, has asked for Khmer to be moved out of JSIS, and perhaps to American Ethnic Studies. The Southeast Asia faculty are in favor of moving Khmer to the Department. Chair notes 2017 Appendix 2 preference for languages to be taught in department. Both Nazry (written) and Pauli (oral) state their preference that Khmer be moved to AL&L.

Chair: Thinks it would be appropriate to vote on this. Do we need a motion or discuss first?

Linda: Discussion.

Faculty member 1: Asks if all goes smoothly, when would course be offered?

Chair: The course would probably be offered under JSIS number for now.

Faculty member 1: Asks if there are any other issues?

Chair: Yes, office space. And, because this is a language taught on soft money (Title VI grant to Southeast Asia Center), it could disappear.

Faculty member 2: States this seems like a great opportunity for our growing Southeast Asia program. Should we be thinking of a hiring priority now too?

Chair: I don't see this as obligating us. I think of it as a trial that will help us decide.

Motion to support moving **Khmer language instruction** from the Jackson School of International Studies into the Department of Asian Languages and Literature.

Vote tally: Yes 22, No 0, Abstention 0

Motion passes

VI. **Vote:** Authority for chair to establish *ad hoc* committees for merit review, promotion, and reappointment (Handel) • Appendix 3: Text of motion on *ad hoc* committees passed in October and text of new motion

Chair: Requests blanket authority for merit reviews, searches, and reappointment instead of requesting separately for each. Have a motion in place, which we can discuss and adjust.

Faculty member 1: Apologizes for leaving out reappointment. Regarding searches—why not take a simple vote?

Chair: Replies when we hired Nazry, funding came in July, and the Chair didn't have a faculty meeting scheduled until October. Needed to act quickly.

Faculty member 1: Adds since committees are disbanded after the work we can take out disband.

Chair: States that's a friendly amendment. I will cross out "disband." Can I as chair of the meeting move my own motion or must it be someone else?

Faculty member 1: Moves, as amended.

Motion on **ad hoc committees**, modified from the text in Appendix 3 by striking "and disband" "The chair may establish promotion, merit, reappointment, and search committees as needed without prior approval of the faculty. This authority remains in effect unless or until explicitly removed by the faculty."

Yes 22, No 0, Abstention 0

Motion passes

Chair: Notes only 5 minutes remains for updates. Informs faculty over \$40,000 raised in total for Department at successful dinner for Assunta Ng, to be combined with her \$150,000 gift establishing an innovation fund in our department. Asks Davinder to give an update on TEAL.

Davinder: Explains that there are two issues: one is a personnel issue, the other is a change in staff reporting lines from TEAL to Suzzallo. My own subject librarian is pleased by the change. Beware of misinformation that is spreading.

Faculty member 1: Emphasizes there is no budget issue and the petition circulated by Dr. Shen is an individual petition.

Faculty member 2: Urges the faculty to come together on this issue.

Faculty member 3: Offers to share own information as a 4-year (former) staff member at TEAL. Asserts staff should have been consulted before any change.

VII. **Updates** (*standing item*; Handel)

- Assunta Ng *Seattle Chinese Post (Xi Hua Bao) Innovation Fund in Asian Languages, Literatures, and Cultures*
- AL&L column in *Northwest Asian Weekly*
- Assistant Teaching Professor hires in Chinese and Korean
- Tateuchi East Asia Library (Davinder)
- Search for professor of non-Anglophone Humanities Data Science
- Unit adjustments
- Regular salary and merit increases
- Hiring outlook in the College
- *Ad hoc* committees appointed

Adjourned:

5:06

Appendix 1: Proposed procedures (adapted from “Simplified Robert’s Rules of Order”)

In adopting these rules, the faculty recognize that procedures not explicitly described here will be carried out according to custom.* These rules may be modified at any time through a majority vote of eligible voting faculty.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES:

- Everyone has a right to speak once before anyone may speak a second time.
- Individuals may only speak when recognized by the Chair / Facilitator .
- A person may request the floor (i.e. right to speak) by raising his/her hand.
- One person cannot be recognized while another person is speaking.
- Everyone has the right to know what is going on at all times.
- Only urgent matters may interrupt a speaker.
- Only one subject at a time may be discussed.

PROCEDURES:

1. To bring up a new idea or proposal (i.e. present a motion)

- a. Raise your hand and be recognized by the Chair / Facilitator.
- b. Present your motion by saying: “I move ...”
- c. To be in order, the motion must be related to the agenda item under discussion.
- d. If the motion is not seconded, it dies. To second a motion, say: “I second the motion” or simply “Second.”
- e. Upon hearing a second, the Chair / Facilitator will say: “The motion is now up for debate.”
- f. During debate, each person who is recognized can make a point, engage in discussion pro or con, or move to modify the motion. Everyone has a right to speak once before anyone may speak a second time.
- g. When debate has ended, the Chair calls for a vote.

If you want to change some of the wording of a motion under debate

- a. After you are recognized by the chair, move to: add words, strike words and/or insert words
- b. If there is a second, the Chair will call for a vote on the amendment
- c. If the vote passes, the motion is amended and debate resumes on the amended motion
- d. If the vote fails, the motion is not amended and debate on the original motion continues

3. If you want more time to study the proposal under debate

1. Move to postpone debate until a specific time or date (such as the next regular meeting)
2. If there is a second, the chair will call for a vote on the postponement
3. If the vote passes, the motion is no longer under consideration. The Chair will put it on the agenda for the specific time or date.
4. If the vote does not pass, debate on the original motion continues

* For example, faculty may always seek clarification or raise procedural errors by raising their hand and/or interrupting the Chair.

Appendix 2: Excerpt from Faculty Meeting Minutes of December 8, 2017

IV. Thai Curriculum and Jackson School

We are currently phasing out Thai, and will have no permanent state money for a Thai position. The SE Asia Center, in its next Title VI application, is applying for soft money for Thai. If we don't want to teach Thai, they would offer it through the Jackson School.

Are we willing to allow that? Alternatives would be to take on the teaching of Thai ourselves with Center money; or to just tell them no, they can't teach Thai here at all. If we keep Thai in-house, we have better quality control and better cohesiveness with the other languages and programs in the department. But it does mean more administrative overhead for us.

After some discussion, the faculty reached a broad consensus that:

- (a) Our department's priority for the current SEA application is the expansion of Vietnamese, not the restoration of Thai;
- (b) We would be delighted if Thai instruction were continued, but **we prefer for Asian languages (including SE Asian languages Thai, Khmer, Burmese) to be taught in our department, where they can be taught within an appropriate cultural-historical context.**

However, we do not wish these preferences to block or prevent the funding and teaching of a language that, for whatever administrative reason, might have to be taught in another unit.

Bold emphasis added.

Appendix 3: Text of motion on *ad hoc* committees passed in October

Motion passed on October 14, 2022:

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.

The chair requests blanket permission to establish **promotion, merit, reappointment, and search committees:**

The chair may establish and disband promotion, merit, reappointment, and search committees as needed without prior approval of the faculty. This authority remains in effect unless or until explicitly removed by the faculty.