Department Faculty Meeting
Friday, April 14, 2023, 3:30

Attendees (in person): Bhowmik, Cao, Cho, Handel, Iwata, Marino, Matsuda-Kiami, Kim, Nishikawa, A. Ohta, Takeda.

Attendees (Zoom): Ahmad, Atkins, Dubrow, Hamm, Horikawa, Mack, Nguyen, Pauwels, Sandjaja, Schnell, Turner, Wang, Won, Yu

I.   **Call to Order**

        3:33

II.   **Vote**: Approval of Minutes (March) (*standing item*; Handel)

        Minutes approved.

Zev: April is no longer here. She was not a good fit for the position. I've been told it will take 2-3 months to find a replacement. Linda Callecod is not here today but we will proceed using the simplified version of Robert's Rules we approved.

III.   **Discussion and Vote:** New Course Proposals and Course Change Proposals (Handel, Appendix 1)

IV. Course proposal

[Suggestions on screen and in minutes]

Change #1 Step 2

Change #2 Step 4

Zev: This is not a motion, it is the basis for a discussion. Let's use new discussion rules. Everyone has a chance to speak before anyone speaks twice.

Faculty member 1: There is some confusion still about UEC and GEC. I doubt it will be talked out at final stage.

Faculty member 2: I'd like to know why we are even doing this when jurisdiction lies elsewhere. This adds time. The process is already a minimum of one year. A second point is once a course is approved and we teach the class there are inevitably a number of changes from the original proposal. This system creates a lot of extra work and I don't believe it is worth our time.

Faculty member 3: My reading of this is that feedback from faculty at large, including UEC is constructive. I see this as improving vs. approving.

Faculty member 4: Following up on FM2's comment, when I proposed 5-6 courses 6-7 years ago, I appreciated the feedback. It helped me make sure my course was consistent with other language and content courses. I found the feedback helpful, but understand the wish to streamline the process.

UEC chair: The UEC's intention is to streamline the bureaucratic process. I'd like to point out that faculty can teach Asian 498 to try out a course. Also, after program review, all faculty and committees are involved in review process. It's not a chain of command. It's a collaborative process. Only the UEC members are obligated to provide feedback; it's optional for everyone else. This addresses FM1's question about the UEC voting something down. I see this as an improvement over the past when UEC was a roadblock. The time to complete this is 3 weeks in total. In the past premature proposals were batted back and forth. Anna offers her expertise all along. She knows what the red flags have been for the curriculum committee and this is very helpful information. We are not creating a policy for a worst-case scenario. I don't think we need to catastrophize.

Faculty member 2: We're already drowning in administrative work. I think we should try to reduce the burden.

Faculty member 6: If, after we receive input, we don't make changes, will the proposer be able to move it forward? I also want to share my experience with DL course proposals since previously I didn't understand the process. The help I needed most was when I wrote the proposal. I asked Anna. I used Nyan-Ping's proposal as a guide. I can see both sides about the value of seeking input and the concerns about drowning in administrative work.

UEC chair: A proposal may move forward without comments incorporated [or program approval], however, this information will be conveyed to the faculty and UEC when the associate chair sends the proposal for faculty review.

Faculty member 7: I appreciate FM5's responses but previous comments prompt my question—what happens when there is a difference in opinion?

UEC member: The UEC's work is burdensome, but we learn from one another. Some proposals need more work than others, like a new major. Occasionally, a proposal needs a lot of work and I've wondered why the program didn't catch this. I think a multilayered review process is helpful.

UEC chair: The UEC's suggestions are constructive not obstructive. We offer consultation and feedback. When a proposal is under department faculty review, faculty don't have to submit feedback. I don't always respond to invitations to comment on tri-campus course proposals, for example. This year our

focus is to create a collaborative workspace. Some people seem to want more authority than this. We don't. The authority lies with the university's curriculum committee.

Faculty member 7: If a program says no and the department and UEC says yes, isn't that a problem?

UEC chair: In that case I'd want to have the UEC talk with proposer and Chair/AC. At the time of course scheduling, the Chair can say no to a course. I don't see a high risk in letting professors create courses.

Faculty member 1: We could take it to faculty. We have faculty governance. It would be an agenda item in a faculty meeting.

Zev: Let's have FM2 speak and then either vote or postpone vote.

Faculty member 2: Do we have the authority to decide? If not, why do this?

Faculty member 1: Faculty definitely have the authority, as I introduced previously. It would hurt our reputation if we just let things move forward with bad proposals going up to the university. To have colleagues' imprimatur on a proposal is a benefit for faculty members making proposals. Writing a policy in the middle of a conflict is not a good idea.

Faculty member 8: Why don't we combine steps 2&3 in the process?

UEC chair: Faculty members may request expedition. We've done that in a hurried case in the past. Expedition is not the norm. In general, we respect programs and would like to give them time to discuss.

[Vote called to adopt proposal with two changes.]

Vote tally: Yes: 15, No: 5, Abstention: 1

Zev: We'll adopt this policy and see how it works.

UEC chair: If you have further ideas for a better policy, let the UEC know. We can continue to make changes. I can set up a Google doc to collect ideas.

Discussion and Vote: Elimination of graduate program options (Cho, Appendix 2)
   • Only graduate faculty vote, everyone is welcome to discuss

Zev: In a review Kirk discovered two unused codes for graduate degrees, one for Textual Studies and one for Theory & Criticism. These codes are confusing but we can't just eliminate them. There's a process. Brian Reed makes the decision after we let him know faculty vote. Other departments have these codes and have told me they are hard to remove. Heekyoung: do you have anything to add?

Heekyoung: I share Zev's view that the codes for Textual Studies and Theory & Criticism options cause problems. One of these codes was assigned to a student in the past mistakenly. She wished to change it before graduating but the Graduate School would not allow it because it was too close to graduation.

10-41   DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (ASIAN LANG & LIT: TEXTUAL STUDIES)
20-41   DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (ASIAN LANG & LIT: THEORY & CRITICISM)

Zev: It's really not clear if just graduate faculty should vote or all faculty should vote. The Graduate School doesn't make it clear. Let's have all voting-eligible faculty vote, not just graduate faculty.

[Vote is called to remove unused codes.]

Vote tally: Yes: 22, No: 0, Abstention: 0

V.   **Discussion:** Department web site orange banner (Handel) • https://asian.washington.edu/: "Statement on Sexual Harassment and Ensuring a Safe Department Environment"

Zev: I'd like to take it down but didn't want to do this without knowing other views. We put up the banner last year, but that banner is intended to be used for short-term announcements. And the link points to a statement by department leadership that is now outdated, since leadership has changed. Taking the banner down in no way means we will stop working on these issues around sexual harassment and department culture. We have a committee working on this and related issues. [Asks for a show of hands of any objections.] No hands, so I will have the staff take down the banner and I will consult with the Committee on AL&L Community Life about restructuring the information we have on our web site about department climate, getting help, resources at the university, and so on.

VI.   **Updates from Standing Committee Chairs**

• Cho: Graduate Admissions and Education

In Autumn we revised policies not aligned with Graduate School, in Winter we focused on Graduate Admissions and Scholarships, and in Spring we are working on Flexible Degree requirements.

• Hamm: Technology

Kaoru has done the lion's share of committee work. I will speak since he is on leave this quarter. The chief task is to coordinate workstation initiative of the College. This year we awarded new equipment to a record 9 faculty members. We also worked on a policy for emergency loaners available in the office.

• Handel: Advancement
Paul, Nazry, Joe and I have worked to raise awareness of the department and fundraise.
Assunta Ng's fundraising party, held this year, generated a lot of funds and connections that will sustain us for a long time. Washinkai continues to raise awareness in premodern Japanese literature. Thanks to Joe and Nazry we are expanding fundraising in Buddhist Studies and Southeast Asia.

• Nishikawa & Won: TA Training
Itsuko shares comprehensive powerpoint slides on TA Training. Slides outline committee duties as follows: 1. TA Orientation (Sept), TA Application Workshop (Dec), Distinguished TA Award (Spring), TA Survey (Dec-Jan), TA Mixer (Jan), TA Observation (Winter/Spring)

• A. Ohta: Undergraduate Education
Besides course proposal procedures and reviewing proposals Yen, Ungsan, and I are thinking of professional development.

• Pauwels: Peer Teaching
Junghee, BichNoc, and I have worked together on Peer Teaching duties. Who reviews whom is complex. We are also updating bylaws to align them with existing process.

• Sandjaja: Diversity
Our committee responds to input and concerns over DEIA issues. We consult with Dean Maya Smith. We have a draft DEIA statement that is almost ready to be presented to faculty. It is forward facing.

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

Zev: I have just enough time to spend two minutes on the first three items.

VIII. Updates

• Department By-laws
I was asked the status of the department by-laws last faculty meeting. In September I asked Justin to make a skeleton of what by-laws should hang on so we can break it up and have groups work on sections. He hasn't done this. I also asked all standing committees to describe how their committee is constituted and what they do. Then, I tasked them with align by-laws with existing practices so that we can come up with a revised version. My plan is to collect all the committees' draft revisions for faculty to approve for an updated set of by-laws.

• Non-Anglophone Humanities Data Science position

We've been given an opportunity to hire a PhD student slated to receive their degree in June. This is the result of a division wide search. The candidate is a recommendation to the department. The division cannot force us to take the person. We are not going to run our own search with just one candidate. I've created a committee: Ping, Paul, Joe, and Liping. They are working now to fly candidate out for a job talk slated for April 28, 3:30. It's this person or no one. [When Chris was acting chair of the Department last spring] we expressed interest in having this kind of person on our faculty.

• Merit-based salary increases for 2023-24

What is known about salary increases is that based on the latest proposal there will be a 2.25% increase for all meritorious faculty. There is an additional .75-1.75% available but it's not clear yet how it would be distributed. The maximum amount available is 4%. The additional amount could be given to everyone or distributed based on merit or to address salary inequities. I'll let you know when the university has made a final decision.

Other items to be announced by email after the meeting:
• Convocation Speaker: Robin Leong
• AL&L opinion column in *Northwest Asian Weekly*
• Assistant Teaching Professor hires in Chinese and Korean
• Office space challenges
• Proposal to overhaul Merit Review process; we will vote on a change to Faculty Code
• TEAL
• Hiring outlook in the College

Adjourned:

5:00

Appendix 1: Revised Departmental Process for Course Proposals

Change #1: Step 2

Old: The faculty member incorporates feedback as needed and desired, and indicates **on the proposal what the program consensus is regarding the proposal**. The proposer then sends the proposal to the Associate Chair.

New: The faculty member incorporates feedback as needed and desired, and indicates **whether the program has approved the proposal**. The proposer then sends the proposal to the Associate Chair.

Change #2: Step 4

The Associate Chair indicates their approval to the proposer and Anna.

Old: NOTE: If, **along the way, there was not a positive consensus from the program**, as a part of the Associate Chair's final review, the Associate Chair **also consults the Department Chair for final approval. The Department Chair has final say if there is no consensus**.

New: NOTE: If **the relevant program did not approve the proposal, then** as a part of the Associate Chair's final review, the Associate Chair **will consult the Chair and the Undergraduate Education Committee, and work together to decide whether the proposal should move forward**.

Appendix 2: Elimination of two unused PhD degree options

Graduate program requirements are being encoded into a computerized audit system. As part of this process, the department is reviewing its degree programs and codes. We have two degree codes that have not been used in decades (if ever). Rather than encode them in the new system, Kirk has proposed eliminating them. They are:

10-41   DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (ASIAN LANG & LIT: TEXTUAL STUDIES)
20-41   DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (ASIAN LANG & LIT: THEORY & CRITICISM)

Brian Reed: "Degree options like these are an old way of promoting cross-departmental collaboration. They have almost entirely been supplanted by graduate certificate programs. … There is no formal College process overseeing the elimination of degree options from department's PhD degrees, which means that it would fall within the discretion of the relevant Divisional Dean. **I would approve abolishing the Textual Studies and Theory and Criticism degree options in AL&L**, contingent on your also receiving the green light from [Geoff] Turnovsky and [Eric] Ames (or whoever else affiliated with CMS might be the current appropriate decision maker on behalf of the Theory and Criticism program)."

Geoff Turkovsky (French and Italian Studies): "There are something like 12 Textual Studies degree options, connected to PhDs in various depts. These were all set up when the Textual Studies program was established in the late 90s. I was surprised to learn of the range of these options when Jeff and I put the TDS grad certificate together in 2016 or so. As I understand it, these are all programs within the respective depts — they're not really cross-departmental. As Brian suggests, this was an effort to create something cross-departmental, but administratively, these are all individual options fully within the purview of the PhD programs in departments. They would have been each set up individually in each of the departments, so I'm amazed at the work involved. … **No issues on my end about eliminating this. We're entirely focused on the grad certificate** (and the minor). Anyway, there's no relevant governing structure here outside of AL&L. And I'm certain other departments are not going to care if you eliminate this option within the AL&L Ph.D. My guess is me reaching out to other departments will just generate confusion because I would bet, like you, that most departments with this option aren't even aware of it."

Eric Ames delegated Míċeál Vaughan to respond.

Míċeál Vaughan (Cinema and Media Studies) reports that his department tried to eliminate the Theory & Criticism degree option in 2015, but found it too challenging to get each of the 12-15 departments with these options to coordinate on removing them.

Brian, Geoff, and Míċeál all have no objection to AL&L eliminating these degree options. The Graduate School requires a vote of the faculty to do so.