Department Faculty Meeting

February 21, 2023
Noon – 1:20
In person: Gould 440
https://washington.zoom.us/j/97032024504

Agenda items

12:00 - 12:05	Review Agenda – Special treat!!	Campbell
12:05 - 12:15	Approve Feb 7 minutes (vote)	Campbell
12:15 – 12:20	Fac Senate updates; College Council updates	Chalana; Whittington
12:20-12:35	BE Commons Proposal - Agreement in Principle (vote)	Campbell
12:35 – 1:20	Chair Transition update – Guests: Dean Renee Cheng and Steve Bourassa	Born

Attendance:

Faculty Present

1. Dan Abramson
2. Christine Bae – Zoom
3. Branden Born
4. Christopher Campbell
5. Manish Chalana - Zoom
6. Sofia Dermisi
7. Himanshu Grover
8. Qing Shen
9. Jan Whittington
   Dylan Stevenson
   Robert Freitag

Staff Present
1. Edith Olguin
2. Diana Siembor
3. Wendy Freitag

Approval Minutes:

Approve minutes from February 7, 2023 faculty meeting – **Approved**

Faculty will vote on Jan 24 minutes next faculty meeting.

Faculty Senate and College Council updates

(Manish) – Faculty Senate, no updates.

(Whittington) – Updates:

Working on modifications to the process that the Curriculum Committee uses to proposals for courses. Hopefully in two weeks will be a vote on these changes.

Reviewing the BE Commons proposal.

BE Commons proposal (Campbell)

This proposal was generated by the current BE Commons Committee, they manage the BE Commons Curriculum. Committee members are listed in the attachment. This is a draft proposal regarding the structure and functioning of the BE Commons curriculum.

Recommended to see the two appendices.

This proposal will circulate among departments to receive feedback, that will go to the College Council, they will prepare some comments.

BE Commons Committee wants:

1. Feedback – questions, concerns, changes, comments.
2. Straw vote (Agreement in principle) – if we should be continued moving forward in developing this BE Commons Curriculum.

This has been in process for several years, if faculty doesn't want to move forward it can be stopped.

Agreement in principle means that in principal we agree in the notion of BE Commons and if we should me moving forward to revise the proposal and make it workable for CBE.

(Whittington) Comments:

Process question – If CBE Commons committee is asking for feedback - What is the process and schedule to modify the proposal?

Proposal – faculty spend time between this faculty meeting and the next faculty meeting to read and collect written comments.

Not comfortable on voting even in principal because there's practically nothing that separates them both in principle from a vote in favor of a written document and I wouldn't want that to be misconstrued by anyone outside in this room.

(Abramson) This was received with a very short of time to review.

(Dermisi) Do not understand the rush, it is unfair to faculty to request feedback in a short time. It was not requested to have a straw vote

(Born) Ask faculty to commit to review the document, have comments and be prepare to make a decision in two weeks.

(Bae) Agrees, not ready to vote.

(Shen) feels don't have enough information, why this took so long?

(Born) It was not administratively well managed.

(Whittington) Clarify that the elected Faculty Council is not asking for departmental votes. They want to see comments on the document. The next two weeks is the process of collecting comments.

(Dermisi) It would be helpful to have someone next meeting to have some background and can respond questions.

(Campbell) There is consensus on giving two weeks to review it. The expectation is that everyone read the proposal and comment on it. In two weeks, the department will give the comments to the College Council rep, J. Whittington, will take the comments to the College Council and the College Council will use these comments to make their comments. We will expect the College Council review in about three weeks (J. Whittington confirms).

Conversation will continue in the next faculty meeting.

Out of order

(Whittington) NEURUS is an International Exchange Program that mean to provide faculty advising and host European universities to UW students. UW is host in April. Would like to talk and put together an agenda and logistics. It has small budged implication. Conversation will continue next faculty meeting.

Chair Transition update (Chen/Bourassa)

C. Campbell turned the meeting over B. Born to run it.

(R. Shen) Steve Bourassa will chair the UDP Chair search. And want to get a sense of what questions do you have about the process? What type of qualities do you want from a Chair? What kind of challenges the chair would be navigating in UDP?

(Whittington) it would be helpful for faculty to see a job description, clarification if the chair position will be with or without an Associate Chair, and what the Associate Chair position will be and process to hire that position. This will help to address the questions about the qualities needed from a chair.

(R. Shen) Don't think UDP needs an Associate Chair unless it is a gap or particularly need.
(Whittington) What is the roll of faculty in the hiring process? This faculty has participated in the hiring process of the last two chair searches in a democratic way, would like to maintain that faculty participate in the choice of finalists and the choose of the final candidate. It would be nice to have the process layout by steps.

(Dermisi) Question about doing an internal search rather than an external search.

(Shen) Generally review if there is internal interest first before proceeding with an external search. There are possibilities to do an external search if there is not interest or not qualified candidates for the position. According to my reading of the department, wouldn't do an external search if there are internal qualify candidates that are interested.

(Dermisi) How many internal viable candidates would you like to see?

(R. Shen) For internal there is not minimum. The most important is the dialogue in the faculty related to the leadership qualities, the choice between a number of candidates is not the key piece. Chair appointments have been done for 3 years and there is a review, this is different to the UW 5 years review. CBE does a streamline 3 years review and the person can renew. In CBE chairs pattern, they served for 6-7 years, maybe 8. After the 5 years feedback they serve a few more years after that. The 3 years gives a good feedback, they can renew. At the 5 years they would end or renew to 6 years. The chair search is not like a faculty search with a competitive pool. Having an external chair search that is someone in the professor level (Senior), it may preclude the department for going for two of junior faculty searches in the near future.

(Q. Shen) Having an associate professor as a chair is not uncommon but must be tenure track.

(Whittington) Can you specify a nomination process?

(R. Shen) Wanted to this discussion before setting up any steps but the typically the chair of the chair search and I would look at the department demographic representation required by the executive order of who is already serving in other committees. Nominations and self-nominations can go directly to S. Bourassa now. After the search committee is form, the job description can be finalized based on the one revisited for Architecture, then it will go to UDP faculty. And it will be final call for nominations and self-nominations.

It will be a rubric in the job description, the search committee review the applicants, make sure qualifications are met. It will be some level of public interaction, panel discussions have been very effective and successful, this an option. Candidates will meet with the search committee, with the Dean, the feedback could be in a anonymous survey. The search committee take all these and meet with faculty in a forma session. The executive order is clear that vote is not required but faculty is always free to vote. Personally, I prefer more cons and pross than votes. I would like to choose between two candidates that you find acceptable.

(Whittington) This faculty has been successful on coming into consensus on who our top candidate is. That was respected by the Dean at the time for the two past chair searches (Q. Shen/C. Campbell).

(R. Shen) Consensus is the ideal. Having consensus any process we use will be positive. Number of candidates, the vote, pros and cons, ranking, are in place in case there is not consensus or there is a variety of point of views.

(Bourassa) My next step is to form the search committee, draft the job description and go from there.

Bourassa's background: split between Urban Planning and Real Estate, PhD in Urban Planning, being chair of planning departments and also real estate departments, quite familiar with the field, this is useful for this process.

(Bae) What is the most important attributes for a successful chair that we can think of?

(R. Shen) There are many models of being a successful chair in this college, the current group of chairs there are different styles and backgrounds, chairs run department that are different sizes, different cultures, practices, disciplines and industry partners. The ability to work with others and appreciate how differences play out and what can be find in common. Being an advocate for the department but also to work cooperatively with the other departments in the college. Some chairs are more comfortable with financial stuff or visionary or industry advocacy. Having a mix of strengths has been great.

(Whittington) Question about the 3 years streamline review process.

(Bourassa) Chairing the 3 years review for G. Migliaccio; The instructions from the Dean is to keep it simple, obtain a report of what the chair has done over the past 3 years. Survey the full-time faculty, maybe some other groups. It is a collection of information form these sources, also interview the chair to make sure I understand his report. After all of this I will write a report to submit it to the Dean. There is not a committee.

(Q. Shen) This review is to confirm that the person is working effectively with the faculty, to get coaching and get additional resources as needed.

(Bae) Will there be external letters for candidates?

(Q. Shen) It is important to know how the PACs and students perceive the candidates. External letters outside UW, I think we had had external letters or at least references listed for candidates in the recent searches.

Adjourned 1:20pm