

## Department Faculty Meeting

March 8, 2022

Noon – 1:20

**ONLINE MEETING ONLY**

**Zoom Link**

<https://washington.zoom.us/j/94538497195>

### Agenda items

12:00 - 12:05	Feb Minute vote	Campbell
12:05 - 12:10	Building updates	Campbell
12:10 - 12:25	URDP voting policy – discussion & vote	Campbell
12:25 – 12:40	Data Science hire – comments	Campbell/search committee
12:40 – 1:15	Data Science hire – closed discussion and vote	Campbell
1:15 – 1:20	Short topics	Open

Present

Jan Whittington, Andy Dannenberg, Larissa Maziak, Christopher Campbell, [Rachel Berney](#), Daniel Abramson, Mark Purcell, [Manish Chalana](#), Marina Alberti, Himanshu Grover, Qing Shen, Bob Mugerauer

Absent [Sofia Dermisi](#), Keith Harris

**Feb 22 minutes**

Moved and seconded

7 yes

1 abstain

## Discussion and vote on the voting policy for the Data Science Position

### Procedure for Evaluating and Voting on Candidates for the “Data Science” Position

Departmental meeting March 8, 2022

#### Open Meeting:

1. Receive the evaluation and recommendations of the search committee, allowing for Q&A.
2. Receive additional comments on the candidates from those not eligible to vote.

#### Closed Meeting – Eligible voting faculty only:

3. Faculty comments: Each member of the faculty will have equal opportunity to briefly state their views on the candidates. Proceed alphabetically, requesting colleagues to identify the activities they undertook to become familiar with the candidates.
4. Open deliberation, facilitated by the Appointment Committee Members. When the faculty are ready, entertain motions. Suggestions for the faculty to choose from:

[Option 1] *Motion 1:* “The faculty of the Department of Urban Design and Planning recommends the appointment of [group] to the position of Assistant Professor, tenure track in the Department of Urban Design and Planning.” [This motion is designed to produce a collective recommendation that will allow the candidates to move forward without producing an implicit ranking of the candidates.]

[Option 2] *Motion 2:* “The faculty of the Department of Urban Design and Planning recommends the appointment of [name single candidate] to the position of Assistant Professor, tenure track in the Department of Urban Design and Planning.” [Repeat motion for all of the candidates brought forward by the Appointment Committee]

6. Prepare statements for each motion summarizing information to aid voters (eg. pros/cons, rationale, etc.) that summarize the discussion or issues that have taken place, for all and including those who would be submitting a post-meeting electronic absentee vote. Distribute to all voting faculty members in Catalyst, keeping the option of voting available for 72 hours post-meeting.

Voting will be done by secret ballot: anonymous to everyone except the Assistant to the Chair, Larissa. Every voting member of the faculty will be given an opportunity to vote either in person, online during the meeting time, or electronically over a 72 hour period following the faculty meeting,

- Zoom meeting votes: Vote by private direct message in Zoom chat to Larissa.
- Electronic voting (includes post-meeting absentee ballots): Vote by Catalyst or Google Forms set up and operated by Larissa.

Larissa will ensure that the votes are legitimate, **but will withhold announcement of the count until a 72 hour period of electronic voting is concluded** after the faculty meeting.

Any voting faculty member, whether present at the meeting or not, may request that their vote be taken electronically during the 72 hour post-meeting window for voting.

**Announcement of the final vote count will be by Larissa at the end of the 72 hour post-meeting window of electronic voting.**

Essential characteristics of online voting, as advised by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, will be followed as shown:

1. Ability to assure that only eligible voters are allowed/able to vote
  - use of specific password & login security
  - current roster of eligible voters
  - reasonable and announced period for voting that is fairly consistent across all voting if not specified in procedures; send reminder before voting period closes
2. Anonymity v. confidentiality – Because password & login security are used, the vote can't be anonymous to all, however, it can be kept confidential by limiting the access to the identity of voters to a trusted source.
3. Actual voting setup issues (Catalyst allows this): a voter can change his own vote before it is cast/"sent"; once "sent", neither the voter nor anyone else can change the vote; a person can't vote more than once.
4. Documentation, Verification & Auditable – method to assure that a cast vote is really counted, and can be recounted, if necessary; who voted, and who didn't, as a public record; the voter can discover if his vote has been changed (or miscounted) and fix it without destroying the secrecy of the ballot.
5. Final vote is verified and certified by 2 people (eg. Faculty Senate votes are certified by the Secretary of the Faculty & the Senate Chair) & reported in writing to the voters/official in charge. For our department, these trusted individuals are Larissa Maziak and Diana Siembor.

Academic HR Policies and Procedures Voting Guidelines stipulate that all reports of voting results must include the following 5 elements:

1. Total number of eligible voters
2. Total number of favorable votes
3. Total number of unfavorable votes
4. Total number of abstentions
5. Total number of absent voters( people who do not cast a vote)

The faculty code requires that for a faculty appointment to pass, a majority of those eligible to vote in the department must vote favorably (yes). A vote of less than **or exactly 50% of those eligible to vote** does not represent a majority. For our department, Winter 2022, **a majority vote is 7 votes**. Note: abstentions effectively function as 'no' votes since they are not included as favorable (yes) votes. Faculty Senate representatives recommend that abstentions be reserved for times when there is a clear conflict of interest or other significant factor that would preclude a vote.

## Questions

What are we voting on? After the committee shares their reports..the faculty can recommend who they would like to move forward

These voting procedures are only for this vote

Motion to approve Procedure for Evaluating and Voting on Candidates for the "Data Science" Position

move approve

7 yes

1 abstention

## Data Science Committee:

### OPEN PORTION OF THE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

It's been a challenging process and got down to 4 finalists and came down to 2 that stood out and 2 have been dropped for various reasons.

The committee felt strongly about submitting a ranking system. Per below, SM Labib would be first and Karen second.

## Summaries of Finalists for the UDP//DEOHS//DS Appointment From the Appointment Committee, March 8, 2022

To Share in Faculty Meetings the week of March 8-12

Pursuant to votes of the Faculty Members of UDP and DEOHS

### 1. **SM Labib**

#### **Applicant summary:**

Dr. Labib is currently an Assistant Professor of Data Science and Health in the Dept. of Human Geography and Spatial Planning at Utrecht University in the Netherlands and a Visiting

Research Associate of the MRC Epidemiology Unit at the University of Cambridge in England. He has a PhD in Geography (2020) and a masters in Geographical Information Science from the University of Manchester and a bachelors in urban planning from the Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology. He has 14 publications as well as several under review in a mix of public health, planning, and environmental journals. His research focuses on using spatial data on public health and built environment issues in urban contexts to assess environmental exposure, including greenspace and air pollution on streetscapes and for cyclists, with a research agenda oriented toward exposure over the lifespan. Such analysis and methods for analyzing differential exposure across urban space holds promise for research aims in social equity and environmental health.

### **Talking points:**

- Selected as top choice with consensus from the search committee
- Pro-active approach to this position; knowledgeable about UW centers and research, as well as good preliminary thoughts on how he could fit in at the UW
- Is pursuing research that would easily fit in and continue the ongoing research on the built environment and active living at the UW, including the Urban Form Lab in UDP
- Excellent collaborative vision with experience collaborating on research and publications
- Strong data science expertise; passionate about innovative approaches to urban health issues
- Strong and well-articulated vision for teaching data science courses at UW
- Experience teaching spatial analysis/machine learning to students with diverse data science backgrounds
- Strong interest in reproducibility and a history of working with open access data
- Strong basis for future international research collaborations with excellent network of colleagues in health and built environment field
- Ready to participate immediately in teaching and improving health and built environment related courses and to support MUP/MPH concurrent degree program
- Strong publication record for this stage of career
- Productive, energetic, and considered collegial in interactions with committee members

## **2. Karen Chen**

### **Applicant summary:**

Dr. Chen is currently a Postdoctoral Associate in the School of the Environment at Yale University, and a recipient of the Gaylord Donnelley Fellowship in the Yale Institute for Biospheric Studies. She has a PhD in Environmental Science (2020) from Aarhus University in Denmark and has masters and bachelors degrees in Geography from National Taiwan University. She has 10 publications as well as several under review in a mix of remote sensing and environmental journals. Her research applies artificial intelligence—deep learning—to remote sensing and other forms of spatial data to understand the effects of the urban environment on human health and well-being, especially mental health, in general and with relation to climate change, in Europe and in various parts of the Global South. In urban planning her research addresses a fundamental problem of how to predict urbanization, in general and with respect to data poor regions of the world. She maintains relationships with local communities engaged in her research, as well as international colleagues collaborating in research, and has experience working on problems related to social inequities in the Global South.

### Talking points:

- Karen would be an excellent colleague and the Committee is enthusiastic about recruiting her to UW. Her research is transformative for urban planning, with strong potential at the intersection of UDP/DEOHS/DS.
- Is pursuing research that would bring in novel directions for research on urban environment and health, with lots of opportunities for researching mental health, aging, cities, and climate at the UW, including the Urban Form Lab in UDP
- Well qualified, collegial, and highly interested in collaboration across all three disciplines including a very strong foundation in urban planning – She is well-prepared and creative, and would be a high performer at UW, bringing in new ideas and streams of research in the long run
- Capable of developing innovative research approaches to urban health and sustainability issues
- Experience and interest in urban research globally, including the global south, maintaining high level (remote sensing & other data sets) and on the ground relationships for community engagement at several locations globally
- Strong record of research and publication accomplishments even though still at an early stage of her academic career
- Her lines of research already include disproportionate negative impacts and mitigations such as humanitarian aid for marginalized groups, especially in the Global South.
- Connection with the Danish National Patient Registry, a superb resource, has excellent future collaborative potential for health-related research
- Excellent pedagogical skill set and situational awareness, demonstrating how she would design a course to meet the needs of the diverse graduate student population in UDP and DEOHS

- Very engaging with students across disciplines; is able to brainstorm methods applications with students outside of her own area of research
- Proposed courses on the use of AI with satellite data that are interesting to students. For example: Strong vision for teaching Google Earth Engine skills that would be very accessible to students at multiple levels
- Proposed service activities to promote gender diversity.

**Comments or questions:**

Keep in mind that this is a joint appt and whoever is approved by UDP also has to be approved by Public Health.

The college is moving forward with a non ranked system for all the cohort hires

Can we still have the discussion with everyone in the room? No we need to have a closed meeting with voting faculty members only for the final discussion portion.

How does our vote today fit into the process...the committee has prepared this summary document for both departments

After each meeting the committee will take the votes from the departments and make a recommendation to give to the chairs, then the chairs discuss and make a recommendation

Finally, the chairs recommendation goes to the Dean...and ultimately the board of regents

Andy is presenting to Public Health on Friday

When DEHOS votes...will they know the outcome of UDP? NO...we want them to be independent