TO: The Graduate School
FROM: SIAS UWB Program Review Committee

Beth Kalikoff, chair, associate professor of Writing Studies, director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, University of Washington

Maria Damon, Professor, Department of Humanities and Media Studies, Pratt Institue of Art

George Sanchez, professor of American Studies & Ethnicity and History, director of the Center for Democracy and Diversity, University of Southern California

Richard Watts, associate professor of French and Italian, University of Washington

DATE: August 2019
RE: SIAS UWB Program Review

Preamble

The SIAS self-study is a model of cogency and ambition reflecting ferocious commitment to excellence in scholarship, evidence-based teaching, community engagement, and student success. This commitment is especially impressive given the scale, complexity, and variety of SIAS degree programs. In addition, the review committee commends the wide range of constituencies that contributed to the self-study.

During the site visit, the committee was struck by the devotion and enthusiasm expressed by undergraduates and graduate students, not only to their particular majors and programs, but to IAS. Every site visit discussion, including those with the staff and with colleagues from partnering units, conveyed a remarkable commitment to "walking the talk." Students, faculty, staff educators, and alumni are particularly committed to interdisciplinarity and to diversity, equity, and social justice. An unusually robust exit discussion amplified this commitment.

Yet "as more is revealed, more is required": bringing this commitment to the meta-level of institutional practices is a sign of maturity and achievement. Recurring review themes point to the need to rethink governance and organization: service exhaustion, dispersion, curricular instability, retention problems, salary and workload expectations, and inequity,

MFA Program

The MFA is a strong, distinctive, and substantive program. In a short period of time, it has become known for its multi-genre approaches and focus on poetics, i.e. articulating ongoing reflective and self-reflective practices, featuring internationally known younger writer/artists, especially in digital poetics, as well as respected scholars in poetry and poetics. Additionally, the review committee values the practice of having five-sixths of a faculty member's assignment

in SIAS & one-sixth in the MFA, a way of integrating the MFA program into other IAS work. On this basis, the committee would normally recommend a review in 10 years.

However, given that the Interim Vice Chancellor was absent from the SIAS program review exit discussion, a permanent Vice Chancellor is now in place, and a new SIAS dean will soon be appointed, and given the MFA program's challenges, none of which have to do with program quality, the committee recommends a review in 3 years. The 3-year review report would be directed to the Vice Chancellor and the new dean, cc-ed to the Graduate School, because the decisions that need to take place regarding the MFA program are internal. It is our hope that this recommendation is seen as an opportunity to rescue a strong program and to keep collective attention focused on the problem while taking concrete steps to resolve it.

What a 3-year review report will include:

1. Measurable progress on developing a hiring plan that pays simultaneous attention to programmatic ambitions, curricular needs, and budgetary constraints
2. Evidence of progress on identifying alternative or supplemental funding streams for the support of MFA students
3. Assessment of a joint MFA application plan where a single application process allows students to apply to the MFA program at UW Seattle, at UW Bothell, or both
4. Any other evidence of successful efforts to support MFA students and the program

Part B: Unit Defined Questions for IAS Academic Program Review

The trifecta of rapid growth in terms of institutional proliferation (hiring, new CAWGs developing, more students), cost of living in the region, and first-generation student demographics indicate a need to rethink basic structures as a result of different material conditions. The challenge IAS faces is first to reject bimodal thinking, where the only choices are "we must embrace current interdisciplinary practices and structures, which exhaust us and increase inequity" or "we must descend into departmentalization and disciplinarity, from which hole we will watch the dream die." Stability need not lead to disciplinarity, but the interdisciplinary structures and practices must be adjusted to reflect changes in scale.

1. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

IAS has made commendable advances. While student enrollment has stabilized, the composition of enrolled students has changed. 40% of IAS enrollments are people of color and first-generation students, while 15% of IAS enrollments are international, multilingual students. IAS has hired some faculty and staff members from underrepresented groups.
Faculty research on equity and social justice is integrated throughout the curriculum. The diversity plan reflects grass-roots rather than top-down efforts. The Diversity Committee is

comprised of staff as well as faculty members. Hiring a diversity coordinator, then changing the position to an associate dean position, reflects both need and commitment.

Yet creating and sustaining equitable classrooms requires more than the infusion of social justice research into the curriculum. It also calls for iterative, evidence-based, and systemic attention to what one faculty member calls "the pedagogy of the people in the room." Beyond the classroom, practices of addressing inequity remain individualized and reactive. There is a "diversity tax" on staff and faculty members from underrepresented groups: the implicit expectation is that they respond individually to matters of bias and inequity, leading to service exhaustion. All staff and faculty members need to know about and use IAS/UWB procedures and protocols for responding to bias.

Similarly, the informality that has been a feature of IAS has become a bug. There is a need for more formal and transparent communication, especially regarding the portfolios of and practices that have an impact on artists-in-residence, lecturers, and assistant professors. The de facto policies around teaching assignments, for example, need formal, IAS-wide articulation. EX: tenure-line and tenured faculty may choose the times and days they teach but lecturers may not. EX: lecturers teach 100- and 200-level courses, except when a senior colleague goes on leave, when they may teach a 300- or 400-level course. EX: Lecturers receive a course release do perform service--what does a course-worth of service look like? What's enough, what's too much? These issues are not unique to IAS or to UW. They are part of a national conversation on equity around adjunct faculty, lecturers, and tenure-line faculty.

Similarly, the need to retain teaching scholars from underrepresented groups--whether competitively recruited lecturers or tenure-line faculty--is not unique to IAS or to UW. Yet the need is urgent and must be centered, addressed effectively, as IAS moves forward. One way to begin doing so is to disaggregate data and experiences of "people of color" as a single group in favor of identifying what specific issues, for example, native, African American, Latino, and LGBTQI students or faculty or staff face. What are the patterns over time? Finally, while all faculty groups expressed exhaustion, it is worth noting that lecturers and assistant professors are also worried about the future and the play of equity across that future.

2. Governance and Budget

The single-entity structure has virtues, but challenges in the area of governance especially, and budget at well, need addressing.

The committee commends the creation of associate dean positions, as well as the decision to give the faculty council a wider and more precisely articulated role. Yet the faculty council, curriculum committee, associate deans, and CAWGS are all only advisory. As a result, faculty members in leadership roles have responsibilities but no decision-making power. The structures have the appearance of shared governance but fall short of the reality.

The he current dean is talented and committed to openness, but IAS structures, policies, and norms cannot depend on the expertise and good will of a single person. Such structures, policies, and norms must be created, adapted, and/or articulated to support the new dean and protect faculty members.

Clear lines of communication are key. A number of faculty members don't know where budget and governance decisions are made, by whom, by what unit, on which campus. Too, the committee recommends surfacing norms. EX: does every faculty member have the right to go directly to the dean to request a course release? If not, who does? On what basis are course releases approved? Retentions and promotions cost money, of course, but while promotion processes are more clear, there is a need for transparency around retention processes (while recognizing the limits of disclosures that can be made.)

Some faculty members see CAWGs as occasions for intellectual, interdisciplinary conversations with colleagues, others less so, due to the service work required in the CAWGs. The committee recommends distinguishing between core and affiliate status in individual CAWGs. It also recommends that each faculty member have core status in one CAWG for a 3-year period and affiliate status in another CAWG for the same period. Changes to and growth of CAWGs seem to align with the portfolio of the associate dean of curriculum, while changes to and growth of the faculty council align with the portfolio of the associate dean of faculty. At the risk of stating the obvious, should these responsibilities be added to those associate dean portfolios, other responsibilities must be subtracted. An annual hiring plan (see recommendations for 3-year report measures) can be developed by CAWGs in concert with faculty council.

As the dean says, advocating for the role of IAS courses for pre-majors is important in terms of planning for permanent faculty positions.

3. Scholarly Engagement and Impact

Faculty members feel that engagement with different CAWGs and disciplines is still a highlight of their intellectual lives at IAS. But service demands too often replace intellectual exchange of ideas for teaching and research. Many of these service demands come from within rather than beyond IAS. Their reduction would increase intellectual engagement, so that assistant professors would not find themselves seeking intellectual engagement primarily from UW Seattle colleagues. The committee recommends limiting and/or clarifying service expectations for tenure-line faculty members and for lecturers.

Tenured faculty members think they are protecting tenure-line faculty members from service. Associate professors believe that they are responsible for picking up additional service obligations. Are each of these statements true? Either? Regardless, these assertions reflect the need for transparency and clarification.

There are diverse perspectives on whether tenure-track and lecturers are expected to meet the same expectations for scholarly production. Mixed messages are received from deans. Too, a

faculty member can ask the same question of three senior colleagues and get three different responses. The committee recommends that expectation for tenure be formalized, written down, with greater clarity than presently exists, and that tenured faculty review these expectations in order to provide consistent and accurate information when consulted. Too, how is scholarly impact evaluated? Does the answer differ depending on the area of study? Nationally, the expectation for artists-in-residence is that they have a smaller teaching load so they can produce art. Do artists-in-residence require different teaching loads from lecturers?

4. Career Pathways and Lifelong Learning

Creating and curating a portfolio while earning an IAS degree is a powerful way for students to reflect on their own progress, learning, and development. The portfolios are introduced effectively in year one and engaged usefully at the conclusion of a student's IAS career.

There is a sense, not uncommon with program-wide portfolios, that engagement with the portfolio dissipates between year one and the capstone. Students report wanting more guidance between those two points. Including reflective practices, self-assessment, and consideration of portfolio artifacts in all courses would address this concern while making the portfolio process and product more meaningful. Reflective pieces could be required for all high-impact practices, particularly those involving global study, community engagement, internships, and meaningful work experiences. Too, a reflective piece that assesses the portfolio as a whole would serve to strengthen the sense that the portfolio has value.

The committee applauds the recent inclusion of an annual curated public display of portfolios. The opportunity (not requirement) for students to share their portfolios with academic and faculty advisors may have a value, too, for the students and for the advisors. Presumably some portfolio artifacts are used as writing samples for job and graduate school applications.

The committee recommends that faculty members partner with the career center to introduce or articulate the way some class assignments, activities, and goals in 200-level and 300-level courses represent professional or career skills. The alumni network has potential to contribute to the shared work of identifying paid internships on campus, near campus, or online that can advance this work.

5. Community Engagement and Impact

IAS should be celebrated for sustaining this commitment to community engagement and impact in scholarship and teaching. The Advisory Board is a good beginning: the review committee recommends expanding the Board and partnering with it more intentionally. In addition, partnering with First-Year Programs to build new engagement courses into first-year pre-major curriculum highlights commitment to engagement among pre-majors while bringing more students into IAS. As per the recommendation in Career Pathways and Lifelong Learning above, each course with community engagement should require that each student submits a

reflective piece and final project into their portfolio. There is a need for more community-based capstones inside of each CAWG major. Finally, IAS has the opportunity to highlight the impact of engagement in both local Puget Sound areas and in global outreach.

Conclusion

In response to the questions of the self-study and the site visit, the review committee offers the following specific recommendations:

1. Address and articulate the difference between tenure-line faculty portfolios and promotion-eligible lecturer portfolios, when hiring and in writing, visible to all faculty
2. Differentiate between the portfolios of lecturers and artists-in-residence, when hiring and in writing, visible to all faculty
3. Address and articulate teaching equity policies, norms, and practices, including those of class size, class level, and schedule choice
4. Offer assistant professors and promotion-eligible lecturers "first crack" at teaching in the summer.
5. Make visible "invisible" forms of labor: CAWG coordinators, informal student support that is also integral to faculty research areas.
6. Strengthen the role of the associate deans so that they have rights as well as responsibilities. IAS staff and faculty are amazing: re-assign some of the coordination responsibilities they currently have and which can be performed by staff and by other faculty, so that associate dean portfolios match their titles.
7. Consider forming a CAWG devoted to first-year student development
8. Have faculty members update their CAWG affiliations every three years
9. Have larger faculty governance bodies report to associate deans
10. Offer more General Education courses to reflect target student-to-faculty ratio (20:1, currently 17:1). Aim for this target by focusing on major and discipline, rather than on individual faculty member.