Welcome to the Chemical Oceanography
Spring 2021 Seminar Series

This series will be ½ chemical oceanography seminars and ½ departmental “101” seminars

The departmental seminars will be ~30 minutes long plus questions, and will be recorded and placed on the departmental website

Fridays 1:30pm
April 2  Rick Keil, Anitra Ingalls, LuAnne Thompson & Parker MacCready  
"Decadal Review 2021: an overview and invitation to participate"

April 9  Kenny Bolster, USC, "Iron Cycling in Oxygen Minimum Zones"

April 16  Stephanie Harrington, UW CoE, "University Budgets 101"

April 23  available

April 30  Rick Keil & Kittie Tucker "School of Oceanography Budgets 101"

May 7  Brook Nunn, UW, "Protein Cycling in Marine waters"

May 14  Melinda Seevers, James Anderson & Liz Excell, UW CoE, "Advancement and Giving at UW and in the School of Oceanography"

May 21  Allison Myers-Pigg PNNL Sequim, "Nearshore Carbon Cycling in the Pacific Northwest"

May 28  Doug Russell, UNOLS, "An Introduction to UNOLS and the US Academic Research Fleet"

June 4  tentatively scheduled
Oceanography Seminar Series, Spring 2021

A seminar series to help people participate in the decadal review and to better understand the school. Also an occasional chemical oceanography talk! Fridays 1:30pm
Who is on the School’s Decadal Review Team?

- Anitra Ingalls (co-chair)
- LuAnne Thompson (co-chair)
- Parker MacCready
- Rick Keil

....and the faculty council

....and every member of our community. This means you!
Reminder of who is in leadership in SoO (March 2021)

- **Director:** Rick Keil
- **Associate Director for Ships and Space:** Bob Morris
- **Associate Director for Academic Programs:** Evelyn Lessard
- **Faculty Council:** Evan Solomon (chair), Parker MacCready (acting chair), Alex Gagnon, Andrea Ogston, Julian Sachs, Julie Keister, Kyle Armour, and the two ADs
- **DEI Committee:** Mikelle Nuwer (co-chair), LuAnne Thompson (co-chair), Randie Bundy, Dhruv Balwada (Postdoc rep), Evan Howard (postdoc rep), Erik Fredrickson (grad prep), Katy Christensen (grad rep), Jaqui Neibauer (staff rep), Emmet Bush (alumni rep)
- **Hiring Committee:** William Wilcock (chair), Kyle Armour, Ginger Armbrust, Anitra Ingalls
- **Academic Affairs Committee:** Evelyn Lessard (chair), Julie Keister, Andrea Ogston, Julian Sachs, Alison Gray
- **Ship Operations:** Robert Kamphaus
- **Departmental Fiscal Management:** Kittie Tucker

(16 of 28 voting faculty are on a leadership committee, 8 men, 8 women, 3-3-10 Assis-Assoc-Prof)
What is a decadal review & who is in charge?

https://www.grad.washington.edu/for-faculty-and-staff/program-review/

“Reviews of all academic units including the graduate and undergraduate degree programs offered by these units are required at least every ten years and are conducted jointly by the Dean of the Graduate School and the Dean of Undergraduate Academic Affairs in cooperation with the relevant School or College Dean” – University Policy Directory (Presidential Orders: Executive Order 20.4).
Among the outcomes of the above reviews should be a clearer understanding of the academic unit's:

1. quality of instruction, research, and public service;
2. value to students' general education and preparation for society;
3. role within the University and effectiveness in fulfilling that role;
4. resource requirements;
5. future objectives and changes necessary to achieve them.
Key questions for a review include:

1. Are the unit’s degree programs of high quality? Do they meet the university’s expectations of quality and reputation?

2. How does the unit compare with that of peer and aspirational institutions in terms of educational programs and scholarship?

3. How can the unit improve the quality of its educational programs and scholarship? What does the unit need to do to increase its regional and national prominence?
The review committee also considers the following additional questions as applicable:

1. Do students, faculty and staff find the department a supportive and welcoming environment in which to pursue their degrees and careers as scholars, teachers, and administrators?

2. Are students, faculty and staff from groups that are underrepresented fully included in the intellectual life of the department?

3. To what extent do the unit’s current facilities and building space meet their needs?

4. To what extent is the unit preparing students at all levels for careers and future academic pursuits?
How is the external committee populated?

- The committee consists of four persons, two from within UW and two from outside.
- The committee chair is internal to UW. Not identified yet.
- The graduate school has our list of names to consider. Some of these names will be dropped due to conflicts. The names are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal to UW</th>
<th>External to UW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becky Alexander - Atm Sci</td>
<td>Margaret Leinen - SIO (confirmed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Caitling - ESS</td>
<td>Victoria Orphan - CalTech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Hungtinton - ESS</td>
<td>Roberta Marinelli - OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Hawley - Astronomy</td>
<td>Richard Murray - WHOI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Anderson - SAFS</td>
<td>Thomas Bianchi - U Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy Connelly - Astronomy</td>
<td>Mary Ann Moran - U Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen Reusink - Biology</td>
<td>David Valentine - UCSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Fitzhugh - Anthropology</td>
<td>Bob Cowen - OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willie Swanson - Genome Sci</td>
<td>Peter Franks - SIO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the components of a decadal review?

- Scoping out the external committee *(grad school handles this with our help)*
- Construction of a self-reflection report *(we are in this stage now; described more fully in a few slides)*
- External committee reads report
- External committee visits and holds open meetings
- External committee writes their report
- School responds to report with yet another report
- The three reports are bundled together and sent to the provost’s office along with a short report from the dean.
- The provost’s office writes a short letter *(not a report!)* empowering *(or not)* the recommendations of the external report.
When exactly is our decadal review?

It has already started!

Fall:

- Kittie and Rick attended an orientation meeting with the graduate school
- ESS, Atmos and Oceanography all agreed to do it this year rather than wait
- Our faculty council began scoping out who to invite to be on our review committee, and scoping out self-reflection questions
When exactly is our decadal review?

Winter:
- Initial requests to serve on external committee were sent, full list being vetted now
- Faculty council and director identified the major themes for the self reflection

Spring (now)
- A series of open meetings to hear from our entire community
- The review team (Anitra, LuAnne, Parker, Rick) will scope out the major elements of the self reflection
- In June there will be a “Charge” meeting where we (leadership) will meet the review committee and hear from the provost’s office about the tasks ahead (a formality)
When exactly is our decadal review?

Summer:

- Self reflection is finished and delivered to the graduate school, and they deliver it to our external review committee

Fall:

- External committee reads the report and meets to plan their visit

Winter 2022

- Our visit will be **THURS - FRI FEBRUARY 7-8 2022**
One important piece:
the Self-reflection document

25 page document + appendices, with prescribed sections

- Section A: Unit answers to pre-determined questions that everyone always has to answer
- Section B: Our actual self-reflection, in which our open meetings help us formulate 1-3 critical questions we’d like the review team to help us with.
- Section C: Appendices, not part of the 25-page limit
Section A: Require narrative

- School Mission and Organizational Structure
  - Lead: Rick and ADs Evelyn and Bob, w/ help from administration

- School Budget and Resources
  - Lead: Rick and ADs Evelyn and Bob, w/ help from administration

- School’s DEI efforts
  - Lead: LuAnne and Mikelle

- Teaching and Learning
  - Educational Goals and outcomes & Mentoring outside the classroom
  - Lead: Evelyn and Academic Affairs committee

- Scholarly Impact
  - A discussion of the impact of or research, lead: faculty council and Rick

- Future Directions
  - Where do we want to go? The open meetings will help us define this.

Total: 21 pages at most including graphics and required tables of information
Section B: Self-reflection

- We set questions to the review committee and they are negotiated at the charge meeting.
- Limited to 4 pages
- The questions being pondered this time are discussed later, but first let’s evaluate the questions and outcomes from the past 3 decadal reviews going back to the 1990s
1990 Decadal Review

Self-study identified space as our #1 issue

- Poor lab space for Chemical Oceanography (Old Ocean building in disrepair)
- Chemical Oceanography faculty spread in three buildings
- MG&G in two buildings
- PO faculty in two buildings
- Poor computational space for servers etc.
- Need for common space for sharing and meeting (small conference room, etc)

RESULT:

- Report from the committee strongly recommended that the UW invest in a new building for SoO (AFS decadal review linked to ours; they asked for a teaching building)
- OSB and FSB opened approximately January 2000.
1999 Review was joint w/ ES, Geophysics, & Atmos

The 1999 SoO self-study reflected on salary inequities of faculty (compression being the major issue), and identified 8 educational areas for improvement:

1) Revise curriculum, 2) create cross-unit classes, 3) evaluate teaching rewards, 4) explore distance learning, 5) bring new technology into the classroom, 6) create collaborative educational opportunities, 7) be more ‘experiential’ in our teaching approach, and 8) develop metric for rewarding faculty who excel in teaching.

The review committee acted as a single committee for the four units, and recommended:

- Merging ES and Geophysics (this happened almost immediately) and eventually bringing all the units into a single college (also eventually happened)
- Money be made available to help with salary problems (a little happened)
- The report said SoO teaching was great and made no effort to help with the 8 initiatives listed above, instead emphasis was placed on helping ES and Atmos, which at that time were struggling with their undergrad programs
2010 Decadal Review

Our self-study asked about:

- Faculty composition and size, asking for more state support for 6-month positions *(Ginger made this happen)*
- How to grow the undergrad major while staying experiential? *(we completely revised the major and saw it grow from ~70 majors to a stable number of about 125)*
- How do we leverage other units in the new college?
- How do we leverage infrastructure like OOI and gliders?
2021: The major topics identified thus far

- *The culture of the school can and should be more inclusive.* DEI activities should be part of every aspect of our community and mission. How to most effectively make this happen?
- **What faculty composition do we want in the future?**
  - How many faculty? What types? (tenure-track, research, teaching, etc)
  - What areas of interest?
  - How can we develop ‘best practices’ for hiring?
  - How can we improve hiring and recruiting across the entire school?
  - Is it time to re-open the pandora’s box of the options and their utility?
- **Quality Research and Computational Space & Services**
  - MSB is in poor shape
  - Some scientists are far away (Ben Hall)
- **Need for broad and consistent buy-in from UW (College, provost) on our research-teaching-innovation mission**
  - How should we be structured to be effective in an ABB-dominated university without sacrificing our research capabilities?
  - How should we optimize and stabilize our graduate program?
Open meetings (all on Weds 10:30am for 1 hour)

Meetings not recorded but notes placed on website. Please read things beforehand and prepare, collect your thoughts.

- April 21 Hiring Committee open meeting
- April 28 Open meeting for all, discussion-oriented
- May 5 Faculty meeting
- May 12 Undergrads, Grads and Postdocs
- May 19 Staff
- May 26 full faculty discussion
- June 2 Faculty Meeting
- June 9 full open meeting
Ways in which you can participate

● Email: email Rick (rickkeil@uw.edu) with “Decadal Review” as subject and it will get shared appropriately

● Attend one of the open meetings
   ○ Think strategically about how the school can improve
   ○ What requests can we implement in the next decade?
   ○ Tangible goals and expectations

● Help write sections of the self-reflection

● Share your enthusiasm and concerns
THANKS, there is time for questions (not recorded)