

**TO: Ana Mari Cauce, Provost
John M. Lee, Chair Faculty Senate**

**From: Tri-Campus Lecturers Committee
Prof. Kate O'Neill, Chair**

Date: June 6, 2014

Re: Report on policies and procedures for non-competitively hired lecturers.

Introduction

In January 2014, the Provost and the Faculty Senate formed this tri-campus committee¹ and charged it to recommend policies and best practices for the recruitment, appointment and retention of lecturers across UW's three campuses. We were specifically asked to recommend:

1. Reappointment policies for lecturers who were appointed before September 1, 2013, received non-competitively hired job classification codes, and have been reappointed full-or part-time since;
2. Policies for part-time lecturer appointments, in particular; and
3. Best practices generally for the recruitment, appointment and retention of all lecturers.

We began with the reappointment of non-competitively classified lecturers because we were aware of some confusion, controversy, and anxiety around that

¹ Committee Members are: Katie Baird, Associate Professor, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW-Tacoma; Lisa Coutu, Principal Lecturer, Department of Communication; Mike Crandall, Senior Lecturer, The Information School; Ron Irving, Professor and Chair, Department of Mathematics; Dan Jacoby, Professor, Indterdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW-Bothell; Shailendra Jain, Professor and Chair, Marketing and International Business; Marcia Killian, Professor, School of Nursing and Secretary of the Faculty; Carol Landis, Professor, School of Nursing; Kate O'Neill (chair), Professor of Law and Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate; Jerelyn Resnick, Senior Lecturer, Nursing Program, UW-Bothell; Michael Shapiro, Professor and Divisional Dean for Humanities; Elizabeth Sunderman, Lecturer, Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences, UW-Tacoma; Barbara Van Ess, Director of Personnel Policy, UW Medicine.

issue on all three campuses. It's impossible to deal with the first issue, without at least touching on aspects of the other two issues. We have unfortunately run out of time this quarter to issue a comprehensive report on part-time lecturers or best practices generally. We think, however, that our recommendations for improving the appointment and reappointment procedures for all lecturers will help rationalize the use of part-time appointments and enable units to engage in best practices.

This report begins by providing an introduction, background information and a description of major issues. It then offers ten key recommendations, and concludes with a separate document (Attachment A) that contains policy and detailed procedures for current and future non-competitively hired, full-time and part-time lecturers.

Background

This tri-campus committee has been working in parallel with campus committees and task forces on lecturers at Bothell, Seattle and Tacoma. Our members include representatives from each of those campuses and those committees. We have been meeting and exchanging information and drafts since early February. As a tri-campus committee, our principal goals have been to help the campus groups identify issues and gather data, to understand how much the issues differ from campus to campus and unit to unit, and to improve the communication among our three campuses and between the administration and appointing units. We have benefitted from the considerable previous work of each of the campus groups. While the tri-campus committee can articulate the basic elements of best practices, ultimately each campus and appointing unit needs to define its instructional needs and then conduct searches to find the most qualified candidates to meet those needs.

We are alarmed by an apparent recent spike in appointments of full-time and part-time lecturers in non-competitive job classifications. Whatever may be causing such a spike, excessive reliance on non-competitive hiring practices is not good for students, for units' programs and curricula, or for the people who are

hired non-competitively and then ineligible for career advancement. Failure to engage in open and competitive searches also undermines the UW's commitment to hiring the most qualified and diverse faculty and deprives potential qualified candidates of the opportunity to teach here. Failure to search for instructional faculty also signals a misguided and demoralizing devaluation of instructional faculty. For all these reasons, we feel strongly that UW administrators on all three campuses and faculties of appointing units need to focus on ensuring that in the future all lecturers are recruited through an appropriate, open and competitive search and that appointments without such a search are rare exceptions.

We credit the Provost for issuing in September 2013 a set of Guidelines which emphasize the UW's commitment to open and competitive searches for all faculty appointments, including lecturers, and which place presumptive caps on reappointments of full-time lecturers hired non-competitively after that date. We do not think the Guidelines go far enough, however, because they do not address the appointment and reappointment process for part-time, non-competitively hired lectures. As noted, there has been a very marked increase in recent years in the number of non-competitively hired lecturers, including part-time lecturers, which we think is worrisome.

At this point, it is necessary to say a few words about our second task – recommendations regarding part-time lecturers. In this report, we do not differentiate between part-time and full-time lecturers because we think that the reasons appropriate, open and competitive searches are generally best practice for recruiting lecturers to fill full-time positions hold equally true for recruiting lecturers to fill most part-time positions.² The distinction between full- and part-time lecturers should turn on the instructional need and not on the caliber of the lecturer or the hiring process. The quality of students' learning and experiences are not determined by whether a lecturer is full-time or part-time but by the

² The decision about whether an open search ought to be conducted should depend on careful planning and definition of the instructional need or position. We recognize that some part-time appointments are part-time because they are designed to fill short-term, temporary needs, as in the case when a faculty member is on leave. It may be appropriate to make those appointments without open searches especially in those instances where the need was not foreseen and there is not time to search. We think those kinds of part-time appointments are quite distinguishable from part-time appointments that may be used to cobble together an array of fairly regular course offerings that might be taught by one or more full-time lecturers. We also think that the temporary part-time appointment is distinguishable from the ongoing, regular, part-time appointment.

lecturer's teaching skill and by his or her availability after class hours. A part-time appointment should be made where the instructional need is genuinely part-time. This could be because a unit needs a teacher for only one or two specialized courses, or it might be because a lecturer, who has a career other than teaching and who wishes to maintain that career, can provide students with valuable perspectives or mentoring in the field. We also note that the UW Faculty Code does not have a separate title for part-time and full-time lecturers. The qualifications for either appointment term are the same. Therefore, going forward, we think that faculties need to put energy into defining instructional needs carefully. Where the need is part-time, but predictable and likely to persist for some time, then appointing units should conduct appropriate searches just as they should for full-time lecturers. Part-time lecturer appointments, conducted without appropriate searches, should not be indefinitely reappointed lest the UW generate a cohort of contingent faculty with no opportunities for career advancement here. Units should not treat part-time appointments like very temporary or emergency appointments. Attention to appropriate open search and appointment processes will benefit the UW and will lead to improved status and opportunities for all lecturers.

These recommendations clearly apply to the future. The particular issue that inspired formation of this tri-campus committee, however, was not disagreement or confusion about future policy with respect to lecturers but disagreement and confusion about how limits on reappointments of non-competitively hired lecturers would or should affect current lecturers with non-competitive job classifications. In the balance of this report, we address this issue without differentiating between part-time and full-time, non-competitively hired lecturers.

We have not found a one-size-fits-all solution for every current lecturer in a non-competitive job classification in every unit. We have tried to strike a balance between competing policies. On one hand, to permit indefinite reappointments of lecturers who were not selected after a competitive search undermines the University's commitment to open and competitive searches for all academic appointments; on the other, to insist that every position now held by a non-competitively hired lecturer be advertised and filled through a competitive search seems disrespectful of meritorious long-serving lecturers who have contributed

significantly and whose units' appreciation for their teaching and service is demonstrated by multiple reappointments — sometimes for many years. In some situations, such searches may generate more costs than benefits to anyone. In any event, although individual members continue to hold very different views of the equities, we have reached a consensus on a compromise procedure and we have drafted detailed policies and procedures (Attachment A) in an effort to make our proposed solutions transparent, fair, efficient, and reasonably adaptable across all three campuses and in diverse units.

We also recognize that, in light of the size and diversity of the UW, our recommendations may have unintended consequences for particular units and positions. Although our recommended policies and procedures have some flexibility built-in, we strongly urge the Provost to share them broadly, including with the Board of Deans, so that they can be fine-tuned, if necessary, before implementation.

The legal and institutional bases for open and competitive searches

For those not already familiar with the area, it may be helpful to summarize the laws and internal UW policies that govern academic appointments and then explain how those relate to AHR's job code classifications.

Under federal, state and local law, the UW has an obligation in all its employment practices to provide equal employment opportunity³ and, as a federal contractor, to take affirmative action to increase the likelihood of a diverse applicant pool for all employment positions.⁴ Collectively, these laws ban discrimination on the basis of age, disability, color, creed, ethnicity or race, military status, including status as a protected veteran, national origin, religion, sex, and sexual orientation or expression, and they require efforts to increase the presence of underrepresented groups. The UW has adopted a non-discrimination policy prohibiting discrimination against any person on any of these bases. The policy applies, among other things, to all employment

³ See Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; The Age Discrimination Act in Employment Act of 1967, as amended; Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, as amended; RCW 49.60; Seattle Municipal Code 14.04.040.

⁴ The Vietnam Era Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, as amended; Executive Order 11246, 30 F.R. 12319.

practices, including recruitment, selection, promotion, transfer, merit increases, salary, training and development, and separation. The UW has also adopted affirmative action policies to promote diversity of the faculty,⁵ and the UW Faculty Senate approved legislation calling for increased efforts by departments and units to assess faculty demographics and to increase the diversity of applicant pools for academic appointments.⁶

The faculty of the University shares responsibility with the administration to recommend all faculty appointments and promotions to the Board of Regents.⁷ The Faculty Code provides that the University's mission depends, in part, on the appointment and retention of distinguished faculty,⁸ and sets qualifications for appointments to various titles, including lecturer.⁹ The Faculty Code addresses the recruitment and appointment of faculty, including the provision that a faculty committee has the duty to search for suitable candidates, evaluate candidates using all available information, and make a recommendation on appointment that is supported with sufficient information to provide a reasoned basis for decision.¹⁰ The voting faculty of the relevant unit has the right to vote on whether to recommend the appointment to the dean or chair, as appropriate, except that the voting faculty may delegate that right to an elected faculty committee with respect to affiliate, clinical, research associate, and annual or quarterly lecturer appointments.¹¹ We note that this delegation may have contributed to a culture in which annual or quarterly lecturer appointments are not viewed as significant academic appointments and this in turn may explain why there seem to be so many non-competitive hires in the lecturer title.

Academic Human Resources assigns job code classifications JCC 0115 to full-time non-competitively hired lecturers and 0185 to part-time non-competitively hired lecturers. These classifications do not reflect credentials but only the apparent

⁵ UW Executive Order No. 31, <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO31.html>; Administrative Policy Statement 46.2. <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/APS/46.02.html>

⁶Class C Bulletin 525, UW Faculty Senate Resolution, November 30, 2012, http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/legislation/class_c/class_c525.pdf

⁷ <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EOV.html>; Faculty Code § 24-51.

⁸ § 24-31

⁹ § 24-34(b)(2)

¹⁰ §§ 24 - 52(b). We note that the Faculty Code does not dictate particular kinds or methods of search. In particular, the Code does not expressly require or define an open and competitive search.

¹¹ §§24-51, 24-52 (c)(1)

hiring method. It may be that most lecturers, indeed most faculty, are unaware of their JCC or its effect. These JCCs do not reveal what kind of search may have been undertaken; they only signify that AHR has no documentation of a search that meets AHR's standards for open and competitive. In any case, the key effect is that under AHR policy, persons holding appointments with JCC 0115 or 0185 are not eligible for multi-year contracts or for promotion.

Major Issues

Some faculty on our committee question whether AHR is legally obligated to limit multi-year contracts and promotion for non-competitively hired lecturers. Although there does not appear to be an explicit statutory or regulatory requirement, AHR's policy seems a logical and necessary ancillary to equal opportunity and affirmative action laws at least going forward. The evident purpose is to cabin non-competitive appointments and limit the terms so that temporary positions do not become de facto long-term positions with better terms. We note, however, that these policies have not in fact operated to prevent non-competitive appointments from becoming de facto (but not de jure) long-term if a unit has chosen to make repeated reappointments.

We have debated long and hard how to balance the legal obligation and the policy goals that the UW hire the best qualified faculty through open and competitive searches with our sense of obligation and respect for those lecturers who, through no fault of their own, were hired years ago without such a search, have performed their duties meritoriously, and been repeatedly reappointed. In such cases, the UW's use of non-competitive AHR job classifications to limit eligibility for multi-year appointments and promotions without a matching prohibition on multiple reappointments has created a paradox: units' repeated appointments of some lecturers without open searches has deprived some long-serving and meritorious lecturers of job security and promotions without opening the positions they now hold to other potential candidates. To require competitive searches now obviously imposes some risks and burdens on the lecturers and strikes some of our members as fundamentally unfair to those lecturers who have been continuously or regularly reappointed for many years. Others have been

concerned about imposing search costs on units that put high value on the current lecturer's teaching and service.¹²

Ideally, appointing units with non-competitively hired, full-or part-time lecturers should assess their foreseeable instructional needs and then conduct open searches to fill those needs. Current lecturers who have been serving meritoriously should be strongly encouraged to apply, and we imagine that in many instances because of their relevant experience such lecturers can be the successful candidates. Nevertheless, we understand that such a process imposes burdens and risks on individuals. Units may redefine their instructional needs. Even if their needs remain the same, a lecturer must devote time to preparing for a competitive search and may face stiff competition, especially in disciplines with significant numbers of un- or under-employed Ph.Ds.

¹² Absent personal interviews with lecturers, we are not sure how many lecturers and how many units would be affected by an open search requirement for all positions now held by non-competitively hired lecturers. Such a requirement seems appropriate for positions now held by lecturers appointed within the last few years. While there has been a gradual upward trend, there was a noticeable increase in non-competitively hired lecturer appointments in 2010 and a dramatic spike in 2013 that we hope will not persist. Those phenomena seem to correlate with the recession and possibly with the institution of activity based budgeting with its incentives to increase enrollment. Going forward, the Provost was clearly right to warn units against repeated reappointments of these recent non-competitively hired individuals.

The issues regarding lecturers initially hired many years ago are different. Their numbers are relatively modest, and while it may be that their recruitments did not embody best practices, the reality may be that, at least in some cases, they are proven meritorious teachers who are integral to their units. Therefore, it is reasonable that such lecturers and units would be troubled by a blanket search requirement for positions that have been held by the same individual for many years. We have not adopted a bright-line rule about what number of years or continuous or near continuous employment justifies an extension of eligibility. Extensions should depend on an individual evaluation of the unit's instructional needs, the lecturer's merit, length of employment at UW, and legitimate employment expectations.

The committee has had difficulty aggregating accurate, useable data about the number of non-competitively hired lecturers who might be affected by our recommendations. There have been some concerns about the accuracy of the data we have received, and there are multiple issues concerning the appropriate method for counting long-term lecturers. The committee's GoPost contains the multiple data sets and analyses we examined. One obvious conclusion is that, if the UW is going to improve its appointment and reappointment processes for lecturers, we will need to focus on gathering and reporting data on non-competitive hires in more useable and transparent forms.

In response to these concerns, committee members report that some faculty in some units believe that a non-competitive AHR classification and the related bars on longer contracts and promotion should simply be altered to permit long-serving, meritorious lecturers to be reclassified into appointments that are eligible for multi-year contracts and promotion. A majority of our committee has rejected this solution, in part because of concerns that it would expose the UW to liability under equal opportunity and other laws and because we doubt the Provost would approve the reclassification.

Members also report a significant number of faculty who believe that such lecturers should be eligible for indefinite reappointments to their present positions in their present classifications. This view seems stronger on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses where lecturers have been key to the rapid growth of new programs. We have not adopted that as a blanket solution either because it, too, seems to undermine the intent if not the letter of the laws and policies favoring open and competitive searches. Recognizing, however, that there may be instances where a unit would very much like to retain a lecturer and the lecturer has good reasons – such as an impending retirement – for not wishing to compete in a search, we have recommended that a unit could apply to the Provost for extending the reappointment period on a case-by-case basis.

In the detailed policies and procedures in Attachment A, our ultimate goal has been to reduce confusion and to recommend clear policies and procedures. We offer these policies and procedures for use by the Provost, appointing units, AHR, and lecturers themselves. We think diverse appointing units will find that these procedures are reasonably efficient, fair, and sufficiently flexible that they can be adapted to meet unique needs for new and ongoing lecturer appointments. We have worked to recommend procedures that promote high standards for instructional faculty's recruitment and appointment and basic fairness, clarity, and consistency – but not necessarily uniform outcomes - on all three campuses. Our recommendations are also designed to preserve and indeed emphasize faculty responsibility for determining programmatic needs and recruiting and recommending the appointment of the best faculty to fill those needs.

We think it is worth pausing to consider how or if any policy we recommend will change behaviors. It's obvious that concerns about reappointing non-competitively hired lecturers would not arise if the lecturers were competitively hired in the first place or, if that was not practicable, any reappointments were strictly limited to the period necessary to conduct a search and non-competitively hired lecturers were informed of that period. Thus, while we don't mean to minimize individual lecturers' hardships, we think at this time that the central and campus administrations and appointing units ought to be focused on stopping poor hiring practices that enable widespread non-competitive hiring of lecturers and repeated reappointments.

In fact, our research suggests that many, perhaps most, new lecturers are being hired without a competitive search. From autumn quarter 2007 through winter 2014, there have been more than 1000 non-competitive, full or part-time lecturer appointments. In Spring Quarter 2013 on the Seattle campus, all but one of the part-time lecturers then employed were classified as non-competitively hired. The Office of Planning and Budgeting data suggests a significant spike in the last few years in the number of non-competitive lecturer appointments, perhaps because of budget pressures. It seems doubtful that all these appointments were made in response to sudden and unpredictable needs. Most tellingly, AHR data shows a significant number of non-competitively hired lecturers have been repeatedly and regularly reappointed for many quarters or years. All in all, this data suggests that appointing units may not understand that, like any academic appointment, regular, predictable full- or part-time lecturer appointments should be made after appropriate open and competitive searches. Perhaps some units are failing to plan adequately for instructional needs or for timely searches, or perhaps some units had good reasons for hiring non-competitively on a short-term basis but then failed to consider whether the position was in fact long-term and the ramifications for both the unit and the lecturer of failing to conduct a timely open search.

No doubt, units may have had various reasons for engaging in consistent non-competitive hiring practices. For example, some units may not respect instructional faculty or they may wish to minimize instructional faculty compensation by limiting eligibility for promotions. Neither reason is appropriate or consistent with best practices because each undermines equal opportunity and

deprives some lecturers of career incentives for becoming excellent teachers and staying with their units. The very fact that some lecturers were not competitively hired is sometimes used as a rationale for disrespecting them. We urge the central and campus administrations to warn units strongly against these attitudes and practices going forward.

In some units, however, there may be neither invidious attitudes toward instructional faculty or any preference for non-competitive hiring, but unpredictable budgets or enrollments may make such hiring hard to avoid. For example, we have anecdotal evidence that units may receive funding for a position too late to participate in a regular hiring season. In such a case, a short-term non-competitive hire may be unavoidable, but if the funding appears relatively stable for two or more years, we think that best practice would require an open search to fill the position in the next possible hiring season. If the funding is uncertain, but the position meets the unit's long-term goals, then the central administration and units should consider creating and using reserve pools to bridge a funding gap, just as the UW provides research faculty with bridge funds.

Finally, some units have hired non-competitively because they have been trying to maintain flexibility in times of uncertain enrollments and budgets. Of course, a sudden and unpredictable increase in enrollment may justify a rapid appointment without a search, but we think that units should distinguish those emergency situations from "predictable unpredictability." In the latter situation, where prior experience means that units can anticipate fluctuations in enrollments – for example in introductory language courses – units should first try to preserve flexibility by limiting the term of appointment and by staggering termination dates where a unit employs multiple lecturers.¹³

In recommending limited appointment terms, however, we are emphatically not recommending that units resort to quarterly appointments, unless those are

¹³ We have also heard, anecdotally, that some units may recruit a pool of persons who are willing to teach courses on relatively short notice. To the extent that such a pool could be constituted through open search, it would at least provide equal opportunity to interested members of local communities. It does not, of course, offer any job security or much career development although it may afford students access to lecturers with some experience teaching a course.

clearly justified by an instructional need that is limited to one or two quarters per year and that cannot be rationally joined with other instructional needs to justify an annual appointment. In all other situations, the minimum duration of a lecturer appointment should normally be annual. In the end, maintaining flexibility is an important goal that requires careful planning and transparency. We think that units that commit to such planning and transparency will help create a norm in which lecturers are recruited carefully, respected for the essential work they do, and retained and rewarded with long term contracts and promotions. Such units will limit non-competitive hiring to exceptional and temporary situations and part-time appointments to genuinely part-time positions.

The Provost has taken the first step to reduce non-competitive hiring and reappointment. The Provost's "Guidelines for the Appointment of Full-time Lecturers," effective September 1, 2013 and revised September 4, 2013, provide, in part:

Recruitment and Selection

New Hires are selected using a competitive recruitment process appropriate for the position.

The benefits of this recruitment and selection process are the option for multiple year appointments and opportunity for promotion. *Limited exceptions to these guidelines for new hires are permitted in circumstances of short-term instructional needs and unanticipated, short-notice instructional needs. Hires under this limited exception are restricted to annual appointments for up to three consecutive years, with continued appointment beyond this period requiring submission of a request, with position justification, and approval from the Office of the Provost (emphasis added).*

Our recommended policy and procedures are largely consistent with the Provost's but we extend them to lecturers, both full- and part-time, who were hired non-competitively before September 1, 2014 (or the effective date, if later) and to those who will be hired in the future. This policy would permit reappointments of

non-competitively classified lecturers, hired before September 1, 2013 until September 2, 2017. This period for reappointment enables those lecturers who wish to compete for a position time to prepare. For Full and Part-time Lecturers initially appointed in academic year 2013 – 2014, we have limited the presumptive period of eligibility for reappointment to three years. That is consistent with the Provost's 2013 Guidelines for Full-time Lecturers. The policy and procedures also give the Provost the power to extend the reappointment periods. Our policy and procedures differ from the Provost's in one significant respect. We think that, after a transition period for current lecturers, three years may be longer than necessary to permit units to make short-notice or temporary non-competitive hires. An excessive tolerance for reappointments risks, we think, perpetuating the overuse of non-competitive hiring and the disadvantaged and uncertain status of lecturers hired in that way. Indeed, we are concerned that a three-year period for reappointments, without special justification, could create a norm in which lecturers are hired non-competitively every three years and then let go. Therefore, for lecturers hired after September 1, 2014, or the effective date of the policies and procedures, we recommend a presumptive reappointment period of only two years.

Ultimately, we agree with the conclusion of the Seattle task force on lecturers that the UW needs a culture change with respect to lecturers. We can articulate best practices but to implement them, we need to build a culture in which the faculties and administrators of appointing units value instructional faculty, treat them as respected professionals, and take seriously their legal and ethical obligations to conduct open and competitive searches for the most qualified instructional faculty. We are disturbed by anecdotal reports that some administrators and faculty in some units may assume that part-time lecturers are not well-qualified simply because they are part-time, and we have also been concerned about resource support for lecturers' work. As part of best practices, for example, we think allocation of scarce resources, like office space and staff support, ought to be a matter of collegial consultation among all of a unit's faculty and should turn on merit, need, and seniority.

To build a culture in appointing units, the central and campus administrations probably need to offer some carrots and brandish some sticks. The carrots would probably take the form of financial support for the planning work needed to

define program goals and instructional needs, for the costs of conducting competitive searches and for properly supporting lecturers once they have been hired. The sticks would probably take the form of refusing appointments or reappointments that did not comply with best practices. Requiring units to make annual reports to the Provost and the Faculty Senate on numbers, titles, duration and demographics of non-competitive hires and reappointments, and the reasons for them, could deter bad practices and could help units and campuses identify and mitigate systemic problems that underlie non-competitive hiring.

We think the UW should make a concerted effort to emphasize the value to students and to the institution as a whole of hiring and retaining the most distinguished instructional faculty. Constrained resources and the resulting need to focus on efficient divisions of faculty labor between instruction and research suggest that units are likely to hire and retain a substantial and growing percentage of faculty whose principal obligations are instructional. It is therefore key to the institution's mission and success that everyone – administration and faculty – commit to improve and maintain the terms and conditions under which all lecturers teach so as to ensure that students have the best learning opportunities possible. To ensure the best learning environment, the university needs to attract the most qualified lecturers by providing some reasonable job security, academic freedom, reasonable compensation and opportunities for promotion that reward excellent teaching and disciplinary development. Students' educations and experiences, including their willingness to enroll, and the reputations of departments and units, depend crucially upon the caliber, motivation, and support of instructional faculty and that is true, regardless of whether the faculty member has a full- or a part-time appointment. For part-time lecturers, appointing units need to ensure that there is a good reason for the part-time position, reason that outweighs the possible disadvantage to students of a teacher who may not be on campus. If existing part-time teaching loads could be rationally aggregated into a full-time position, units should do so.

Conclusion

We believe that, provided they comply with some basic legal principles, university policies, and the faculty code, the faculties of appointing units are in the best position to determine what faculty positions are needed and to implement

appointment and retention practices to hire and retain the most qualified faculty for that unit. At the same time, we doubt that reports like this one will alter administrators' and faculties' habits and assumptions. Thus, we think that each campus's administration in cooperation with the central administration needs to focus on setting up systems that ensure that appointing units engage in serious assessment of their program goals and instructional needs, make crystal clear the terms and conditions of appointment for new lecturer hires, and gather and report recruitment, appointment, and reappointment data on full- and part-time lecturers in each appointing unit, for the next five years at least. We suggest that each campus have an annual obligation to report this data to the Provost and the Faculty Senate at least until such time as all parties feel confident that lecturer recruitment, appointment and reappointment across campuses and units consistently conform with best practices.

Key Recommendations:

1. Appointing units should conduct appropriate open and competitive searches for all available lecturer positions including full-time and part-time lecturer positions for annual or quarterly appointments, unless unpredicted and unpredictable, or very temporary, instructional needs make a timely search genuinely impractical, or the Provost has granted a search waiver. The fact that an appointment may be part-time does not justify a failure to search. Administrators and faculties of appointing units should be regularly reminded that public laws and internal policy prohibiting discrimination and promoting equal opportunity and affirmative action apply to all academic appointments without regard to title, rank, or FTE.
2. The criteria for an appropriate open and competitive search are flexible, provided that the search is open and fair and designed to attract as diverse a group of candidates as possible. They permit assessment of the position and the relevant labor pool of qualified individuals available to fill it. An appropriate search must provide effective notice of the position to the relevant labor pool, but advertising need not necessarily be national. Interviews of multiple candidates are essential but they need not necessarily be on campus and may be conducted by teleconference.
3. If an appointment must be made without an appropriate open search, AHR and the appointing unit should notify the lecturer in writing before the effective date of the appointment that the lecturer will not be eligible for multi-year appointments or promotion at the appointing unit and that the period during which the lecturer may be eligible for reappointment is limited.
4. Ordinarily, lecturers who were appointed without an open and competitive search before September 1, 2013¹⁴ will be eligible for reappointment to a non-competitive classification until September 1, 2017; those appointed before

¹⁴ We have selected the September 1 date because the Provost's Guidelines for Full-Time Lecturers (2013) used that date. It may be that the policy would be more appropriate implemented with a September 15 date – the start of Autumn Quarter.

September 1, 2014 will be eligible for reappointment for no more than three years. Lecturers or deans, chairs or directors may apply to the Provost for extensions.

5. Lecturers who will be appointed without an open and competitive search after September 1, 2014 may ordinarily be eligible for reappointment for no more than two years to any non-competitively hired appointment, or combination of non-competitively hired appointments, in the unit.¹⁵ Lecturers or deans, chairs or directors may apply to the Provost for extensions.

6. Just as AHR requires documentation that an open and competitive search has been conducted before it gives an appointment a competitive job code classification, AHR should require unit heads to supply documentation of why an open search could *not* be conducted before it recognizes an appointment and assigns a job code classification. AHR should make available to the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting at least once a year a database that would enable SCPB to determine how many initial non-competitive appointments and reappointments, if any, have been made by each appointing unit in the previous year.

7. It will require sustained administrative and faculty oversight, some additional or redirected resources and perhaps the imposition of some measurable costs to change how units hire and reappointment lecturers, especially non-competitively hired lecturers. At present, units incur obvious and immediate costs when they plan carefully and hire through open and competitive searches, but the risks and costs of not planning and not hiring in that manner may not be obvious. In fact, particularly in challenging economic times, hiring short-term, contingent faculty may seem efficient and prudent, but in the long term we think that the caliber of instruction and the collegiality of faculties is undermined by such practices. Although we recognize that there are instances where non-competitive, short-term hiring can be unavoidable because short-term funding may become available on short notice, we suspect that too much

¹⁵ Note: this shortens the reappointment period from three to two or one and essentially recommends that the Provost amend her Guidelines for Full-Time Lecturers (and extend the timelines to part-time appointments).

non-competitive hiring has no such excuse. Rapid growth, inadequate planning, controversies about program direction, unpredictable student enrollments, unpredictable, late, or inadequate budgets, inexperienced unit administrators, faculty inattention and excessive delegation to those administrators — all may contribute to less than best practices in recruiting, appointing, and reappointing.

8. The Faculty should consider amending the Faculty Code to create a unique title for non-competitively hired lecturers that will clearly distinguish them from competitively-hired lecturers and will make clear the temporary nature of the position. We suggest a title with the word “Acting.” Advertisements and appointment letters should clearly notify candidates of the duration of the initial appointment and the limits on reappointments and the bar to promotion. The Faculty should further consider amending the code to provide more instructional titles that would distinguish among instructional faculties’ roles in units and provide a clearer basis for determining their rights and responsibilities in governance. The Faculty should consider assigning voting rights based on a lecturer’s role and presence in the life of a unit and not necessarily on FTE.
9. AHR should revise the information on open and competitive searches on its website to provide guidelines for searches for non-tenure track faculty, including lecturers. AHR should also devise different job classification codes, with presumptive limits on reappointment as one of the qualifications for an appointment with a non-competitive code after September 1, 2014 [or effective date]. This will make it easier to track non-competitive appointments that were made before or after the effective date. AHR should consider keying lecturer classification codes to the nature of the position so as to distinguish jobs that are intended to be short-term and temporary from those that may be longer term or reappointed.
10. Steps should be taken to minimize the effects of budget uncertainties on instructional faculty appointment processes and appointment terms. Units that have multiple lecturers with comparable instructional capabilities, should consider staggering appointment terms to permit longer appointments without losing the ability to deal with an enrollment decline. This may help

reduce the impetus to use short-term appointments to deal with budget or enrollment uncertainty. Central or campus administrators should consider creating and using reserves as bridge funds to enable units to renew meritorious lecturers' appointments for a period even though enrollments or funding decreases might otherwise counsel against a reappointment.

Attachment A is attached to this Report

Additional Demographic Data that the Committee reviewed may be seen on the Committee's Catalyst Go-Post. You must have a UW NetId to view the Go-Post.
<https://catalyst.uw.edu/gopost/board/kateon/35996/>