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Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from January 29, 2019
3. Subcommittee reports:
   o Proposed EFC code changes (Jack Lee)
   o Instructional professor proposal (Jack Lee)
   o Equity & inclusion (Purnima Dhavan)
4. Non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process (Jacob Vigdor & Jack Lee) (see attachments)
5. Proposed interim and part-time lecturer code changes (Dan Jacoby & Jack Lee) (see attachments)
6. Good of the order
7. Adjourn

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

2. Review of the minutes from January 29, 2019

The minutes from January 29, 2019 were approved as written.

3. Subcommittee reports:
   o Proposed EFC code changes (Jack Lee)

   Lee, the chair, notified the council that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) reviewed the proposed EFC code changes at the February 25 meeting. The SEC voted to forward the Class legislation with one amendment to include “heads of appointing units” in the list of non-voting members. The Faculty Senate will review the legislation at the first spring quarter meeting (April 18).

   o Instructional professor proposal (Jack Lee)

   Due to time constraints the chair decided to postpone discussion around the Instructional/Teaching Professor proposal. The council will revisit the proposal after the March 12 meeting.

   o Equity & inclusion (Purnima Dhavan)

   Robin Angotti, chair of the Faculty Council on Women in Academia, was scheduled to attend the last council meeting, but this was canceled due to inclement weather. The chair will invite Angotti back at a future date. Purnima Dhavan attended the last Faculty Council on
Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) meeting. FCMA members discussed burdens around service requirements and shared that expectations seemed unequal.

The chair suggested that the subcommittee reach out to Chad Allen, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement. Allen attended the last SEC meeting and presented information on recruitment and retention of faculty members and noted that the University has a more difficult time retaining faculty members. This is likely due to the campus climate. Allen pointed out in particular that the lack of public and transparent standards for promotion & tenure is cited by many faculty of color as an issue that contributes to a climate of uncertainty.

4. Non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process (Jacob Vigdor & Jack Lee) (see attachments)

The chair summarized the feedback that he had obtained from EFC chairs about the proposed non-departmentalized tenure and promotion process changes (Exhibits 1 &2). The chair offered that the council should not push this legislation forward.

A member commented that the feedback should not cause the council to completely drop the issue and that there is more work to be done. Another member asked if there were comments from the non-departmentalized colleges beyond having no desire to pursue changes. The chair responded that he heard about processes that are already taking place. The chair further commented that the council should further articulate the principles that need to be upheld and then invite each of the non-departmentalized units to the council to explain how they are upholding these principles.

Vigdor responded that the council could focus more on the nature of the problem. There are redundancies and restrictions in the Faculty Code that could be revised which should give non-departmentalized units more leeway to develop their own processes. He also commented that the council should respond to the EFC’s memo (Exhibit 2). The chair responded that the council’s response could articulate principles and invite them to respond with how they are upholding those principles. A member responded that “independent” should be defined by the unit. Another member had questions around recusal.

Members discussed how to move forward and how to package a response around promotion and merit. The chair will draft a response to the five EFCs and Deans that conveys that the council values a secondary review in order to allow a candidate to respond and to counteract any outside influence. The response will also request that the units explain their process and suggest possible code changes.

5. Proposed interim and part-time lecturer code changes (Dan Jacoby & Jack Lee) (see attachments)

The chair summarized that when the last time the council met the feeling was that part-time lecturers should be treated the same as full-time lecturers. The chair received some pushback on the proposal based on concern that a college would see a significant increase in the number of competitive searches they conduct each year. The chair looked into this claim and saw that there would not be a dramatic increase. The chair noted that the legislation may meet similar resistance if the council moves forward with the current proposal.
The council discussed needed clarifications, unintended consequences and details of the proposal. A member suggested that the council familiarize itself with the processes across departments and units associated with appointing Affiliates. Another member stated that potential consequences should not preclude the council’s pursuit in addressing the larger issue. The chair asked if the basic framework in the draft (Exhibit 3) could serve as a starting point and if there are needed clarifications. Some members expressed that there are still questions that need to be addressed before moving forward. The chair noted that he drafted a document that responds to questions the proposal has received (Exhibit 4). The chair will make adjustments to the current proposal and the council will continue this discussion at the next meeting.

6. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

7. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst

Present: Faculty: Jack Lee (chair), Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Aaron Katz, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Kamran Nemati, Dan Jacoby, Tom Hazlet, James Gregory, Mary Pat Wenderoth, Lauren Montgomery
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Bryan Crockett
Guests: Mike Townsend

Absent: Faculty: Joseph Janes, Dawn Lehman, Míceál Vaughan,
Ex-officio reps: JoAnn Taricani, Padmaja Vrudhula

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Vigdor response Feb 8.pdf
Exhibit 2 – response to amendment proposal FINAL_8Feb19.pdf
Exhibit 3 – Faculty Code 21-24 lecturer changes Revised 021119.docx
Exhibit 4 – disc-questions-part-time.pdf
Dear Kevin et al:

Thank you very much for this feedback, as Jack indicated we will take this back to FCFA for further discussion.

I appreciate your request for a better sense of the problem that this proposed code intervention would be designed to solve. I have been reluctant to articulate this problem bluntly because to do so would, in my view, exacerbate problems of legal liability for the University and require me to call out the behavior of my dean, to whom I report as my direct supervisor. I note that this message, beyond being "discoverable" in court proceedings, is a public record.

Your memo makes clear, however, that circumstances warrant such an articulation. So here it is. I am a relative newcomer to UW, having spent 15 years at Duke, now in my 5th year here. During my time at Duke I served a three year term on a provost-level APT committee, reviewing cases from the entire university, departmentalized and non-departmentalized alike -- importantly, with the exception of the law school and the clinical departments in the medical school. I chaired this committee in my final year of service. I’ve reviewed over 200 tenure and promotion dossiers from virtually every academic discipline. I’ve been personally responsible for presenting cases from toxicology to tap dancing. In the course of preparing these proposed code revisions I studied the tenure and promotion procedures of two dozen major research universities and the use of a provost- or other campus-level committee is normative; the absence of such a committee is unusual. Even among the three UW campuses, Bothell and Tacoma have campus-wide review committees.

The UW Faculty Code does provide for a multi-layered review process in non-departmentalized units, but my basic concern in studying this process and observing it in practice is this: it is vulnerable to collapse to an effective single-layer review by the dean wherein concerns of personal favoritism and bias are not adequately checked. This is more than a theoretical concern. As a faculty member in a non-departmentalized unit I have witnessed it in person.

The Faculty Code permits deans of non-departmentalized schools to participate in the selection of a review committee, the selection of letter writers, and faculty discussion of the merits of the case. The Faculty Code requires the advisory committee in non-departmentalized units to consist entirely of individuals who report directly to the dean. Moreover, the Faculty Code does not prohibit the use of letter writers with conflicts of interest. Thus, in non-departmentalized units, candidates may be reviewed by conflicted letter-writers selected by the dean. The dean's presence and intervention can stifle candid discussion among the faculty, and a secondary review committee beholden to the dean for purposes of merit review and salary determination may likewise be reluctant to intervene in a manner contrary to the dean's clearly expressed intentions, even when the issue is a violation of Faculty Code or the school's own bylaws. As a former member of the Evans School committee charged with performing secondary review of promotion and tenure cases, I have personally witnessed each of these problems.

The potential for unchecked favoritism by deans -- the mere potential, regardless of actual practice -- is in turn a source of legal liability for the entire University, the departmentalized units included. I note that personal favoritism in promotion decisions does not necessarily create liability under employment law, however it does if this favoritism creates de facto variability in standards for individuals representing specific protected groups under state and federal employment laws. The behavior I have witnessed could easily be coded as invoking this concern.

Were a candidate to sue the University on the grounds that her case had been unduly influenced by decanal favoritism, and were I called as a witness on the basis of my expertise in tenure and promotion review, I would have no choice but to state that the University's procedures inadequately guard against the potential for favoritism. Were I asked to advise the University in such a matter, I would recommend settling out of court as the University's procedures are unusual among peer institutions, the most internally inconsistent of any peer institution, and ultimately indefensible. This is a particular concern in non-departmentalized units; in departmentalized units layers of the process occur at the department level where the dean does not directly participate.

There are alternate solutions to this problem, in particular code revisions that would prohibit the dean from directly participating in the solicitation of letters and faculty deliberations. I would also argue for revisions that would prohibit the use
of conflicted letter writers. FCFA has instead pursued a path of ensuring external independent oversight of the process, which as noted above is the norm at almost all of our peer institutions and on the Bothell and Tacoma campuses.

I will also note that by making the new joint council advisory to deans, these proposed code revisions can be criticized for falling far short of solving the problem. Deans would retain the full right to ignore the council's advice. At most of our peer institutions, councils of this nature report to the provost rather than deans to serve as a true independent check on a process originating in schools and colleges.

Yes, the non-departmentalized units of UW Seattle are each unique. At the same time, each of them have peers on many other campuses in the United States, and in virtually every circumstance tenure and promotion cases from these peer schools and colleges are reviewed by an external committee. In an interview I conducted, the vice-provost for faculty and academic affairs at Minnesota indicated that external review is so well ingrained and accepted at that university so as to be an afterthought.

From the perspective of ensuring fairness and some semblance of uniformity in procedure, and from the perspective of legal liability, the procedure unique to five units on the Seattle campus is highly problematic. I would argue that the vast majority of American universities have adopted the norm of external review of tenure and promotion cases in all units not because they are more fond of bureaucracy than we are, nor because they are any less committed to advancing the interests of faculty diversity or shared governance, but because they appreciate that it is necessary to address these concerns.

Having done my best to articulate my understanding of the problem, I would welcome alternate suggestions for how to address it. I will also, in consultation with my colleagues on FCFA, prepare a more detailed response to each of the points you raise in your memo.

Thanks,
Jake

Jacob L. Vigdor, Ph.D.
Daniel J. Evans Professor of Public Policy and Governance
Evans School of Public Policy and Governance
University of Washington
jvigdor@uw.edu
412 Condon Hall
Box 353055
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3055
Phone: (206)616-4436
FAX: (206)543-1096

All correspondence to/from this address constitutes a public record per R.C.W. 42.56. Please direct all messages unrelated to University of Washington business to <jacob.vigdor@gmail.com>
Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed amendment to the faculty code being developed by FCFA regarding the promotion and tenure procedures in non-departmentalized schools and colleges. We appreciate providing us time to consult with our faculty members to review the proposal and thoughtfully provide feedback. Although there are some school specific issues that have been discussed, there are enough common, overarching issues that have emerged that we thought it would be useful to provide a joint response. Please see below for our joint comments on common issues:

1. What is the nature of the problem being addressed?

First, there was a consistent question that emerged. Why is the amendment being proposed? The rationale for the proposed amendment was unclear and unspecified. Faculty in all schools commented that it appeared that the proposed amendment was a “solution in search of a problem” rather than a solution to an existing problem. All units have functioning retention, promotion and tenure systems in place that seek external reviews for promotional candidates, have subcommittees evaluating merit of the candidate related to scholarship, teaching and service, and have a process review by faculty councils or a college advisory council. Current systems provide strong substantive and process reviews. Overall, faculty expressed that they did not see a need for this substantial addition to their workload, complication, and additional time to their current process, and potential for conflict. Further, it does not appear that the proposal is aligned with other UW school’s processes (i.e. no other units/schools/colleges have faculty from other colleges weighing in on their promotion and tenure process).

2. Is there a need for review from faculty outside of the respective schools?

Second, there was strong agreement among the faculty that the unit faculty are best able to evaluate the merits of promotion in their respective schools. All of the schools are professional schools and are subject to strong professional accreditation standards. In no other unit at UW are candidates subject to review by faculty outside of their school. Please see points 3 below for additional issues this raises.

Concerns were voiced about how the proposed committee would ensure that they understood the professional and research norms for each school. Each school has diverse professional and research

---

1 The School of Law does not have a separate process review body but does have an elected Promotion & Tenure Council as well as an elected EFC. The EFC is reviewing their P&T and Faculty Governance Bylaws. The School of Law EFC is actively in discussion with respect to possible proposed revisions to include a process review step.
norms and the faculty have worked to understand each other’s culture and expectations. Our worry is that the representatives from different schools would need to learn about new sets of research cultures and this education would have to take place repeatedly when people rotate on or off the committee. Furthermore, having representatives from each school recuse themselves from the discussion and vote prevents the broader committee from understanding the context and norms from their school and therefore must be part of the discussion of each case from their school. Such perspectives from the school would be essential to help the broader committee understand the context of the schools’ priorities and how the candidate’s qualifications fit the unique needs of the school.

While we understand that faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences are reviewed by a central committee composed of faculty from diverse disciplines, the review nonetheless takes place within a single school. Finally, there was some concern that some schools affected by the proposed policy are smaller and may not have the capacity for a full professor to be on a three-year rotation to a centralized committee and thereby unable to participate in tenure decisions in their home department.

3. Does this proposal undermine shared governance? Is modifying the faculty code the right approach?

Third, the proposed amendment goes against the spirit of shared governance by undermining the Faculty Council’s role as advisory to the dean and reducing the Elected Faculty Council’s role in the school. Currently, each school has processes to review the promotion and tenure to verify that the relevant procedures have been followed, appropriate standards have been upheld, and that the candidate’s file has been evaluated fairly. While it is noteworthy that this amendment is based on procedures implemented at the University of Minnesota, it may not be the best fit for UW’s commitment to shared governance.

Faculty and EFCs in all schools are unclear on the need for this proposal. Thus, modifying the entire university faculty code seems to be a disproportionate response to an unclear problem. In addition, the level of detail specified in the procedure for undepartmentalized schools is far greater than the detail on procedures in any other section of the code, again raising concerns about shared governance. The FCFA has communicated a desire to ensure that there is a final review process that includes a review by some faculty who have not previously voted on the case.

4. Could this proposal undermine individual school goals of recruiting and retaining faculty of color and first generation faculty?

Fourth, this policy is likely to negatively impact the recruitment and retention of faculty of color and first generation faculty, a priority for all of our units. The ability of schools to establish and communicate clear policies in this area and retain the autonomy to implement these policies is a plus/draw in a fiercely competitive market for top faculty of color and first generation candidates. Given the proposal’s recommendations for review of candidate files by individuals from other schools, along with the arguments raised in point 2 above, we believe this policy is likely to negatively impact the retention of faculty of color and first generation faculty who may have research agendas that are not aligned with the research norms of other schools. We already have an established research base that shows that the promotion and tenure process has historically disproportionate success outcomes for faculty of color. Adding another layer of scrutiny from scholars with less knowledge about a candidate’s area of expertise is likely to perpetuate a problem that we are working hard to overcome.
5. Additional concerns

In addition to these concerns over the substance of the proposal, we had concerns about process and potential implications of the proposed changes. The developmental process for this proposal began more than a year ago, with overtures to elected faculty councils in the five affected units and initial discussions in FCFA. Yet, none of the EFC’s had seen any drafts of the proposal until it was emailed to us on late on January 7th with a request for feedback representing our faculty on January 14th. We appreciate the need to move things along. Yet, in the spirit of shared governance, this timeframe did not allow us to consult with our faculty councils, or our full faculty at a faculty meeting. We appreciated the extension of time provided for the feedback but were curious as to the urgency of the requested feedback that did not seem in the spirit of shared governance embraced by the University of Washington.

The policies could also incentivize sub-optimal outcomes. Will this change in policy push undepartmentalized schools to departmentalize, and is that in the best interest of these schools and the university more broadly? Many schools highly value their lack of departmentalization as a mean for encouraging interdisciplinary research and teaching. Moreover, this policy has the potential to discourage joint appointments, as candidates may not wish to be subject to review by two schools plus a third council.

6. Recommendation

The time provided to review this proposal was too short for five schools to fully communicate with the University FCFA to clarify the rationale for the proposal and subsequently develop a joint proposal or response for addressing these concerns. Our recommendation is that each school should work with the Provost’s office and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (aka the “code cops”) to propose a solution that meets this University level need for process review under the current faculty code.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback to you on the proposed amendment.
Notes from Jack Lee

Here's another draft of possible code language for the lecturer/interim lecturer revisions. In this version, I tried first to address a point of ambiguity that Cheryl pointed out in the earlier version regarding the 3-year cap on the Interim title -- I've revised the language so the 3-year clock runs throughout any academic year during which a person is appointed to an interim title during any portion of the year. The three years don't have to be consecutive. (My thought was if we hire an interim lecturer to teach one course this fall, and then discover four years later that we unexpectedly need to cover a similar course, it wouldn't make sense to prohibit that person from being hired again.)

Also, at Cheryl's suggestion, I added a Provost exception for the 3-year cap.

But there are more changes than that. As I thought about what we're trying to do, I realized that the underlying thrust of these changes is to erase almost all distinctions between part-time and full-time lecturers. It's always seemed odd and illogical to me that "Part-Time Lecturer" and "Full-Time Lecturer" are different titles. There should be one title, with perhaps specific language about what rights and privileges are reserved to full-timers.

And as I thought more about it and looked more closely at the code, I realized that the only distinction that really makes sense is voting rights.

So here's what I've tried to do in this version: I've eliminated "part-time" and "full-time" as components of the titles of lecturers and artists-in-residence. Instead, there's just a specific requirement in the list of voting faculty that Lecturers and Artists in Residence vote only if they are on an annual or multi-year appointment at 100%.

Here, as I see it, are the practical things that will change under this proposal. (All the things that apply to lecturers below also apply to artists-in-residence.)

- All (non-interim) lecturers (whether FT or PT, regardless of percentage) will require a competitive search. For short-term urgent hires, they can be Interim for up to three years. For longer-term people who have jobs elsewhere, the can be Affiliates.
- All (non-interim) lecturers, whether PT or FT, will be eligible for multi-year contracts and promotion.
- The delegation of appointment authority to a committee will apply to interim faculty, but no longer to part-time lecturers.

Some questions for discussion:

1. What do you think about this approach as a whole? Do you see any pitfalls that I haven't thought of?
2. Dan is interested in tying the three-year cap for Interim lecturers to the position, not to the person, so that the cap would come into effect even if a department repeatedly hired different people under the Interim title into the same position. I didn't include this in the code, because I couldn't think of an unambiguous way to specify exactly what constitutes the "same position." What do you think?
3. The opening up of multi-year contracts and promotions to part-time lecturers might be considered controversial; but honestly, I can't see any real problems with it, because
there's nothing in the code that would require departments to take advantage of it. Do you see potential problems that I'm missing?

---

**Faculty Code**

**Chapter 21**

---

**Organization of the University Faculty**

**Section 21-01  Statutory Provision Relating to Faculty**

See [RCW 28B.20.200](#).

**Section 21-31  Membership in the Faculty**

The University faculty consists of:

- The President,
- The Provost,
- The professors,
- The associate professors,
- The assistant professors,
- The principal lecturers,
- The senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
- The professors of practice,
- The lecturers and artists in residence,
- The instructors,
- The teaching and research associates,

whether serving under visiting, acting, research, clinical, interim, or affiliate appointment, whether serving part-time or full-time, and whether serving in an active or emeritus capacity. The faculty, beginning with the professor, are listed in order for purposes of determining voting eligibility based on superior rank.

**Section 21-32  Voting Membership in the Faculty**

A. Except as provided in Subsection B of this section the voting members of the University faculty are those faculty members holding the rank and/or title of:

- Professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
- Research associate professor, 50% appointment or greater,
• Assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
• Research assistant professor, 50% appointment or greater,
• Principal lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 50% or greater,
• Senior lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 50% or greater,
• Full-time senior artist in residence, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 100%.
• Full-time Lecturer, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 100%.
• Full-time Artist in residence, with an annual or multi-year appointment at 100%, or
• A retired assistant professor, associate professor, or professor during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or a retired research assistant professor, research associate professor, or research professor, principal lecturer, or senior lecturer, during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis.

B. Notwithstanding the rank or title held, the following are not voting members of the faculty:

• Persons serving under acting or visiting appointments,
• Persons on leave of absence,
• Persons serving under clinical or affiliate appointments,
• Persons serving under interim appointments,
• Persons serving under professor of practice appointments,
• Persons of emeritus status unless serving on a part-time basis,
• Persons serving under adjunct appointments insofar as their adjunct appointments are concerned.

[For definitions of faculty titles, see Section 24-34.]

C. Research faculty may vote on all personnel matters as described in the Faculty Code except those relating to the promotion to and/or tenure of faculty to the following ranks and titles:

• Senior artist in residence
• Senior lecturer,
• Principal Lecturer,
• Associate professor,
• Professor,
• Associate professor WOT,
• Professor WOT.

Chapter 24

Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

A. Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks
1. Appointment with the rank of assistant professor requires completion of professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and a demonstration of teaching and research ability that evidences promise of a successful career.

2. Appointment to the rank of associate professor requires a record of substantial success in both teaching and research, except that in unusual cases an outstanding record in one of these activities may be considered sufficient.

3. Appointment to the rank of professor requires outstanding, mature scholarship as evidenced by accomplishments in teaching, and in research as evaluated in terms of national or international recognition.

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

3. Principal lecturer is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons whose excellence in instruction is demonstrated by exemplary success in curricular design and implementation, student mentoring, and service and leadership to the department, school/college, University, and field. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

4. Individuals appointed to one of the instructional titles in Section 1–3 above may demonstrate their scholarship and research in a variety of specific ways (Section 24-32). While they may choose to do so through publication, such publication shall not be required.

5. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired through service in research appointments.

Research professor and research associate professor appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions
Research assistant professor appointments are for a term not to exceed three years with renewals and extensions to a maximum of eight years (see Section 24-41, Subsection H.) The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-41.

Research associate appointments are for a term not to exceed three years, with renewals to a maximum of six years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in Section 24-35.

6. Appointment with the title of professor of practice is made to a person who is a distinguished practitioner or distinguished academician, and who has had a major impact on a field important to the University's teaching, research, and/or service mission.

Professor of practice appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53. This title is available to address a unique appointment need and is intended to be sparingly used. Tenure is not acquired through service in this title.

7. Appointment with the title of instructor is made to a person who has completed professional training, in many fields marked by the Ph.D., and is fulfilling a temporary, clinical, or affiliate instructional need, or is in a temporary transition period between post-doctoral training and mentoring and entry into the professorial ranks. These appointments are limited to acting, affiliate, or clinical.

8. An affiliate appointment requires qualifications comparable to those required for appointment to the corresponding rank or title. It recognizes the professional contribution of an individual whose principal employment responsibilities lie outside the colleges or schools of the University. Affiliate appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

9. An adjunct appointment is made only to a faculty member (including one in a research professorial rank) already holding a primary appointment in another department. This
appointment recognizes the contributions of a member of the faculty to a secondary department. Adjunct appointments do not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure in the secondary department. These appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the secondary department.

10. A joint appointment recognizes a faculty member’s long-term commitment to, and participation in, two or more departments. A joint appointment may be discontinued only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. One department shall be designated the primary department and the others secondary, and this designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department, but may be proposed by the secondary department(s), and all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary department(s). A faculty member who has the privilege of participation in governance and voting in the primary department may arrange with the secondary department(s) either to participate or not to participate in governance and voting in the secondary department(s). This agreement must be in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved.

11. A clinical appointment in the appropriate rank or title is usually made to a person who holds a primary appointment with an outside agency or non-academic unit of the University, or who is in private practice. Clinical faculty make substantial contributions to University programs through their expertise, interest, and motivation to work with the faculty in preparing and assisting with the instruction of students in practicum settings. Clinical appointments are annual; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

12. Appointment with the title of teaching associate is made to a non-student with credentials more limited than those required of an instructor. Teaching associate appointments are annual, or shorter; the question of their renewal shall be considered each year by the faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which they are held.

13. The emeritus appointment is recommended by departmental action for a regular, WOT, research or clinical faculty member who has retired under the UW Retirement Plan or is receiving benefits as if he or she retired under another state of Washington retirement plan and whose scholarly, teaching, or service record has been meritorious. Such a recommendation requires approval by the college dean and the President of the University. The normal criteria for appointment with the emeritus title are at least ten years of prior service as a member of the faculty and achievement of the rank of professor or associate professor. Under certain circumstances the President may grant emeritus status to an
administrator at the level of dean or vice president, or at other levels if deemed appropriate.

14. The acting title denotes a temporary appointment for properly qualified persons in the instructor title or at the professorial ranks. It commonly is used for persons who are on the faculty for a year or less or for persons who have not yet completed the requirements for a regular appointment. In the latter case, the acting title is dropped when the requirements are completed. The total service of a faculty member with an acting appointment may not exceed four years in any single rank or title, or six years in any combination of ranks or titles. A faculty member whose appointment as assistant professor has not been renewed may not be given an acting appointment.

15. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a visiting title indicates that the appointee holds a professorial position at another institution of higher learning and is temporarily employed by the University. An employee who does not hold a professorial position elsewhere, but who is otherwise qualified, may be designated as a visiting lecturer.

16. The visiting scholar title is an honorary title awarded to persons who hold professorial (including research titles) positions at other institutions and who are visiting the University but who are not employed by the University during their stay. The purpose of this title is recognition of the visitor's presence at the University, and to make University facilities and privileges (library, etc.) available.

17. An interim title may be used when it is necessary to hire a lecturer or artist in residence for unanticipated or very short-term needs without a competitive search or otherwise authorized process (see section 24-52). Interim lecturers or artists in residence are normally employed for terms of one year or less, full-time or part-time. After a lecturer or artist in residence has been employed under the interim designation for any portion of three separate academic years, employment under that designation may not continue except by express permission of the Provost. Where an appointing unit wishes to extend an interim position requiring identical or similar qualifications for longer periods, a search process for an appointment to a regular position as lecturer or artist-in-residence must be opened and any interim incumbent may apply. The interim title may not be used with clinical, affiliate, acting, or visiting faculty appointments.


Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

A. The first appointment or the reappointment of an assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Although neither appointment period shall
extend beyond the academic year in which a decision on tenure is required, the year in which a negative tenure decision is made must be followed by a terminal year of appointment. If the assistant professor is reappointed, the period of reappointment must include a tenure decision. Assistant professors holding positions funded by other than state funds shall be treated in the same way except that the appointment may be to a position without tenure by reason of funding as provided in **Subsection D**. Procedures governing the reappointment of assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the assistant professor’s college or school shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will terminate at the end of the third year; or
   c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment, or
   b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

B. Lecturer and Artist in Residence

1. Appointment as a **full-time** lecturer or artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.

   **The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.**

2. Appointment as a **full-time** senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years. The normal appointment period of senior and principal lecturers shall be for a minimum of three years with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

   **The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.**
3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an annual or multi-year appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, or senior artist in residence, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, senior lecturer, or principal lecturer is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

- 5. Part-time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24-53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.

C. A full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer may, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively.

D. Notwithstanding the provisions of Subsection A, appointments of assistant professors who are supported by other than state-appropriated funds are subject to termination should the supporting agency fail to continue the funding for the appointment, provided that the assistant professor supported by other than state-appropriated funds is advised in writing prior to commencement of his or her appointment that such appointment is at all times subject to the continued availability of grant or contract funds.

E. The first appointment or the reappointment of a faculty member to less than 50% of full-time status shall be made on an annual, or shorter, basis. A faculty member who is appointed to a position with less than 50% of full-time status shall not accumulate eligibility toward tenure.

F. The first appointment or the reappointment of a research assistant professor is for a basic period of three years, subject to earlier dismissal for cause. Research assistant professors may not be reappointed more than once, except that a research assistant professor who does not receive promotion in rank must receive a terminal year of appointment. Procedures governing the reappointment of research assistant professors are as follows:

1. During the second year of the initial appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor's college or school shall decide whether:

   a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment;

   b. The appointment is not to be renewed beyond the initial three-year period, in which case the appointment will cease at the end of the third year; or
c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year.

2. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the third year of the initial appointment the dean shall decide whether:
   
a. The appointment is to be renewed under the above provision for reappointment or
   
b. The appointment is not to be renewed; if it is not renewed, the basic appointment is extended to include a fourth and terminal year.

3. Not later than the end of the third year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor’s college or school shall decide whether:
   
a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure;
   
b. The appointment is to cease at the end of the following year; or
   
c. The decision concerning the appointment is to be postponed to the following year. In cases b and c the appointment is extended by one year.

4. Should the above decision result in a postponement, during the extension year of a second appointment, the dean of the research assistant professor’s college or school shall decide whether:
   
a. The research assistant professor is to be appointed as research associate professor, associate professor without tenure by reason of funding or associate professor with tenure, or
   
b. The appointment is to cease; in which case the basic appointment is extended by one year.

5. The dean shall inform the professor in writing within 30 days of any decision made pursuant to this section.

G. At least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a research associate professor, research professor, or professor of practice, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment of a research associate professor, research professor, or professor of practice is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

H. Notwithstanding the provisions of this subsection, research assistant professors are subject to removal during the term of their appointment for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51), for termination of funding, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52).
I. Research professors and research associate professors are not subject to removal during the term of their appointment except by removal for cause (see Chapter 25, Section 25-51), for termination of funding as defined in Subsection J, or for reasons of program elimination (see Chapter 25, Section 25-52.)

J. Termination of funding is defined as failure, for a continuous period of more than 12 months, to obtain funding sufficient to provide at least 50% of the faculty member's base annual salary. The University is not obligated to provide replacement funding during lapses of a faculty member's external support.

K. In unusual cases, an individual may be appointed to the title of research assistant professor when there is no known funding to support the appointment. The department and dean shall determine that the individual will seek external funding to support his or her appointment. Such appointments shall be made on an annual or shorter basis, and may be renewed annually upon evidence of research grant or contract pursuit activity. Upon receipt of salary funding support, said appointments shall be converted to initial three-year appointments in conformance with Subsection H.

L. The procedures prescribed in Section 24-53 for renewal of appointments and in Section 24-54 for Procedure for Promotion shall govern actions taken under this section.


Section 24-52 Procedure for New Appointments

A. Faculty recommendations of appointments are ordinarily rendered through committees, and the procedure depends upon the level of appointment.

1. For recommendation of a departmental appointment other than that of chair, the department members act as an advisory appointment committee. A department may delegate this responsibility to a departmental committee.

2. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a department chair should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the dean of the appropriate college, or if the President so desires, by the President.

3. A committee responsible for recommending the appointment of a dean should be an ad hoc committee appointed by the President.

B. The duty of an appointment committee is to search for suitable candidates, to study and determine their qualifications (Sections 24-32 to 24-36), and to obtain and evaluate all data related to the problem of appointment. When, after such a study, the committee finds a
candidate or candidates who appear to be qualified it shall transmit its information and recommendation to:

1. The department chair, if the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, or
2. The appropriate dean, if the appointment is to be one of a department chair, or
3. The President, if the appointment is to be one of a dean.

C. In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean to the voting members of the department faculty. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time interim lecturers or artists in residence to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made. Recommendations in favor of appointment, based on a majority vote of the voting members of the faculty or of the elected committee with delegated authority, shall be sent with pertinent information to the appropriate dean. If the chair concurs in the department recommendation, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if it is favorable, shall transmit it together with the vote of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President. In the unusual case where the chair does not concur in the department recommendation, he or she may communicate objections to the dean and may also submit a separate recommendation to the dean from among the candidates who have been considered by the department. If the dean concurs in the chair's recommendation, or has additional information which raises doubts concerning the department's recommendation, or finds that the President has such information, the dean shall refer the matter again to the department along with an explanation and comments. After considering the evidence, the department may then either reaffirm its original recommendation, or transmit a new one. After the department's final recommendation has been sent to the dean, the dean shall make a decision concerning the appointment and, if an appointment is to be recommended, shall transmit it together with the final recommendation of the department and the recommendation of the chair to the President.

2. If the appointment is to be one of a department chair, the dean shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision. The department concerned shall be consulted in making the appointment, but a formal vote is not required.

3. If the appointment is to be one of a dean, the President shall deal directly with the appointment committee in making the decision.
Section 24-53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24-41), the procedure described below shall be followed.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associate, or annual or quarterly part-time interim lecturer or artist in residence appointments to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and
2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

B. If this recommendation is a departmental one, the chair shall transmit it to the dean. If the chair does not concur in the recommendation he or she may also submit a separate recommendation.

C. The dean shall decide the matter within the time prescribed in Section 24-41 and inform the faculty member concerned of the decision.

D. If a faculty member requests a written statement of the reasons for the non-renewal of his or her appointment, the dean shall supply such a written statement within 30 days.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 24, June 23, 1959; S-A 126, June 11, 2012: all with Presidential approval.
Discussion Questions about the Part-Time Lecturer Proposal

Compiled by Jack Lee

Based on the discussions we’ve had so far about code changes for part-time lecturers, it seemed to me that where the committee has been heading is essentially to erase all code-based distinctions between part-time and full-time lecturers except voting rights. So in the current proposal, I’ve tried eliminating “part-time” and “full-time” titles.

Here are some questions that FCFA needs to discuss.

1. **The three-year cap:** For Interim Lecturers (and Artists in Residence), we agreed at our last meeting to set the cap at three years. After that, in order to hire them again, they would have to be hired as an Affiliate (without competitive search) or as a regular Lecturer or Artist in Residence (with competitive search). This version tries to elucidate what “three years” means – “any portion of three separate academic years.” This would mean that someone hired as an Interim lecturer to teach one course in 2013-14, one in 2015-17, and one in 2018-19 would no longer be eligible for interim hires. Is this what we want? Does it matter if those hires are in different departments, schools, or campuses?

2. **Provost exception:** At Cheryl’s suggestion, I added a Provost exception to the three-year cap – after three years, employment under the Interim title may not continue “except by express permission of the Provost.” Do we want to keep this? Do we want to be more specific about what the bases for a Provost exception might be?

3. **Delegation of appointment & renewal authority:** The current code allows departments (by faculty vote) to delegate the appointment and renewal of part-time lecturers to a committee. In this proposal, the appointment and renewal of interim appointments can be delegated, but not part-timers. Is this what we want?

4. **Three-year cap on a “position”**? Dan has suggested that maybe the three-year cap on interim hires should apply to a “position,” not to a person – for example, a unit should not be allowed to indefinitely keep hiring different people as Interim Lecturers to teach the same course. I didn’t try to incorporate this, because I couldn’t think of an unambiguous way to specify exactly what constitutes the "same position." What do you think?

5. **Multi-year appointments and promotion:** This draft proposes that (non-interim) part-time lecturers have all the benefits available to full-time lecturers except voting rights. In particular, competitively hired part-time lecturers (regardless of whether they’re over or under 50%) would be eligible for multi-year appointments (up to five years) and promotion. Is this what we want? Would there be any difference in the promotion criteria for part-timers? E.g., would they also require annual collegial teaching evaluations?