

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
October 30, 2018
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from June 5 and October 16, 2018
 3. Report on the librarians' decision to discontinue the pursuit of faculty status (Judith Henchy; see attached letter)
 4. Discussion of FCFA priorities 2018-19:
 - 1. Continue exploring the status, working conditions, and career paths for instructional faculty.
 - 2. Explore ways to ensure consistency between Academic Human Resources policies and Faculty Code around Tenure & Promotion.
 - 3. (tied)
 - Review Faculty Code language around non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process.
 - Review Faculty Code language around Elected Faculty Councils to bring greater clarity around membership and function.
 - Code provisions regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - 6. (tied)
 - Faculty policies around writing recommendation letters.
 - Retired faculty participation in Faculty Senate.
 5. Good of the order
 6. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

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

2. Review of the minutes from June 5 and October 16, 2018

The minutes from June 5 and October 16, 2018 were approved as written.

3. Report on the librarians' decision to discontinue the pursuit of faculty status (Judith Henchy; see attached letter)

Lee (the chair) presented a letter written by Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) (Exhibit 1). Judith Henchy, Southeast Asian Studies Librarian, provided additional context. She explained that many library staff were concerned about salary equity and many ALUW members thought that aligning with the faculty policies would not address this issue. They were also concerned about professional and classified staff salaries. As an alternative the library has considered unionizing.

Aaron Katz, Principal Lecturer in Health Services, offered to connect ALUW with UW Faculty Forward.

4. Discussion of FCFA priorities 2018-19:

The chair shared the results of the priorities poll. After much discussion the council agreed to prioritize the following items:

- Top priorities
 - Continue exploring the status, working conditions, and career paths for instructional faculty.
 - Explore ways to ensure consistency between Academic Human Resources policies and Faculty Code around Tenure & Promotion.
 - Code provisions regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Second group
 - Review Faculty Code language around non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process.
 - Review Faculty Code language around Elected Faculty Councils to bring greater clarity around membership and function.
- Third group
 - Faculty policies around writing recommendation letters.
 - Retired faculty participation in Faculty Senate.

Below is discussion around these priorities.

Top Priorities

Continue exploring the status, working conditions, and career paths for instructional faculty.

The chair asked the council to consider developing career paths for instructional faculty. The basic idea is to create three new professorial titles (instructional/teaching assistant professor, instructional/teaching associate professor, and instructional/teaching professor). The chair reasoned that creating these new titles will improve recruitment and retention, increase transparency, and improve morale among faculty. The chair researched what other universities have done (Exhibit 2). The chair mentioned that the most important thing to address when writing code is how to simultaneously allow departments (when appropriate) to hire temporary positions, and yet dissuade them from repeatedly hiring people into these positions. Should also allow for terminal degree exceptions (language degrees which often use master's degrees).

A member noted that taking up this issue will likely take up the council's time, and prevent the council from addressing more immediate issues. A member rebutted by agreeing that changing the title will not change everything, but it does mean something. A couple of members raised issues around clinical faculty in the med school.

A member asked if it is just a change in title or in job structure. Another member wondered about the practicality, what prevents this from becoming one more title? The chair responded that other schools eliminated lecturer titles. The only question left would be what would the remaining titles be at the lowest level.

A member noted that the UC system uses a designation "with the potential for security of employment" for non-tenure track.

Padmaja Vrudhula, ASUW representative, said that from a student perspective it is important to see teaching and research faculty on the same level and equally valued.

The chair stated that he did not want to lose the momentum from last year. If the council takes on this issue, the council will change the code and reflect the values of the council expressed.

A member asked if the council could boil this down to a few points and how they work with this.

- Job security
- Closing the revolving door
- Voting rights
- Salary floors and promotion models

A member noted that the council will have to think about what job security means in the future, particularly if that will pertain to a person's salary or their position.

The chair asked the council if it made sense to form a subcommittee to draft a proposal and what other information was needed. A member suggested that the council needed to better understand the universe of faculty (numbers). Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, noted that there are nuances to faculty data that can only be answered by faculty. The chair will send out the data that Cameron sent last year and share the dashboard. Cameron will send Jack Lee promotional statistics.

The chair will work on this proposal, with Mary Pat Wenderoth, Dan Jacoby, and Míceál Vaughan

Explore ways to ensure consistency between Academic Human Resources policies and Faculty Code around Tenure & Promotion.

The chair proposed working on this simultaneously with "Continue exploring the status, working conditions, and career paths for instructional faculty."

Code provisions regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, noted that during a meeting of the Pac-12 faculty leadership Stanford has had a very specific and targeted programming for diversity. It has worked well for gender, but they have not made progress for other underrepresented groups. Other schools echoed this frustration. Townsend recommended that the council form a group that considers whether or not the faculty code is the appropriate place to make changes to ultimately impact diversity, equity and inclusion on campus.

A member noted that funding could resolve some challenges for hiring underrepresented faculty members. This may not be the total answer, but it could be helpful. Another member responded that there are greater issues and challenges (institutional challenges) that underrepresented faculty members face once they are on campus. Townsend agreed and said that the Provost and President have said that money/funding is not necessarily the answer, but faculty attitudes about what excellence means, about how professorships will be allocated, about whether diversity is going to be a separate category need to change. The faculty should own this issue.

Another member commented that supply and demand (in certain fields) is also an underlying issue. Increasing funding for underrepresented faculty members in some fields may inflate the cost of recruitment efforts. A member noted that there are ways to broaden hiring searches instead of looking for niche skills – deciding what excellence means and standards. As they are defined now they can be exclusionary.

A member suggested working with other councils as a better way to guide the work of FCFA.

The chair summarized that a subcommittee should address this, work with other councils (FCMA and FCWA) and the Senate leadership, and decide if FCFA should take action. A member moved to list “Code provisions regarding diversity, equity, and inclusion” as a top priority. The council approved this motion.

Purnima Dhavan (convener), Jim Gregory, Kamran Nemati, Mike Townsend, Padmaja Vrudhula, and Judith Henchy volunteered to serve on the subcommittee. The chair asked for a more formal report in 6 weeks (last meeting of the quarter, December 11).

Second Group

Review Faculty Code language around non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process.

The chair noted that Jacob Vigdor has already worked on faculty code language on non-departmentalized tenure and promotion. The chair will work with Vigdor on presenting this at a future council meeting.

Review Faculty Code language around Elected Faculty Councils to bring greater clarity around membership and function.

Aaron Katz (convener) and Tom Hazlet will serve on this subcommittee.

Third Group

Faculty policies around writing recommendation letters and Retired faculty participation in Faculty Senate.

The chair proposed taking these up at the end of the year.

5. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

6. 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, Miceal Vaughan, James Gregory, Mary Wenderoth
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Bryan Crockett, Angelia Miranda
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend

Absent: **Faculty:** Joseph Janes, Lauren Montgomery, Dawn Lehman
Ex-officio reps: JoAnn Taricani

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – aluw-faculty-status-2018-10-3.pdf
Exhibit 2 – Reasons for Considering.docx