University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
April 24th, 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 April 10th, 2018
3. Chair’s report
4. Discussion of altering titles (attachment)
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 April 10th, 2018

The minutes from April 10th, 2018 were approved as written.

3) Chair’s report

Janes reported that FCFA’s two pieces of Class A legislation were approved by the Faculty Senate in the body’s most recent (April 19) meeting. It was noted FCFA’s Class A legislation on lecturer voting eligibility was approved in its second reading, and thus the legislation has now been sent out for full (voting) faculty vote. Members were reminded to vote. Relating to FCFA’s Class A legislation on faculty lecturer issues, there were some comments from senators stating they support the legislation and would hope similar legislation in the future might “go even further.” Specifically, some members felt Principal lecturers should be able to vote on matters concerning other Principal Lecturers. Janes explained this is something for the FCFA to take note of for the coming 2018-2019 academic year. Members were thanked for their work on the legislation.

The previously-reviewed Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) Class A legislation was also approved by the Faculty Senate in its first reading. The revision formerly proposed by FCFA during its own review of the legislation concerning addition of the term “any” within the language was proposed on the floor of the Faculty Senate and added to the language before approval.

Janes explained dispute resolution and adjudication procedures are currently being discussed within the framework of Faculty Code Chapters 27 and 28. An associated drafting committee has been charged with drafting related code language – work which will likely be reviewed by the FCFA during winter of the 2018-2019 academic year.
4) Discussion of altering titles (attachment)

Janes noted he has planned for the council to discuss a proposal for a UW “instructional professor track,” formerly developed and forwarded by a UW faculty member in the spring of 2016 but never wholly considered by FCFA (Exhibit 1). He clarified development of legislation/code language surrounding lecturer titles issues and/or this specific proposal will not be taken up by the council this year, but may be done in the fall of 2018. He noted the discussion is intended to determine if the proposal or any of its components may be useful to the council in its continuing work related to altering/adding lecturer titles. He asked members for feedback on the proposal.

A member noted there are substantial cost considerations related to the proposal given the size and breadth of the recommended changes. Another member made note of the amount of work it would take to translate the proposal into legislation, noting the council’s resources in terms of time and man-hours must be considered.

There was some discussion of the proposal solely altering lecturer titles, and if a title change on its own would truly be of value to UW’s lecturing faculty. Another member agreed with the point, explaining FCFA should decide if it means to address “what things are” or rather “what they are called.”

A member pointed out that the proposal includes changes for the lecturer promotion framework, altering it to an “up or out” model (an individual must be promoted or the appointment will cease after a terminal year) similar to the tenure-track. He explained the “up or out” component is a very serious change to make to the promotion process.

Janes pointed out the proposal begs questions concerning the requirement of terminal degrees to be appointed to various positions. He explained there are also references to a 50% effort threshold for various titles, of which the council formerly expressed disapproval. He noted there are also currently several groups/types of lecturers not accounted for by the proposal.

A member noted FCFA previously expressed during 2017-2018 that it was interested in creating well-defined and understood pathways for promotion of lecturers, as well as make efforts to limit unethical hiring practices surrounding temporary/part-time instructors. She noted the proposal in-question does not address either of those issues, but rather seems to relate to notions of self-worth and/or professional esteem. Another member agreed and noted he felt part-time lecturer considerations were not sufficiently addressed in the proposal.

One member noted as aspect of the proposal he likes is the altering the Principal Lecturer title to “Instructional Professor,” noting it seems a fitting title for the highest lecturer position at the university.

There was some discussion of methods the council might use to garner input from UW lecturers on changes they would value being instituted at the UW. The idea of the council broadcasting a survey widely was considered. A few members noted they would consider useful questions such a survey might
include. Another member recommended the council chair communicate with the university President to attain her thoughts on the issues.

There were no more comments. Janes concluded there is little to no enthusiasm for the proposal in-question, and thus it will be set aside for the time being.

5) Good of the order

Henchy explained the Association of Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) is planning this summer to further develop the legislative proposal altering the Faculty Code to grant UW librarians “faculty” status. She explained it is the Association’s desire that the proposal go forward in the coming (2018-2019) academic year.

Janes noted he plans to poll FCFA members by email to solicit new agenda items for the council to consider for the remainder of the year’s meetings.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at noon.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Steve Buck, Joseph Janes (chair), Aaron Katz, Purnima Dhavan, Kamran Nemati, Dan Jacoby, Tom Hazlet, Miceal Vaughan, Jacob Vigdor
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Ziyan Bai, Bryan Crockett
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend, George Sandison

Absent: Faculty: Margaret Adam, Kurt Johnson, Gordon Watts, Eric Bugyis
Ex-officio reps: N/A

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – instructional professor proposal 09-15_fcfa_spring2016.pdf
Proposal to FCFA: Instructional Professor Track
9/10/2015

Introduction
In recent years, non-tenure-track teaching faculty have been forming an increasing percentage of the faculty at the University of Washington, reflecting a nationwide trend. Because teaching is one of the three fundamental parts of the university’s mission of teaching, research, and service, it is vital that our teaching faculty be recognized as a valued and integral part of the UW faculty, with professional standing commensurate with their expertise and responsibilities.

The core faculty of the university are its tenure-track faculty, who are hired, evaluated, and promoted on the basis of their contributions to all aspects of the university’s mission: teaching, research, and service. But in today’s universities a number of other faculty clusters have developed. For example, at UW, alongside the tenure-track faculty are the WOT faculty (“without tenure by reason of funding”), who are hired, evaluated, and promoted based on exactly the same criteria as the tenure-track ones.

In addition to tenured and WOT faculty, there are two categories of faculty members whose responsibilities are somewhat more limited but who nevertheless are essential to the university’s mission, and who have become more prominent. Faculty with a Research title (Research Assistant Professors, Research Associate Professors, and Research Professors) are hired, evaluated, and promoted based on criteria similar to those for tenure-track and WOT faculty, but with primary emphasis upon research. Faculty members in these positions are not eligible for tenure, but in other respects they are treated similarly to other professors. In particular, Research Assistant Professor appointments are subject to the AAUP standard that after six years, either the faculty member must be promoted to (Research) Associate Prof or the appointment must cease.

Another important category of faculty members with limited responsibilities is the Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Principal Lecturers. These faculty members are hired, evaluated, and promoted primarily on the basis of teaching, and in many departments they teach a large percentage of the student credit hours. They also are expected to contribute to the university’s service mission, and indeed, in the UW system, lecturers take on major service responsibilities. However, they are generally paid much less than the faculty members in professorial ranks, and they are afforded neither the respect generally given to tenured or Research professorial faculty nor the promotion timeline required for all types of Assistant Professors.

This situation seems incompatible with the growing recognition that excellent teaching is central to this university’s core mission. This proposal is designed to improve the professional standing of the UW’s lecturers, many of whom, while not doing traditional disciplinary research, may nonetheless be doing work that they publish, present at national and international meetings, and give workshops on. It is time for the UW to take a leadership position in addressing the
widespread erosion of the status of teaching faculty and offering them the respect and professional status they deserve as an important part of the faculty as a whole.

The main novelty in this proposal is the introduction of a new Instructional Professor track, with appointment rules similar to those of the Research Professor track, but with primary emphasis on teaching. The main advantages we see in this new track are (a) the application of the AAUP-standard “six year up-or-out” requirement, which will ensure that long-serving instructional faculty do not get permanently stuck in low-status, low-paying, and low-job-security positions; and (b) enhanced respect and status within and outside the university.

Proposed New Titles
We propose that all of the current Lecturer titles and ranks be replaced by the following titles and ranks. (See Appendix A for comparisons with current titles and ranks.)

- **Instructional Assistant Professor**: This should be the entry-level title for all teaching faculty who might be expected to make a career at the university, or at least to work half-time or more for more than three years.
  - search required
  - terminal degree required
  - not tenure-eligible
  - maximum three-year appointment with one three-year renewal, after which the individual must be promoted or the appointment must cease after a terminal year
  - voting rights
  - tier-eligible
  - full-time or part-time

- **Instructional Associate Professor**: Typically, this title will be awarded to people promoted from Instructional Assistant Professor; but experienced faculty members could be hired directly into this position.
  - search required
  - terminal degree required
  - not tenure-eligible
  - maximum five-year appointment, renewable
  - voting rights
  - tier-eligible
  - full-time or part-time

- **Instructional Professor**: Typically, this title will be awarded to people promoted from Instructional Associate Professor; but experienced faculty members could be hired directly into this position.
  - search required
  - terminal degree required
  - not tenure-eligible
  - maximum five-year appointment, renewable
  - voting rights
  - tier-eligible
  - full-time or part-time

- **Part-Time Lecturer**: This is a (potentially) long-term position for anyone who will always be teaching less than 50% time.
Acting Lecturer: This is a temporary fill-in position. It is meant to be easy and quick to fill. If the department wishes to keep someone who was initially hired with this title longer than three years, they must be appointed to a different position (either Part-Time Lecturer or Instructional Assistant Professor).

- no search required
- no terminal degree required
- not tenure-eligible
- maximum five-year appointment, renewable
- no voting rights
- not tier-eligible
- less than 50% time

Comments

- Part-time lecturers (less than 50% FTE) are often hired to teach specific courses on a regular basis, and often have principal employment elsewhere. We do not want to stand in the way of continued hiring of such lecturers.

- On the other hand, once a lecturer is working 50% FTE or more for the University of Washington, the appointing department should make a choice: If this is a temporary situation, the faculty member should be labeled “Acting” and given a time-limited appointment; if it’s permanent, he or she should move into the professorial ranks and be treated as a career faculty member. The “50% or more” criterion must include all faculty appointments at UW, not just those in a single department, college, or campus.

- There is a possibility that part-time lecturer positions could be abused by departments that wish to cover lots of teaching needs inexpensively and without long-term commitments. We could consider establishing structural safeguards against this kind of abuse; but such safeguards should not be so stringent that they might diminish the usefulness of this position for legitimate long-term part-time needs. The alternative to structural safeguards would be to rely on deans, chancellors, elected faculty councils, the provost, and the SCPB to monitor the uses of these positions and ensure that they are not being used exploitatively.

- Some faculty members have expressed a concern that the introduction of the “Instructional Professor” titles might encourage some departments to gradually (or even rapidly) increase the percentage of their faculty who are non-tenure-track, thus further eroding tenure. Should there be language in the Faculty Code that establishes criteria for when it’s appropriate to hire into the Instructional track? Or do we depend on deans, chancellors, elected faculty councils, the provost, and the SCPB to police this? This deserves more discussion.
We realize that many full-time lecturers are currently hired using temporary departmental funds, which makes chairs and deans reluctant to make multi-year commitments to them. An important part of making this plan succeed will be the establishment of some kind of central “risk pool” that can be used as a source of bridge funds for lecturers whose contracts have not ended. This would be in some senses parallel to the bridge funding for lecturers provided by the Office of Research, but it would only be used to support salary of instructional faculty members. The Provost has already expressed an interest in creating such a pool.

When the voting rights of faculty in these positions are established, we should ensure that they are grouped with other faculty members of the same rank for the purposes of voting on promotion and tier advancements. For example, promotion and advancement of Instructional Associate Professors should be voted on only by full professors, not by all assistant/associate/full professors as is currently the case for Senior and Principal Lecturers. This will be an important ingredient in establishing a higher standard of professional respect for the instructional faculty.

Questions

- **Did we choose the correct titles?** Here are some alternatives that have been suggested:
  - *Teaching Professor* (and *Assistant Teaching Professor*, etc.) instead of “Instructional Professor.” Some have argued that this would more clearly indicate that this role also includes the teacher as scholar and curriculum creator.
  - *Instructor* (*Acting Instructor, Part-Time Instructor*) instead of Lecturer.
    - Currently, this title exists only in the form of “Acting Instructor.” One advantage of introducing “Instructor” for the non-professorial ranks might be to draw a clearer dividing line between the new titles and our current Lecturer titles, which would be discontinued.

- **Is there a need for a permanent, full-time teaching position at a lower level than Instructional Assistant Prof?** Some have argued that a terminal degree is not really needed (and is perhaps even contraindicated) for certain teaching jobs, such as elementary language instruction. Do we need to add another “lecturer” designation for such people – something like “Full-Time Lecturer” or “Full-Time Instructor”? Such a position should require a competitive search, but not a terminal degree; and should be indefinitely renewable. A big question here is this: What is to prevent departments from appointing large numbers of people to this position, in order to avoid the expense and commitment involved in appointing Instructional Assistant Professors? We currently do not support the creation of such a title.

- **Are there other current groups of lecturers who don’t fit into any of the categories in this proposal?** If so, who are they and why are these categories not appropriate for them?

- **Is “less than 50%” the correct criterion for part-time?** We chose this because anyone hired at 50% or more receives benefits, and we believe the presumption in that case should be that this is their primary job.
Transition
A crucial part of a successful overhaul of our instructional titles will be the provision of a carefully designed pathway for transitioning all of our current lecturers into the new titles. Here’s a proposed transition scheme:

- **Principal Lecturers**: convert immediately to Instructional Professor
- **Senior Lecturers**: convert immediately to Instructional Associate Professor
- **Competitively hired full-time Lecturers**: convert immediately to Instructional Assistant Professor; once converted, a 6-year clock for promotion to Associate Instructional Professor will begin. (Does there need to be a grandfather clause to allow competitively hired full-time lecturers to stay in that position if they prefer not to face a 6-year up or out clock?)
- **Competitively hired part-time Lecturers**: convert immediately to Part-time Lecturer
- **Noncompetitively hired part-time or full-time Lecturers**: convert immediately to Acting Lecturer

Of course, after an appropriate search, a department may choose to promote any noncompetitively hired lecturer to one of the other positions.

Sincerely,

Jack Lee
Professor of Mathematics
Former Faculty Senate Chair
## Appendix A: Comparison of Titles and Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXISTING TITLES</th>
<th>NEW TITLES</th>
<th>DISCONTINUED TITLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professorial</td>
<td>WOT</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Class Code</td>
<td>101,102,116</td>
<td>101,102,116</td>
<td>141,142,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Ranks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Hire</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal degree req?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appt. Duration</td>
<td>3,3 cont.</td>
<td>3,3 cont.</td>
<td>3,3,then 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT/PT</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Appt.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 mo/12 mo</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>12 mo only</td>
<td>12 mo only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotable</td>
<td>Y, mandatory</td>
<td>Y, mandatory</td>
<td>Y, mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Activity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-eligible</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>Y (50%)</td>
<td>Y (50%)</td>
<td>Y (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote on prom, tenure</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>