

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**  
April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
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 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017
  3. Short update on librarians as faculty (Henchy)
  4. Short report on the 50% legislation
  5. Continuing the discussion on lecturer issues
  6. Good of the order
  7. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

Janes called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

**2) Review of the minutes from April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

The minutes from April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017 were approved as written.

**3) Short update on librarians as faculty (Henchy)**

Henchy remarked that the Associated Librarians of the University of Washington (ALUW) is planning to forward a recommendation to the FCFA relating to changing the status of UW librarians from their current status as “academic personnel” to faculty. The change would require amendment to the Faculty Code in various chapters.

She explained there have been attempts to develop initial code language relating to the proposal, in addition to a draft ALUW request yet to be approved/disseminated. The letter of request also includes current demographics of UW librarians by rank, and other information related to the initiative. Henchy explained there is an additional rank in the librarian ranks than currently exists for UW faculty, and the Dean of Libraries previously agreed the “extra” rank will be eliminated during translation into the Faculty Code. ALUW will hold a vote of the membership confirming agreement on this change. There was some discussion of the current promotion procedures for librarians; a clarification was made that librarian promotion and tenure reviews are similar to the faculty model in that they are “up or out.” The draft letter of request will be voted on by ALUW membership in the next week.

Outstanding questions/concerns associated with the change include variations in sick leave and benefits, as librarians accrue leave and faculty do not, as well as a question of budgetary impact as a result of the change.

*Feedback*

It was suggested the research titles in the Faculty Code may provide a useful parallel for modeling inclusion of librarians into the document - and this might be evaluated by the ALUW.

A member noted the defined timeline for submission of the code changes may be optimistic (review by FCFA in late spring, 2017 and review by the Faculty Senate in fall, 2017).

After some discussion of voting changes, it was clarified librarians would be housed in their own unit, and internal voting on hiring is imagined to be similar to the current process. It was clarified the status change would allow librarians voting rights in the Faculty Senate and the right to vote on broader university legislation.

There was some discussion of the initiative occurring at the same time that the FCFA is addressing part-time lecturer issues, and a possibility the two topics may be conflated. It was noted the same objections might be raised in relation to public relations for the initiative.

There was some discussion of UW librarians who exist outside of the UW Libraries system, and how (if at all) the change affects them. A member pointed out the title of "Director of University Libraries" was changed to "Dean of University Libraries" in the recent past, and the rationale for the title change was noted to be of interest to the initiative.

#### **4) Short report on the 50% legislation**

##### *Publication legislation*

Janes explained the FCFA Class A legislation on clarification of roles for part-time lecturers (advanced February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2017) was approved by the Faculty Senate in its most recent meeting, and will be forwarded through the legislative process for its second and final consideration before the end of academic year 2016-2017.

##### *50% lecturer voting legislation*

Watts explained he presented the draft FCFA draft Class A legislation on voting rights for part-time lecturers in a recent elected faculty council (EFC) chair's luncheon, wherein a representative from the School of Nursing remarked that the School has had "heated discussions" on the topic of voting rights for part-time lecturers, and that it is a competitive disadvantage for the School that part-time lecturers do not vote, as many other institutions allow it. She communicated a belief that the School would be majority in favor of the legislation. There was another comment from a representative from UW Tacoma, who noted he believes that campus would have considerable concern over the inclusion of annual part-time lecturers (in those who may vote). It was noted the comment has been heard in other venues (namely the Senate Executive Committee), and this may drive the FCFA to discuss duration of contract as a threshold for the granting of voting rights (for part-time lecturers).

Janes explained he and Watts plan to join individual EFC meetings to discuss the legislation and garner feedback (Nursing has already agreed to host a discussion).

There was some discussion of political obstacles facing the legislation, the legislation being taken directly to the Faculty Senate via a motion on the floor of the meeting, as well as some comments concerning the status of the UW professoriate.

#### **5) Continuing the discussion on lecturer issues**

Janes explained draft changes have been made to Faculty Code Chapter 24.41 relating to new subsections C.2 and C.3, and in Chapter 24.54.D (Exhibit 1).

The passages add a mandatory review for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, artist in residence to senior artist in residence, and senior to principal lecturer (via defined timelines). A separate language addition in 24.54.D clarifies the review is not “up or out.”

The language was reviewed by the council. Watts asked for questions or comments. Vaughan confirmed the intent of the legislation is to implement that after two multiyear appointments of a lecturer, every following multiyear appointment would require a promotion consideration (or six or more annual appointments).

There was some discussion of the language; a recommendation was heard that “appointment” language be substituted for “years of service.” It was noted any number of years (between six or ten) would likely work, though the promotion review must explicitly be triggered at the end of an appointment.

Vaughan explained “promotion eligible” as a term does not exist in the Faculty Code, raising questions about how to delineate it in relation to new code language.

There was a question about why the language states six appointments “within eight years.” The language was included in order to reduce the potential of finding a way around conducting a promotion review (i.e. not hiring a lecturer for one year at the end of 5 annual appointments, then rehiring thereafter). A member clarified this is an unbinding review; there is no requirement that promotion be granted. He commented that the possibility of gaming a system should not be considered a sufficient argument against setting up a system, as no system is immune to exploitation. Other members agreed.

Janes noted after some debate, he ultimately did not include the ability to opt out of the mandatory review for promotion in the new language (a topic of discussion in past FCFA meetings).

There was some discussion of the idea that not all senior lecturers desire to go up for promotion. A member explained he personally knows several senior lecturers who do not want to go up for promotion. It was pointed out that recent data shows there are 36 principal lecturers across the entire university. A member pointed out the FCFA should make sure that guidelines surrounding lecturer job positions are clear, as defining those positions is a necessary piece of providing mandatory reviews for promotion.

Vaughan made a motion to remove subsection C.3 from the legislation. The motion passed, and the change was made (Exhibit 1).

*Further discussion of titles*

A member recommended adding a new title to differentiate between lecturers who are promotion-eligible and those who are not. The “acting professor” title was mentioned, and noted as a temporary appointment. It was noted the university already has an “acting instructor” title in use. Vaughan noted “instructor” used to be one of the faculty ranks years in the past. There was a recommendation to add “acting lecturer” to the Faculty Code, as then, the title of “lecturer” could be used exclusively for multiyear appointments.

There was some discussion of expected pushback for such a change. A member noted concerted pushback would come from administration, as all lecturers (under the above model) would have to be hired on multiyear appointments. The member recommended that lecturers be first hired on three annual appointments, and then a multiyear appointment may be made available (and a subsequent promotion consideration). Several other members liked the idea. It was noted there is still concern that one title could be used for a range of different purposes.

It was agreed that six years is the recommended duration before promotion review takes place.

#### **6) Good of the order**

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

#### **7) Adjourn**

Watts adjourned the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

---

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

**Present:** **Faculty:** Margaret Adam, David Goldstein, Joseph Janes, Kurt Johnson, Gordon Watts (chair), Aaron Katz, Jacob Vigdor, Miceal Vaughan, Kamran Nemati,  
**Ex-officio reps:** Judith Henchy  
**Guests:** Mike Townsend

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Steve Buck, Eric Bugyis, Chandan Reddy, Purnima Dhavan  
**President’s designee:** Cheryl Cameron  
**Ex-officio reps:** Freddy Mora, JoAnn Taricani, Julius Doyle, George Sandison

#### **Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – DRAFT revisions of 24-41 24-54 041817\_revised042517byfcfa

## Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments

### 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 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. 1. 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.

2. Upon the completion of six or more annual appointments in any eight year period, or two or more consecutive multi-year appointments, a full-time lecturer or artist in residence shall, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for promotion to senior lecturer or senior artist in residence, respectively, following the procedures detailed in Section 24-54.

~~3. Upon the completion of two or more consecutive multi-year appointments, a full-time senior lecturer shall, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for promotion to principal lecturer, following the procedures detailed in Section 24-54.~~

### **Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions**

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

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 the promotion. Research faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsection B shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an eligible professorial appointment or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered. In this decision they shall take into account the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of these qualifications and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates' qualifications described in Section 24-32.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate's college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate's qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.

For departments (or college/school if undepartmentalized) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the faculty senior in rank and title, the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean's designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days. The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the voting faculty.

The voting faculty of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

If the faculty recommendation is a departmental one, and is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, or if the candidate has written a response to the departmental vote, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair's recommendations with the candidate.

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

D. After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall decide the matter.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean's designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

If the recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the promotion decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.

[An unfavorable promotion decision regarding a faculty member with an instructional title does not preclude renewal of appointment as described in Section 24-41, Subsection B.3.](#)

E. After the case is decided, the dean shall ensure that the candidate is informed in writing in a timely way of the result of the case and, if the result is not favorable, the reasons therefor.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 130, June 14, 2013: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]