

**University of Washington
Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs**

May 8, 2017
12:30 p.m. – 2 p.m.
Gerberding 26

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from April 10th, 2016
 3. Follow up on draft Class C resolution / recommendation
 4. Diversity Council workshops / update from Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement
 5. Report on FCMA motion to hold discussion in faculty senate
 6. Planning for fall 2017 / hearing from campus administrators on diversity-related topics
 7. Good of the order
 8. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

Williams called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from April 10th, 2016

The minutes from April 10th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Follow up on draft Class C resolution / recommendation

Williams reminded members that in the last meeting, the council discussed the draft Class C resolution on Equity, Access, and Inclusion for Promotion & Tenure Committees with an idea to redirect the focus of the resolution on lecturers (Exhibit 1). That discussion included the chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) as an invited guest to provide insight on ongoing legislative efforts surrounding lecturers. Williams noted the council should make a decision relating to the future of the resolution, and asked for feedback from members.

Discussion focused on a belief that the resolution is not prescriptive enough to be effective in producing change. Other thoughts included that the council was previously informed the vast majority of UW faculty who go up for tenure & promotion have it granted, which considerably reduces evidence that there is an equity problem at that particular stage in faculty advancement.

Generally, consensus was reached that the resolution should either be retired or redrafted with an alternative focus.

Demographic dashboard tool in Tableau

Williams explained the council has an important tool at its disposal that might drive its addressing of various issues – university-wide faculty demographic data by race, rank, title, and gender, viewable via Tableau data-analytics software. The online tool was displayed and various data outputs and trends were viewed and discussed by members.

Outcomes

Lee explained inequities are often made apparent via evaluation of a time-in-rank for faculty members in the rank of Associate Professor, however, time-in-rank is not tracked via the dashboard, and perhaps it could be evaluated by the council through an alternative method.

Allen (president's designee) explained it would be useful to evaluate separation data (data surrounding faculty leaving a position at the UW) for female and minority faculty members. A member agreed and questioned if these groups tend to leave the university at higher rates. There was a mention of the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) and the UW EOAA Officer. A member noted the UW Board of Regents is also interested in separation data. It was clarified separation data in individual departments is difficult to track given the varied nature surrounding who in the department records and stores it and if it is kept at all. A member recommended that faculty members who leave the University be queried for their "reason for separation" 6-12 months after their separation date. Another member noted if the wait period is too long, the faculty member may be less likely to enter a response.

4) Diversity Council workshops / update from Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Advancement

Allen reported on recent workshops held by the UW Diversity Council. The most recent workshop focused on diversity within UW's staff, and the Staff Diversity Toolkit was presented and discussed there. Additional presentations focused on best practices for onboarding and retention of new staff. Allen reported the event was largely attended by hiring managers in various units.

The final workshop of the year is scheduled for May 17th and focuses on campus climate. An expert on effective use of climate-related surveys will be the keynote speaker, who formerly worked on campus climate for the University of California.

There was some discussion of campus climate surveys at the University of Washington. The last time a full survey was conducted was in 2008, and it was clarified there were substantial costs associated with the effort at that time. Allen explained another climate survey will be conducted at the UW in 2018.

A member noted he wonders what the perception of deans, chairs, and other administrative heads is related to campus climate. He explained once the campus climate survey data is available (2018), it would be interesting to compare the results of the survey to the perceptions of those campus leaders. There was some discussion of conducting another survey only targeting administrative heads.

Allen explained onboarding of new faculty is a topic of interest for the Diversity Council in the next year. He explained an ad hoc group is looking at conducting a related pilot program in one college. Lee noted his unit is effective in onboarding new faculty, and recommended a new member for the ad hoc group.

5) Report on FCMA motion to hold discussion in faculty senate

Williams updated members on the result of the a previous FCMA motion requesting a discussion in the Faculty Senate of immigration law/policies and resources for affected UW community members. She noted the remaining meetings of the body are too full to include a discussion item, however, she will submit a written report to members of the Faculty Senate providing information on immigration law-related activities ongoing at the UW. She noted she would be happy to include additional information within the report if members have anything to add.

Williams explained Zoe Barsness (Chair, Faculty Senate) is interested in having the FCMA report to the Faculty Senate regularly (within its meetings) during the 2017-2018 academic year. The idea will be discussed further over the summer.

6) Planning for fall 2017 / hearing from campus administrators on diversity-related topics

The council held some discussion of planning for the 2017-2018 academic year, including selecting meaningful topics to address and implementing effective methods for carrying out its charge (in the Faculty Code). Discussion takeaway points included:

- ❖ A member noted sharing information with the Faculty Senate may be a valuable output for the council's discussions and interests. He explained he believes the FCMA might be more impactful by addressing issues associated with lecturers during 2017-2018, as opposed to its historical interest in the tenure track.
- ❖ A member added he would like to work on information sharing between the UW's diversity-related councils, committees, and taskforces. He noted he would like to invite the UW's Chief Diversity Officer, Rickey Hall, to introduce himself to FCMA during an early fall 2017 meeting. Other members agreed.
- ❖ Williams noted FCMA will focus increasingly on receiving external reports from relevant administrators and campus bodies during 2017-2018 to help keep the body informed and up-to-date.
- ❖ A member commented that one focus of other diversity-related bodies next year relates to finding diversity-related research ongoing at the University; he explained the FCMA might aid in helping locate individuals involved in this type of research.
- ❖ A member added he believes the council should take on a review of the Faculty Code and Governance polices that relate to appointment and tenure of faculty through the lens of diversity-related interests. He noted areas of the Code are outdated, and outlined processes are vague to the point of potential exploitation.
- ❖ Rajendran explained council members should work informally between council meetings (potentially in the form of new subcommittees).
- ❖ There was some discussion of a diversity meeting of diversity "leads" at the UW, which Williams was recently invited to attend.

7) Good of the order

Williams noted she would like to strengthen the membership of the FCMA for the next year by replacing members who have resigned or are term-limited.

8) Adjourn

Williams adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Joseph Babigumira, Thomas Lee, Yoriko Kozuki, Brenda Williams (chair),
Pietro Paparella, Joseph Rajendran

Ex-officio reps: N/A

President's designee: Chadwick Allen

Absent: **Faculty:** Rachel Chapman, Jim Gregory, Delphine Yung, Sadaf Bhutta, Teresa
Evans-Campbell

Ex-officio reps: Patricia Devine, Ada Onyewuenyi, Katie Woods, Jo-Fen Wang

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – draftclassresolutionpacket_requiringtrainingp&tcommittees_spring2017

Documents relevant to FCMA (draft) “Class C resolution on Equity, Access, and Inclusion Trainings for P&T Committees”

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

April 10th, 2017

Table of Contents

1. Draft Class C resolution on equity, access, and inclusion trainings for P&T committees
2. Provost’s email response to resolution (fall quarter, 2016)
3. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs – Draft Class A legislation on voting rights for part-time lecturers
4. Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs – Draft Class A legislation on clarification of roles for faculty members with instructional titles

Rationale: In light of renewed commitments to campus faculty diversity, we propose that the Faculty Senate pass a resolution requesting that the leadership of the University of Washington makes available the resources and personnel required to mandate “equity, access and inclusion” training for faculty involved in tenure and promotion decisions. In particular, vigorous efforts, supported by adequate funding to the appropriate units, should be made to ensure that all members of tenure and promotion committees are fully equipped to support the UW mission and vision of excellence, access, equal opportunity, and inclusion.

Current research on bias in hiring, retention and promotion suggests (from UW ADVANCE: Interrupting Bias in the Faculty Search Process, 2014):

- “Minority professors in majority academic settings often must struggle against the presumption that they are incompetent.” (Moody: 2004)
- Psychological research demonstrates that women and other underrepresented candidates may be subject to different expectations than majority candidates (Trix & Psenka: 2003).
- Underrepresented faculty members groups face a different set of judgment outcomes than do individuals from dominant groups. The careers outcomes for a faculty member from an underrepresented group are gained on a longer, more difficult trek to document ability and evaluations that are far less positive than those awarded to similarly credentialed members from dominant groups (Biernat & Kobrynowicz 1997)

Critical Mass is *Critical*:

- Critical mass is defined as 15% of a population and represents the tipping point, the threshold between the continuity of the status quo and the emergence of cultural change (Etzkowitz et al., 2000; Gladwell, 2002). When white males dominate the high-ranking positions in an organization, cultural norms tend to favor this dominant group, leaving women faculty to struggle with both structural and interpersonal inequities (Ropers-Huilman, 2000).

Underrepresented faculty tend to carry greater responsibility for undergraduate education and service; have access to fewer resources; experience heavier course loads; and be excluded from professional networks (Park, 1996; Mendoza & Johnson, 2000; Bird et al., 2004). Empirical research shows that student evaluations of teaching for women and minority faculty are significantly lower than for their white male colleagues even when the quality of the teaching is the same (Merritt 2009; Stark 2014).

Class C Resolution adopted at the _____ , Faculty Senate Meeting

WHEREAS, the leadership of the University of Washington is committed to a broad vision of excellence that requires equity, access and inclusion, which is upheld by our institutional Diversity Mission statement: “diversity is integral to excellence. We value and honor diverse experiences and perspectives, strive to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, and promote access, opportunity and justice for all” (UW Diversity Mission Statement 2014); and

WHEREAS, consistent with this vision and mission of excellence, the UW has implemented, with University-wide faculty endorsement, important changes to the Faculty Code related to diversity work in promotion and tenure assessment, an Undergraduate Diversity Requirement,

and unanimously passed Class C Bulletin No. 539 Resolution Concerning Equity, Access and Inclusion in Hiring (Jan. 29, 2015);

WHEREAS, in order to empower current and future UW faculty to contribute to its dynamic vision and mission of excellence, they must be equipped with resources and skills to achieve our commitment to diversity through the above changes to tenure and promotion assessment and undergraduate teaching, and to respond to UW's faculty demographic concerns; and

WHEREAS, the UW commitment to diversity work in faculty promotion, tenure assessment and teaching is crucial to these efforts;

WHEREAS, current research on faculty excellence and diversity suggests that gaps in equity, access and inclusion in promotion, like those in hiring, may be linked to patterns of institutional bias, and that these often unconscious practices can be productively addressed through interactive training; therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that funding be made available to enable all University of Washington faculty involved in evaluations for promotion and tenure to participate in some form of "Equity, Access and Inclusion in Promotion" training developed in collaboration with the Office for Faculty Advancement that informs participants on best practices regarding faculty assessment, retention and promotion; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all Promotion and Tenure Committees be given a requirement, along with adequate funding and personnel resources, to participate in "Equity, Access and Inclusion in Promotion" training; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all UW unit heads are accountable to University leadership for making improvements in the area of faculty diversity by reporting unit participation in "Equity, Access and Inclusion in Promotion" training efforts as well as reporting diversity evaluation activities and outcomes.

Submitted by:

Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Faculty Council on Women in Academia

Approved by:

Senate Executive Committee _____

Approved by:

Faculty Senate _____

Bill:

Thank you for taking a few minutes to talk with me Thursday afternoon. I later realized I should have just given you a shorter version of things and asked to talk with you later – as you were really no doubt focused on the get together with the regents and faculty leaders. So my apologies for trying to conduct business so quickly!

The proposed legislation focuses on an important issue – the continued lag in the growth of diversity in our faculty. We've been making some progress -- but clearly not enough.

My questions below are meant to get more information about the problem, how we can work together to address it, whether this is the best route to do that – or if there are other approaches we could try. I'm very happy to work with you and your council members on this issue in any way that would be useful.

I did not know that this proposal was coming to SEC until Thursday (yesterday) morning. So I apologize for giving you questions at the last minute! I will ask our administrative rep on your council to let us know about these kinds of issues earlier in the future, so that we can ask questions before the legislation is coming before SEC.

My chief questions are about the idea that diversity would improve if ALL faculty had some kind of training. Since all voting faculty are involved in new hiring decisions, that would mean all voting faculty: all in the lecturer ranks (lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer) and all in tenure track lines (assistant, associate, full professor) and other voting ranks (professor of practice, artists in residence, etc.). I mention this just because the scale of the proposal is large – and would thus encompass thousands of people.

My question:

1. What is the problem we are seeking to solve? (I assume it is the need for greater diversity in the faculty). So how would this proposal solve the problem? Is the problem about the lack of hiring? Or retention? Or promotion? Or some combination? Is the lack of such training of faculty a key contributor to the problem? Are there data to show that training is the best route forward?
2. If the issue is one about hiring --- It might be good to know: How do our applicant pools differ from the potential pool of people graduating in fields/disciplines? We are just starting a pilot project to start to gauge that kind of issue precisely: what's the potential size of the applicant pool, for instance, in Business, or some field in Engineering, or social sciences; then do our own applicant pools match that, and then what are we doing in terms of hiring and yield?
3. If the issue is around tenure and promotion: Another approach might be to look at how teaching and mentorship by faculty are evaluated in promotion and tenure decisions. The Center for Teaching and Learning (which as consulted with the Multicultural Affairs Council) is doing a pilot this year on a more expansive assessment the wide array of teaching activities that occur – and that should be counted and valued in tenure and promotion decisions. We know that faculty of color often face much higher mentoring and advising roles than some other faculty; so the pilot is trying to develop a way to address that workload issue.

4. Are there data to show that required trainings would produce the results desired? Some contend that studies show that required trainings often create a backlash. (We would want to look at any and all of these kinds of studies, and I could ask my staff to help).
5. Are there alternatives – that is, an alternative to requiring training of all faculty – that might be easier and cheaper to implement this year? At least to get things going? I've asked staff to offer trainings for department chairs, whom I see as crucial figures in hiring issues. I anticipate we will start this trainings in winter, patterned after the types of workshops that ADVANCE used to offer. Could this be a good step forward?
6. What would be the cost of training? I have to ask this question, because the issue is this: How much money would we need for this? Where should the money come from? Is this as important as, say, faculty compensation? Student financial aid? We do not have the FTE resources to create a training for ALL UW voting faculty, so I assume the cost would probably entail hiring 2-3 new staff members working full time – although I'm not certain of that, as I don't have a sense of what kind of training is being advocated in the resolution.
7. What is the training being advocated? One time? Multiple sessions?
8. How often should a faculty member go through training? Is once enough? Or would this be something that should be repeated every 3-5 years?
As I noted above, my questions are focused on trying to understand the goals and thinking behind the resolution. And my questions are also about just how we would do this – how often, at what cost, etc.

I am happy to work with you and your council on the broader issues.

Thanks!

Jerry

50% Change

PURPOSE

Chapter 21-32 of the Faculty Code specifies voting membership of the faculty. The first section gives voting rights to professors and research professors of all ranks with a 50% of greater appointment. The second set does the same for full-time lecturers of all ranks. The proposed change modifies the lectures to include 50% or greater annual or multiyear appointments.

EXPLANATION

Many of UW's part-time lecturers are deeply committed to the university. Their teaching and administrative loads mean they are fully-participating members of their departments and the broader university. The current code grants them no voting rights at any level if they are anything less than full-time. This change brings university policy more in line with the actual contributions being made by the lecturing faculty.

To understand the impact of this code change an analysis was done (see attached page). In summary, after the proposed code change, the new voting faculty will impact the School of Social Work (18%), School of Nursing (16%), UW Bothell (16%), and the School of Dentistry (15%) the most. The percentages are the fraction of all voting faculty in that the new voting part-time lecturers constitute.

Differentiating between competitively hired and non-competitively hired lecturers was not made because of changes in the provost's hiring guidelines.

There are units that employ a number of Lecturers above 50%: the numbers from UW Bothell, at 66% and 75% percent, suggest that these may be virtually full-time colleagues. Providing voting rights to colleagues with these appointments confirms the important role they play in our University and we have already been too slow in recognizing their contributions. We cannot continue to ignore the important part they play in educating our students and serving our units' needs: giving them full voting rights is, quite frankly, a matter of social justice.

Retirement

PURPOSE

Chapter 21-32 of the Faculty Code specifies voting membership of the faculty. The last paragraph addresses retired faculty who are rehired to teach a classes on a quarter-by-quarter basis. The current paragraph only addresses assistant, associate, and professors (or their research counter-parts). The proposed change adds the instructional titles, bring them into symmetry with professors and research professors.

EXPLANATION

When a retired faculty member with an instructional title is currently excluded from decision making at the department level and participation in faculty votes, while research professors and professors are not. The instructional faculty have teaching expertise and long-term institutional memory, as much as other faculty, and should participate in decision making at the same level.

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,
- ~~Full-time p~~Principal lecturer, with an annual or multiyear appointment at 50% or greater.
- ~~Full-time s~~Senior lecturer, with an annual or multiyear appointment at 50% or greater.
- Full-time senior artist in residence,
- ~~Full-time l~~Lecturer, with an annual or multiyear appointment at 50% or greater.
- Full-time artist in residence, 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 during the quarter(s) he or she is serving on a part-time basis, or a retired full-time principal lecturer, full-time senior lecturer, or full-time lecturer who had voting rights at the time of retirement, 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 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.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 32, May 8, 1967; S-A 37, February 8, 1971; S-A 45, January 17, 1975; S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 98, May 12, 1998; S-A 103, March 6, 2001; S-A 108, June 21, 2002; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 133, June 11, 2014: all with Presidential approval.

PURPOSE

Chapter 24-32 of the Faculty Code states: “The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service.” Part A of that section elaborates: “Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.”

Section 24-34.A defines “Lecturer,” “Senior Lecturer,” “Principal Lecturer,” “Artist in Residence,” and “Senior Artist in Residence” as “instructional titles.”

This proposed Code change clarifies what the University means by “scholarship and research” for faculty members with instructional titles.

EXPLANATION

Given that the primary responsibility of faculty members in the lecturer or artist in residence track is instruction, the requirement of “scholarship and research” for all faculty members should be interpreted for the lecturer or artist in residence titles in ways that relate to such instruction: i.e., in terms of method, content, pedagogy, student achievement, etc.

Moreover, given the UW needs classroom teachers to meet the needs of its students, and if annual and multi-year appointments and reappointments of lecturers are required to serve those needs, then those lecturers need to be assured that the terms of those continued/continuing (re)appointments are specifically suited to their primary duties and responsibilities. Any definition of “success” for them should be based on the quality of their achievements in teaching and service that reveal their scholarship and research (i.e., their remaining current in their field and their success in transmitting those materials to UW students).

This Code clarification also benefits the rest of the faculty because (a) it encourages a lecturer or artist in residence to do the work most needed by the unit rather than dissipating effort in areas that serve the unit less; and (b) it provides guidance to the more senior faculty (i.e., individuals holding titles above that of a given lecturer or artist in residence plus all of the tenure-track faculty) who serve on hiring and promotion committees for lecturer and artist in residence positions.

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 recognized through appropriate awards, distinctions, or major contributions to their 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.
- 4.5. 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 of Section 24-53.

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.

- 5.6.** 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.

- 6.7.** 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.

- 7.8.** 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.

- 8.9.** 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.

- 9-10.** 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.
- 10-11.** 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.
- 11-12.** 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.
- 12-13.** 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.

- 13.14.** 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.
- 14.15.** 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.
- 15.16.** 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.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 23, February 22, 1959; S-A 32, May 8, 1967; S-A 33, June 13, 1967; S-A 37, February 8, 1971; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 78, December 14, 1988; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 97, January 10, 1997; S-A 103, March 6, 2001; S-A 108, June 21, 2002; S-A 109, June 5, 2003: all with Presidential approval; RC, April 18, 2006; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 133, June 11, 2014: both with Presidential approval.