

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
April 11th, 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 March 28th, 2017
 3. Lecturer issues
 4. Good of the order
 5. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:06 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from March 28th, 2017

The minutes from March 28th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Lecturer issues

24.41.C replacement language and feedback

Janes explained Chapter 24.41.C of the Faculty Code has been revised with new code language to reflect ideas for lecturer career track improvement heard in the FCFA's last meeting (Exhibit 1). The revised language states:

Upon the completion of two or more consecutive multi-year appointments (which add up to no more than ten years), a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer shall, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for promotion to, a senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively, following the procedures detailed in Section 25-54. 9 (Exhibit 1).

Janes noted section 24.54 is used as a reference to the procedures for promotion. He explained the revised language seems to accomplish what was recommended by members in the previous FCFA meeting.

There was some discussion of permissive promotions (a promotion review that is requested as opposed to mandated) and if the new language unintentionally restricts lecturers to mandated promotion reviews. There was also a question if the language is limited to full-time lecturers, or if it is applicable to 50% or greater lecturers. After discussion, It was agreed several changes need to be made to the draft language. A recommendation was made to leave subsection C. intact in the code, and simply add new language in a new passage rather than modify existing language.

Townsend explained that in the professorial ranks, mandatory reviews exist for a promotion from assistant to associate professor, but not for associate to full professor. He noted the term “shall” in the draft language assumes all senior lecturers are seeking promotion. Other members agreed and noted there should be some distinction between promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer, and promotion from senior to principal lecturer.

It was clarified there is language at the beginning of Chapter 24-54 stating “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).” Thus, this condition does not need to be written into new code for lecturers.

There was some discussion of the difference between a lecturer promotion and a situation wherein an existing lecturer applies for another open lecturer position (of a higher title). Cameron (president's designee) explained a full-time lecturer could apply and be selected for an open senior lecturer position, which is an example of an appointment (rather than a promotion).

There was continued discussion of if a promotion review from senior to principal lecturer should be mandatory. A member brought up data shows inequities appear more often between men and women or relating to underrepresented minorities (URM) when a promotion review is to be initiated by a faculty member versus mandated on a specific timeline. It was noted in a situation wherein a promotion review is contingent upon the candidate's own volition, disparities naturally occur. It was clarified that during a mandatory review for promotion, a faculty member cannot opt to decline the review even if they would not like to go through with it. It was noted a faculty member may not want a declined promotion on their record. A member commented that there is no “clock” for promotion from associate to full professor because, being the highest professorial rank, full professor (as a rank) has been traditionally used to recognize only very special people.

Conclusion

Janes recommended keeping the language in 24.41.C intact and adding the draft language in a new passage, but removing references to a promotion from senior lecturer to principal lecturer. The new language would substantiate Faculty Code Chapter 24.41.C.1. The change was made (Exhibit 2). Some remaining questions were raised in relation to the new language, including:

- If a promotion is not granted, what happens?
- What happens if a lecturer changes departments, their clock for promotion review is not known or scrutinized, and thus a mistake is made and the clock is missed. There was discussion of penalties for this mistake, as penalties were noted to be “serious” related to similar mistakes in the tenure track. A point was made that the lecturer's new department would have to review the lecturer's prior appointments as part of the appointment/selection process.

It was concluded there is some consensus in adding language close to what has been developed (Exhibit 2), though there are reservations. The draft language requires further examination before being voted forward as Class A legislation.

4) Good of the order

SEC deliberation of pending FCFA legislation

The council held some discussion of the recent deliberation of two pieces of FCFA draft Class A legislation within the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) (Exhibit 3) (Exhibit 4).

Watts explained members of the SEC were generally supportive of Class A legislation on lecturer publications (Exhibit 3). The vote was unanimous to forward the legislation to the next faculty senate meeting for action. He explained there was some critique that the legislation did not go far enough.

Critique of Class A legislation on part-time lecturer voting rights in SEC

Relating to the Class A legislation on voting rights for part-time lecturers, three SEC members were generally supportive of the legislation (Exhibit 4). Many comments related to the threshold where the FCFA chose to draw the line for part-time lecturer voting rights to be granted (50%). More so, the inclusion of part-time lecturers on annual appointments caused a considerable amount of problems for several members and guests. President Cauce also did not support the legislation in its current form.

Several administrative guests in the meeting requested that the FCFA discuss the legislation with various Elected Faculty Councils to gain college-specific feedback. Additional SEC discussion focused on how in the professional schools (and in some other schools), even at 50% and above, part-time lecturers should not be included in those who vote, as they are not part of the department and should not participate in department life. One suggestion was that departments vote individually to allow their part-time lecturers to vote. Additional recommendations included having lecturers only vote on matters pertaining to other lecturers. Three SEC members felt no change was needed in relation to lecturer voting rights, as the line where it is now (only full-time lecturers voting) is in the perfect place.

Additional feedback included that the legislation would lead to lecturers being hired at less than 50%-time, which is an important threshold as it dictates granting of certain employee benefits at the UW. It was noted the data compiled for FCFA on the amount of part-time lecturers 50% or greater at the university was only very lightly discussed in the meeting.

A member noted the two issues relating to part-time lecturers being involved in voting were tenure decisions and curriculum decisions. A member commented that full-time lecturers (who vote currently) being involved in voting decisions presents the same concerns. He questioned how part-time lecturers 50% or greater voting is any different. Another member agreed and questioned what the status difference is between 66% and 100%-time lecturers; he noted that question should be asked of the college councils.

Conclusion

Janes recommended pulling the Class A legislation on voting rights for part-time lecturers off of the next faculty senate meeting agenda. He and other members supported the idea to gain feedback from the EFCs. The council supported the recommended action.

5) Adjourn

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

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

Present: **Faculty:** David Goldstein, Joseph Janes, Kurt Johnson, Chandan Reddy, Gordon Watts (chair), Aaron Katz, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Miceal Vaughan
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Julius Doyle, George Sandison
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend

Absent: **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Eric Bugyis, Kamran Nemati
Ex-officio reps: Freddy Mora, JoAnn Taricani

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – DRAFT Revision to 24-41 C JWJ

Exhibit 2 – DRAFT Revision to 24-41 C JWJ_revised041117

Upon the completion of two or more consecutive multi-year appointments (which add up to no more than ten years), a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, or senior lecturer ~~may~~^{shall}, 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, following the procedures detailed in Section 25-54.

;

Upon the completion of two or more consecutive multi-year appointments (which add up to no more than ten years), a full-time lecturer or artist in residence, or senior lecturer may shall, prior to expiration of an existing appointment, be considered for appointment as, or promotion to, a senior lecturer or senior artist in residence, or principal lecturer, respectively, following the procedures detailed in Section 24-54.

;