

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
November 29th, 2016
11:00 p.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from November 17th, 2016
 3. Comments on announcements
 4. Report from the FF Lecturer survey
 5. Definition of a lecturer
 6. Good of the order
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:04 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from November 17th, 2016

The minutes from November 17th, 2016 were approved as amended.

3) Comments on announcements

Zoe Barsness, Chair of the Faculty Senate, spoke about the PAC-12 faculty governance coalition work on academic career paths with a focus on non-tenure track. Barsness asked the council to provide her with any questions they would like her to ask the PAC-12 coalition at the next meeting in March.

4) Report from the FF Lecturer survey (Exhibit 1)

Eric Bugyis went over the PowerPoint from the Faculty Forward lecturer survey. There was a low response rate, but the results show that there is some confusion among the lecturers over their hiring status, work responsibilities, and benefits eligibility.

There was discussion over the best way to proceed in terms of trying to fix some of the issues that lecturers face at the university. Some ideas were: to incrementally change the code to better define lecturer terms, to make sure Deans and Chairs were properly informed of the criteria for promotion of lecturers, to establish a task force to identify specific code language for FCFA to adopt, and to put underlying principles in the code with instructions to units to come up with their own criteria for the promotion of lecturers.

5) Definition of a lecturer (Exhibit 2)

The council looked at the job responsibilities of lecturers and the issue of some lecturers feeling the need to do research for promotion, even though it is not in their job description. Units and departments already have their own reality on the ground and changing the code to better define lecturer promotion

would not do much to change that. The decentralization of the university has led to some lecturers not being treated fairly or being properly supported.

It was noted that the best way to get traction on the problem would be to take segments at a time, as there are a lot of layers of separation between the code and the decisions being made at the unit level. They would start by researching the legislative history of the word 'instructional' in the Faculty Code to describe the lecturer position. Miceal Vaughan agreed to do this research and report back at the next meeting.

6) Good of the order

There was no good of the order.

7) Adjourn

The council adjourned at 12:28 p.m.

Minutes by Jordan Smith, jjsmith4@uw.edu, assistant to the secretary of the faculty

Present: **Faculty:** Margaret Adam, Kurt Johnson, Purnima Dhavan, Eric Bugyis, Kamran Nemati, Kurt Johnson, Chandan Reddy, Jacob Vigdor

Ex-officio reps: Julius Doyle, Miceal Vaughan, George Sandison

President's designee: Cheryl Cameron

Guests: Mike Townsend, Zoe Barsness

Absent: **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Steve Buck, Joseph Janes, Gordon Watts (chair), David Goldstein

Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Freddy Mora, JoAnn Taricani

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – lecturer survey powerpoint.pdf

Exhibit 2 – FCFA Meeting 2016-11-29_whatisalecturer

Lecturer Survey PowerPoint. Double click to open.



Lecturer survey
powerpoint.pdf

What is a Lecturer?

FCFA Meeting 2016-11-29

At the last FCFA meeting we decided to have a discussion about the responsibilities - the definition - of lecturers. This is potentially a very open ended discussion, so we thought it might be useful to write down our ideas and comments ahead of time. This way, when we meet, we will already have a good idea of where the issues are. This will also give people who can't attend a chance for some input.

This document has a section for teaching, service, and research. That is followed by a section where comments on criteria for promotion should be left And at the end a copy from the current Faculty Code the definition of all the lecturer positions. When you add comments, please make sure you prefix them with your name. And, obviously, try not to edit everyone else's.

Teaching

What role should teaching duties play in a lecturer's appointment?

Gordon: The normal duties of a lecturer are teaching. This might be displaced by some service work, but especially for the lecturer position, I would expect this to be the bulk of the duties.

Miceal: Agreed! But the crucial issue (I think) is *how much* teaching should be required of those with the three Lecturer titles. Matters of equity (work and compensation) should enter into our discussion of any proposed Code changes.

Service

What role should service duties play in a lecturer's appointment?

Gordon: A lecturer can take on and be compensated for significant service duties in the department. Teaching release would be expected if they have duties that are large enough to impact the time they have for teaching. The fraction of time should be discussed with the unit chair so that when merit review comes up everyone is on the same page. I would rather not see lecturers expected to take on significant service work - but, rather, senior and principal (that isn't to say that someone steps up b.c. they see something they are interested in). If a lecturer is 100% service and 0% teaching for more than (a year??) they should be moved out of the teaching position, with an opportunity to return when they desire.

Joe: I'd agree with Gordon's comments above, though I'd be more inclined to allow for a balance of teaching and service activities (for example, lecturers have some expectation or allowance for service/committee work, though it might be a different level and mix than for tenure-track faculty, with the additional possibility of higher service activities and reduction in expected teaching load if mutually agreed upon)

Miceal: While lecturers are '*instructional*' titles, and will continue to be so, I don't see any reason why *some* service (and research) responsibilities are not also included. The larger question may be how '*instructional titles*' are defined in the Code. (My recollection is that '*instructional*' is *not* currently defined fully. It needs to be!)

Research

What role should research play in a lecturer's appointment?

Gordon: While this work should not be disallowed, other than for principal lecturer it should never be considered for hiring or for promotion

Joe: I would be more flexible on this score; I would say that research/creative activities should not be required or even necessarily expected for lecturing faculty, though if they undertake it, it should be factored in, without diminishing the primary expectation for teaching and some service.

Miceal: As I say above, we probably should factor in *some* role for ‘research’ for lecturers. Perhaps, ‘scholarship’ would be a more appropriate term in these instances, since at the very least we would expect lecturers to keep their teaching current, which probably means they should at least be aware of recent advances in research in their particular area(s).

Promotion

Anything about the review and determination of merit for lecturers that might be unique?

Gordon: Teaching/Service should be used to judge merit. Research should not enter into this except perhaps during promotion to principal. Hopefully all parties have agreed to the fractions of teaching and service and how they will get rewarded during the merit review process.

Miceal: The Code at present doesn’t quite employ ‘promotion’ as the relevant term, since there is nothing (yet) used for these ‘titles’ equivalent to the ‘continuing appointment’ language (as it *is* in the case of tenure-track/WOT appointments). Since all these lecturer appointments (in the past, and present) are term appointments of various sorts, and while reappointment is conceived of, ‘promotion’ really only happens as a result of, and on the occasion of, a **new** appointment with a new title. We really do need to clear this up for the present and future appointments.

Current Code

What follows is the current code language. If you feel it should be changed, please leave a comment - though don’t modify the current code language as everyone should see what is currently in use at UW.

[Chapter 24](#) of the faculty code contains all the following text. For longer statements on what “research”, “teaching”, and “service” mean, look to the full code.

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](#).

Gordon: If you look above these at the requirements for professors, you’ll find the following text as a requirement: “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.” Note that “teaching” is explicitly mentioned. Only in principal lecturer is it really tied to the position. The lecturer definition is much more open in some sense, other than it is an instructional role. Perhaps the language should be made more tight?