

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
November 1st, 2016
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from October 18th, 2016
 3. Lecturer issues
 4. Good of the order
 5. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

Watts called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

2) Review of the minutes from October 18th, 2016

The minutes from October 18th, 2016 were approved as amended.

3) Chair's report

Watts reported that a UW-Seattle South Campus "listening session" will take place in late November relating to the interests of UW clinical faculty. There was a question of if the listening session is meant to address voting rights. The response was that it is meant to address voting rights in addition to other topics.

Vaughan reported that a faculty council chair luncheon took place involving chairs and/or designees of the 11 university faculty councils meeting with faculty senate leadership. He explained he attended the meeting as a representative for the FCFA. The bulk of the meeting was devoted to oral reports from council chairs on expected agendas for the coming year. Vaughan explained that given the content of those reports, he did not feel the planned business of other councils intersects with the business of the FCFA.

Janes explained he has heard as part of his sitting on the Information School Elected Faculty Council (EFC) that Provost Baldasty has required Deans to work with their EFCs on annual budgetary matters. It was noted the chair of the Senate Committee on Planning and Budgeting (SCPB) is also currently broadcasting surveys to EFCs in an attempt to gather information for use by that committee. The intention of this work is to improve the role of EFCs in budgetary processes around the university.

4) Lecturer issues

Watts provided a brief summary of some of the issues surrounding lecturers at the UW for new members. He noted one major issue is the hiring of temporary lecturers on a long-term basis, which is an unintended use of some lecturer appointments. It was noted the Provost has released "Lecturer

Appointment Guidelines,” both for appointment of full-time lecturers and for ≥ 50% annual or multi-year part-time lecturers, which have had a positive effect on the situation.

Watts explained the work of the council is often centered around the possibility of altering the UW Faculty Code. He explained the Faculty Code includes information on which types of university faculty are to be involved in governance, along with other facets of their employment. He explained the council decided to focus discussion of these considerations through the use of a “Grid on Lecturer Rights, Privileges, and Responsibilities” (excel grid), of which the council has been filling out since winter quarter of 2016 (Exhibit 1).

Watts noted he would like to go through the Grid, and discuss what has already been decided by the council in the past year. He gave a background into the columns of the Grid, and explained the Quarter-to-Quarter lecturer appointment (Column H) is the type of appointment historically misused by some.

He gave a deeper background into the difference between part-time and full-time lecturer appointments, as the university makes a distinction during hiring for part-time and full-time appointments.

After some discussion, the “Tier Eligible” row was deleted from the document, as the distinction relates to the draft faculty salary policy (Class A legislation 2015-2016) which failed during full faculty vote. Row 14 (Frequency of Collegial review) was changed to “Frequency of Merit review” due to the same consideration.

Watts noted the grid is extensive, and covers many facets of being an employee instructor at the UW. He explained voting rights were broken down within the Grid far more than they are within the Faculty Code itself, which was a result of substantive discussions in the FCFA.

New issues

The council discussed new issues that have surfaced surrounding rights, privileges, and responsibilities of lecturers:

- ❖ The title of “lecturer” versus “professor.” Watts explained in 2015-2016, the FCFA did not see a problem with the title of lecturer.
- ❖ Watts noted some universities have begun offering tenure to lecturers, and perhaps this should be investigating further.
- ❖ Emeritus rights were raised, as some retired faculty may be rehired part-time up to 40% for one year, with the right to do so for five years. It was noted this is a policy of the university, but does not appear in the Faculty Code.
- ❖ Right to take sabbaticals, which does not currently appear in the Grid.

There was some discussion of recent faculty-led efforts to facilitate listening sessions at both the UW Tacoma and UW Bothell campuses; the efforts relate in-part to the work of faculty pro-unionization group Faculty Forward. A member suggested the council seek out faculty who were present in these sessions and invite them to the FCFA to inform on what was heard and discussed there. Katz reported he would work on inviting a guest to join the council for this purpose, and members Goldstein and Bugyis also volunteered to invite guests from UW Bothell and UW Tacoma present at those sessions. There was

a specific interest in a summary of the big issues expressed at the sessions. Watts noted he would now like to open the floor to discussion. He asked members to consider if there are particular issues not present in the Grid that might be added, or any recommendations on best ways to proceed in this work. He also asked members to consider if the FCFA should continue with the Grid, or split off some issues and attempt to work through them individually.

Council discussion

Bugyis explained people from UW Tacoma are interested in locating functional differences (aka. differences in responsibility) that justify the differences between tenure track and non-tenure track faculty. Katz agreed and noted that, in looking at job responsibilities and portfolios of lecturers and professors in his own unit, a great deal of overlap is present. Though, he noted this will tend to vary by unit.

Dhavan spoke to the urgency of the issues the FCFA is addressing, and explained she would like for the FCFA to emphasize timeliness in its work. She noted a distinct timeline for completion of projects may be necessary. She also explained it may be useful to poll departmental unit practices surrounding some of the issues given widespread variance, which can then be used to create a best practices model.

Cameron (president's designee) explained after a question that nothing precludes unit-adjustments for lecturers, as all faculty are eligible for merit raises/adjustments. Reddy agreed it seems effective to develop a best practices document, as for example, not all faculty are aware that newly revised Executive Order No. 64 can be used to cover lecturers in this way.

A member noted the issues seem to boil down to money and risk, as in his opinion the rise of contingent faculty across academia relate largely to carrying out hiring at a smaller cost, as well as increasing ability to reduce faculty levels in departments that are reducing in size. Watts noted that as a group of faculty, the FCFA's role is to try and shape the faculty in a way that bolsters the broad health of the university, especially as it relates to teaching and learning.

There was some discussion of the ambitions of the council in its work to address these issues, as well the most suitable methods for doing so.

Dhavan explained she believes the goal of the council should be to enact changes to the Faculty Code, or to seek to disseminate best practices as a secondary option. She noted she would recommend a "top-down approach" for any issues identifiable as "low-hanging fruit."

Katz explained his own goal is to improve the relationship between a lot of faculty who have important duties at the university, and academic life. He explained if the Code is the vehicle to complete that objective, it should be used. He noted there are varying amounts of interest in engaging more with the university on behalf of lecturer faculty.

Vaughan explained he would like to see more distinction in the Grid between annual appointments and multi-year appointments, as a multi-year appointment bears similarities to a "quasi-tenure." A question was asked about the difference between multi-year appointments and annual appointments. It was explained that an annual appointment is held from September through June, and a "renewal decision" must be made six months prior to the end of that appointment contract. The renewal process takes

every year for any faculty on an annual appointment. Bugyis added another distinction: to attain a multi-year appointment, one must be hired competitively.

Janes explained his own principles for the work of the council relating to lecturers:

- Reduce exploitation
- “Leave people alone who are happy”
- Allow for diversity within units, but not allowing for mischief in the process
- Instilling a sense of security in those who want and deserve it

He noted he would encourage the council to adopt a specific set of principles, as these provide a good basis that will be useful when navigating through complications involved in writing code language. Other members agreed with the suggestion.

Cameron explained a lot of work was done by the faculty leading up to publishing of the Provost’s Guidelines (described above), including development of several reports from different faculty taskforces/workgroups. She encouraged these be placed on the council’s Google Drive as a resource.

Reddy explained he would encourage that the FCFA distinguish which departmental methods tend to vary, and which do not. He noted perhaps new content should be added to the Grid to reflect any findings, as this might make clear problems which can be solved via changes to the faculty code, versus problems at local levels. After a question, Watts explained many colleges and departments refine their own procedures for varying things, and publish these within their Dean’s Office. He explained there are areas of the Faculty Code which specify certain mechanisms may be customized at a local level.

Cameron noted that the focus of the council has been on legislation, however, if discussions come out of the council can be transformed into best practices, these can be advanced and put to use, as well.

5) Good of the order

The council is expected to work on designating principles for carrying out work on lecturer issues and identifying “low-hanging fruit issues” in its next meeting.

6) Adjourn

Watts adjourned the meeting 5:01 p.m.

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

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

Absent: **Faculty:** Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Kurt Johnson, Alissa Ackerman
Ex-officio reps: Freddy Mora

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Copy of 2016-03-10 - Lecturer Matrix_revisedapproved_11016

Right/Priv/Responsibility	Annual or multi-year competitiv	
	Full Time	> 50% Part Time
Rank: Lecturer	Y	Y
Rank: Senior Lecturer	Y	Y
Rank: Principal Lecturer	Y	Y
Eligible for promotion to next rank	Y	Y (timing)
Can be transitioned from part-time to full-time	N/A	Y
Annual Appointments	Y required	Y required
Multi Year Appointments	Y possible	Y possible
Frequency of Peer Review of Teaching	Code	Same as FT
Frequency of Student Evaluations Required	Y	Same as FT
Frequency of Merit Review	Code	Same as FT
"Chair" planning conference	Y	Same as FT
Yearly Activity Report	Y	Same as FT
Reappointment by committee (24-44B)	Revisit	Same as FT
Time of notification of renewal before end of term	Code	Same as FT
Tenure	N	N
Vote in Shared Governance	Y	Y
Vote for hiring of colleagues	Y	Y
Vote on department issues	Y	Y
Vote on department curriculum issues	Y	Y
Terminal Degree Required?		
Competitively or Non-Competitively	comp only	comp only
Type of competitive hire		

rely hired (D,E)

< 50% Part Time multi < 50% Part Time (Possibly Non-Competitively h Quarter-to-Quarter		
Y	Y	Y
Y	N	N
N	N	N
N	N	
N	N	
Y required	Y required	N
Y possible	N	N
Same as FT		
Same as FT		
For reappointment		
Annual		
Y		
Possible		
Same as FT		
N		
N		
N		
unit by unit		
unit by unit		
comp only	Either	Either