

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

April 12th, 2016

11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.

Gerberding 26

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from March 29th, 2016
 3. Announcements
 4. Gathering faculty data
 5. Lecturer Grid
 6. Good of the order
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

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

2) Review of the minutes from March 29th, 2016

The minutes from March 29th, 2016 were approved as amended.

3) Announcements

Watts noted that Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty, Faculty Senate & Governance Office) has announced her retirement effective spring, 2016. Council members congratulated her and thanked her for her service to the university.

Watts explained two new Executive Orders (EOs) - No. 51 and No. 31 - have been forwarded to the faculty for review. He noted FCFA may conduct its review of the policies electronically, as the comment period will end on April 29th.

Watts explained a Class C resolution will be considered by the faculty senate at its next meeting titled: "Resolution Concerning an Alternative Salary Policy Proposal." There was some discussion on the resolution, and Watts gave some background information to members who were not present at the last council meeting wherein it was discussed in detail.

Watts noted in the recent SEC meeting, the Class A legislation on the faculty salary policy, as well as the Class C resolution concerning an alternative salary policy proposal were both approved. There was some discussion of what will happen if the Class A legislation is voted up or down in the senate meeting, and how this might affect the Class C resolution (and vice versa). It was noted if the Class A legislation is approved, the Class C resolution may be "deferred" by the faculty senate until its return is requested. Katz explained the Class C resolution does not have any time demands (based in code) for its consideration to take place.

Watts noted an argument against the Class A legislation has become prevalent, which is the idea that many units, schools, and colleges will opt out of the policy if it is approved. Katz explained the question for him is whether the salary model proposed in the Class A legislation is suitable as a pilot for the university – explaining that a smaller group of faculty piloting a new policy might actually be ideal, as more units may opt back in if the policy functions as designed.

4) Gathering faculty data

Watts noted monitoring how lecturers are utilized around the university has been one important issue to the FCFA. He noted he would like the investigation of data pertaining to this question to become an annual tradition of the FCFA, as the council monitors the faculty code and its application around campus. He explained it is important to check on how departments, schools, and other faculty bodies are interpreting and applying the faculty code. He noted he would like to discuss what information/data specifically should be requested and reviewed each year.

It was noted the FCFA (academic year) agenda is often set by faculty senate leadership in the beginning of the academic year, after question.

Vaughn noted there is a fair amount of data on UW lecturers already available on the UW Academic HR webpage. It was explained this data is university-wide, and is not broken down (in its current state) by school, college, or in other divisions. Vaughn noted the UW Office of Planning and Management also has similar lists of data, but listed by school. She also suggested that the FCFA consult with the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) to further discuss lecturer issues, and issues of gender and diversity at the university.

Buck suggested data should be sought in response to the specific questions the council may have, as this will bolster efficiency and provide a more driven discussion. Buck noted he would like to place an emphasis on identifying issues first, and then seeking data. Watts agreed.

Katz noted he likes the idea of monitoring lecturer data as proposed. He noted it would be useful to see more qualitative data from units around the university concerning issues they may be facing, especially in regards to lecturer titles.

Cameron (president's designee) noted the question of whether her office is able to provide lecturer data depends on the specific parameters of the data requested. After some discussion of her office's timelines, Watts posed that this annual review occur in the first FCFA meeting of winter quarter. This was agreed to.

Cameron noted her ability to extract particular data sets will depend on various factors, though "blanket" data is always available on the Office of Academic Personnel website. Watts noted clean data (aka. data extracted for a specific purpose) is desirable.

Watts noted he would like to develop specific questions, and identify precise data sets required to answer them, which than may be requested of Cameron. Watts noted a loose target date for this check is one of the two January FCFA meetings (each year).

Watts noted a subcommittee of the FCFA may be best suited to conduct initial vetting of this data.

5) Lecturer Grid

Watts began by noting he had recently discovered that UW Information School has “guest hire” faculty members, an unrecognized faculty title at the university. He noted the school internally set this designation. Some discussion ensued.

Watts explained the council’s lecturer excel grid will be useful in a number of ways to define advancement for various faculty hires. At this point in the meeting, the council began working on its lecturer matrix grid of rights, privileges, and responsibilities (Exhibit 1). Some takeaway points from the ensuing discussion are as follows:

- ❖ Watts noted there was a suggestion that the “less than 50% hired lecturers” and full time lecturers be combined into one category in the excel sheet, as they are currently two separate categories.
- ❖ It was noted Column E is meant to include only lecturers with a minimum of an annual appointment.
- ❖ Watts noted the council does need to understand the operational definition of greater than 50% (lecturers) for code language purposes.
- ❖ Watts explained the meaning for cell C9: a lecturer who can be transitioned from part-time to full-time appointment without a complete competitive hiring process.
- ❖ It was clarified that the full time lecturer column (Column D) is already mandated within the faculty code.
- ❖ It was noted voting in “shared governance” refers to voting in the faculty senate.
- ❖ Cameron noted some units have reported that research faculty often do not vote in their units, though still count towards overall quorum, creating some difficulties.
- ❖ Killien noted units often have different preferences for the granting of voting rights to their lecturers, and this should be considered.
- ❖ Katz explained the amount of lecturers is increasing, and there is a school of thought that they should be granted voting rights as they become a larger and larger faculty subgroup.
- ❖ Taricani reported she has heard that many part-time lecturers do not desire to be involved in faculty governance matters at any level.

6) Good of the order

This item was missed due to time constraints.

7) Adjourn

Watts adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Steve Buck, David Goldstein, Lea Vaughn, Gordon Watts (chair), Aaron Katz
Ex-Officio reps: Judith Henchy, JoAnne Taricani
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron

Guests: Marcia Killien

Absent:

Faculty: Margaret Adam, Joseph Janes, Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis, Chandan Reddy

Ex-Officio reps: Julian Rees, Freddy Mora

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Copy of 2016-03-10 - Lecturer Matrix_revisedapproved_041216

Exhibit 1

Right/Priv/Responsibility	Full Time	> 50% Part Time	< 50% Part Time	50% Lecture + 50% Admin	Quarter-to-Quarter	Non-Competitively Hired
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					
Tier Eligible	Y	Y				
Annual Appointments	Y	Y				
Multi Year Appointments	Y	Y				
Frequency of Peer Review of Teaching	Code	Same as FT				
Frequency of Student Evaluations Required	Y	Same as FT				
Frequency of Collegial Review	Code	Same as FT				
"Chair" planning conference	Y	Same as FT				
Yearly Activity Report	Y					
Reappointment by committee (24-44B)						
Time of notification of renewal before end of term						
Tenure						
Vote in Shared Governance						
Vote for hiring of colleagues						
Vote on department issues						
Vote on department curriculum issues						
Terminal Reportment Required?						