

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**  
February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2016  
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.  
Gerberding 142

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to order
  2. Review of the minutes from February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016
  3. Announcements
  4. Lecturer Issues
  5. Adding a faculty regent to the UW Board of Regents – Taricani
  6. Evaluating Teaching in Promotion
  7. Good of the order
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

Johnson called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. He explained to the council that chair Watts is unable to join the meeting and so he is serving as proxy chair in his absence.

**2) Review of the minutes from February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016**

The minutes from February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2016 were approved unanimously as written.

**3) Announcements**

Johnson explained proposed language to add mentoring to the faculty code has gone out to the council from Radiology faculty member Eric Stern. He asked members to submit comments on this proposal electronically by the end of this week (2/18), in preparation for Stern's joining the council to receive feedback in a future meeting.

Johnson explained Duane Storti (member, Senate Executive Committee) has proposed that UW faculty senator term limits be lengthened (proposal is for 3 two-year term limits, current policy is 2 two-year term limits). Johnson explained as this change would require Class A legislation, the council may be asked to review the proposal in a coming meeting.

Johnson explained librarians will be attending the next council meeting to further discuss the ALUW proposal requesting that UW librarians have their academic personnel status changed to faculty (currently academic staff).

**4) Lecturer Issues**

Johnson explained Watts has asked the council to continue work on the lecturer topic by way of a matrix graph. The graph is to be filled in by members with their desired outcomes for rights and privileges of

lecturers in varying ranks and capacities. After some discussion, council members felt they did not have clear enough information on how to proceed with the graph, and it was decided the activity will be tabled until Watts is able to be present to provide instruction.

Killien explained when Ana Mari Cauce (President, University of Washington) was acting as Provost in 2013, she issued some guidelines for fulltime (FT) lecturers which led to better institutional practices surrounding hiring. Killien informed the council she is under the impression some similar guidelines are in discussion for lecturers at 50% or more time. Cameron (president's designee) agreed and explained the lecturer task forces were originally charged to look at fulltime lecturers, though part-time (PT) lecturers were investigated, as well. Based on a review of the lecturer reports by the Board of Deans and Chancellors, they supported an expansion of the guidelines to address the appointment of PT lecturers. She explained these draft revisions to the Provost's guidelines have now been presented to the faculty senate leadership. It was noted the hope is that the same success will be replicated for PT lecturers as was seen for FT lecturers working at the UW.

After question, it was noted the guidelines on behalf of the Provost cannot be in conflict with the UW faculty code. For example, changing the voting status of PT lecturers would still have to manifest in a change to the faculty code.

There was some question as to if other bodies (in addition to the FCFA) are investigating the situation of lecturers with an eye to alter relative sections of the faculty code. The answer was not known.

Landis explained she served as a representative from the FCFA on a previous lecturer taskforce. She noted the problem to be solved was based on the way lecturers are hired (hired on part time basis and non-competitively). The main issue was that lecturers had been hired and served for a long duration, but then had to be rehired in a competitive pool. She explained altering titles in the faculty code was not substantively discussed.

There was a motion to table the agenda item until more information can be given relating to the draft guidelines on PT lecturers, and the matrix graph activity. The motion passed, and the agenda item was tabled.

## **5) Adding a faculty regent to the UW Board of Regents – Taricani**

JoAnne Taricani (Faculty Legislative Representative) explained there is a current movement to introduce legislation to the Washington State Legislature seeking to add a faculty regent to the UW Board of Regents (BoR). She explained similar legislation has failed several times since the mid-2000's. She noted currently, several other regional Washington public universities are in support of this legislation, and the UW and these universities have devised a plan to work together in moving the legislation forward in the 2017 legislative session.

Taricani explained recently, while negotiations between the UW and other Washington universities were underway, a bill was introduced to the legislature requesting the addition of a faculty regent to the UW Board of Regents (not of Taricani's crafting), which did not include other universities. She noted the bill failed to get out of committee, and did not make it into official legislation. Following this, a Class C resolution was passed in the faculty senate supporting the movement to add a faculty regent through the work of the faculty senate's auspices and in cooperation with the other several other Washington institutions.

Taricani explained there is an idea to have this legislation progress only with Washington State University and the University of Washington included, as both institutions have faculty that are not unionized, and are research universities. Taricani explained these institutions (and still potentially others) are working together to fine-tune a bill for the next legislative session (2017).

A member explained the aforementioned bill that went forth in the 2016 legislation session was poorly drafted. She explained she did not like the idea that the faculty senate chair would become the faculty regent in the next academic year (one component of the bill). She noted there is also a conflict of interest involved in this legislative effort, as the UW Board of Regents votes on an array of major decisions affecting the university, such as setting wages for faculty, and the conflict of interest will be in this faculty member effectively voting on setting their own salary through their inclusion on the board.

Taricani thanked the member for the input, noting she already has language that has taken into account much of what was mentioned. She explained she will consult with the faculty senate leadership on if the draft bill should be brought to the FCFA for review, and explained she has lots of related information that she can share with the council when opportune.

Katz suggested to the council that if FCFA is the appropriate forum for faculty senate deliberation concerning the faculty regent issue, it should begin that discussion soon. Resolving issues of substance and assuring adequate consultation with the UW's four-year partners will take time in order to have a good policy position ready by fall 2016, prior to the 2017 legislative session. Taricani outlined the various activities that will need to be undertaken before the 2017 session.

## **6) Evaluating Teaching in Promotion**

Beth Kalikoff (Director, Center for Teaching & Learning) was present to receive feedback on the CTL's (Center for Teaching and Learning) draft Guide for Evaluating Teaching in Promotion and Tenure Cases. The council was asked to review the draft document before the meeting and offer comments or questions to Kalikoff, to aid her in crafting a useful and meaningful guide for UW faculty to use.

After some question, Kalikoff explained the draft document is available to be shared with departmental groups of faculty, and Kalikoff is able to join these groups for feedback if schedules align. She noted work began on this guide when then-Provost Ana Mari Cauce charged the CTL to draft a guide on evaluating teaching. Kalikoff mentioned that the current Provost Jerry Baldasty has stated he will endorse the guide and post it on the Provost's website, if certain bodies vote for endorsement of the final draft (including several faculty councils).

Cameron asked why not expand the title of the guide given its potential use in other capacities. Kalikoff explained it is a good suggestion, and she will ask the President and Provost about this. She noted the original charge was only to develop guidelines to be used in promotion and tenure cases. Katz agreed with Cameron, and noted faculty in his unit are interested in having evidence-based guidelines to be used in improving teaching, and for faculty reviews and other purposes. It was noted the title of the document makes it seem narrower than it actually is.

Vaughn noted she would like to echo Reddy's comments on breaking out diversity within the document to give attention to it. She noted she would like the responsibility of handling this to fall on all faculty. Kalikoff agreed, and noted there have been some related questions which she would like to

clarify. She noted the Office of Educational Assessment (not the CTL) is deciding on how and whether or not to adjust student ratings for an instructor who is from an underrepresented group, as evidence shows these instructors may have skewed student ratings. Some short discussion ensued.

Cameron explained there is a decline in student's returning course and instructor evaluations at the culmination of courses. Kalikoff agreed and noted it needs to be better known that there are higher rates of return if instructors ask students to complete evaluations in class and set aside class-time for this, as opposed to encouraging students do this electronically outside of class; she noted the CTL is engaged in disseminating this information. Other council members agreed the rate of return is much higher when conducted in this fashion. After question, Kalikoff noted she will include more information on this within the guide. She explained faculty may benefit from stating to students the purpose of student evaluations in altering and optimizing course or instructor styles, as this often yields a greater rate of return, as well.

Rees explained teaching assistants and graduate students helping with courses typically sit in on every class session of a course, provide individual tutoring to students, and grade homework assignments, allowing them to often be able to measure student understanding of course content, and gauge effectiveness of an instructor. Kalikoff noted this to be a good point. Buck explained they used to seek graduate student opinions in the Psychology Department, but the graduate students stopped offering opinions when they sensed there may be consequences for doing so.

Cameron noted the faculty code does have specific requirements for evaluation, and it is advisable these be cited or highlighted in the guide. Kalikoff agreed and noted this information would be incorporated.

Kalikoff noted she would send a final draft of the guide soon to all the consulted groups and faculty councils. She requested there be a vote for endorsement of the guide in a later meeting. She thanked council members for their input.

## **7) Good of the order**

This item was missed due to time constraints.

## **8) Adjourn**

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

---

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

**Present:** **Faculty:** Steve Buck, Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis, Lea Vaughn, Aaron Katz  
**Ex-officio reps:** Julian Rees, Judith Henchy, JoAnne Taricani  
**President's designee:** Cheryl Cameron  
**Guests:** Marcia Killien, Beth Kalikoff

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Margaret Adam, David Goldstein, Joseph Janes, Chandan Reddy, Gordon Watts  
**Ex-officio reps:** Freddy Mora