

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
February 2nd, 2016
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from January 19th, 2016
 3. Announcements
 4. Code Cops outstanding issues
 5. Discussion of librarians as faculty proposal
 6. Lecturer issues
 7. Good of the order
 8. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order by Watts at 11:00 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from January 19th, 2016

The minutes from January 19th, 2016 were approved unanimously as written.

3) Announcements

Watts noted the FCFA's Class A legislation on "Conflict of Interest" (Chapter 24) was presented by Buck at the January 28th faculty senate meeting wherein senators made small comments but ultimately noted no major concerns. The legislation was approved by the faculty senate and will proceed through the senate's first consideration process for Class A legislation.

Watts explained the draft guide for "Evaluating Teaching in Promotion & Tenure Cases" will be reviewed by the council before the next council meeting where primary drafter Beth Kalikoff (Director, Center for Teaching & Learning) will be present to collect feedback. He explained comments from council members submitted electronically will be collated in a single document before Kalikoff joins that meeting. It was studies and colloquial evidence support the claim that student evaluations are not as reliable as peer evaluations in evaluating teaching, which is one major finding of the guide.

Watts explained the Code Cops have delivered their final review of the Class A salary policy legislation (currently within its second consideration in the faculty senate), which included some additional questions for the FCFA relating to the proposed code. The council will discuss these questions in today's meeting, he explained.

Watts noted there is a push from a member of the UW Radiology Department, Erik Stern (Vice Chair for Academic Affairs, Radiology) to include mentoring within the faculty code. Stern has sent his recommendation along with draft code language with proposed modifications. Watts noted his

response to Stern was that he is happy for the council to take a look at his proposal. He noted the draft code will be circulated, put on the google drive, and Stern will be invited to present his proposal in a future meeting.

Watts noted the FCFA may be involved in the current initiative to put a faculty member on the UW Board of Regents, a process which requires legislation in the State Legislature. Watts explained he wanted to let the council know that it may be involved in this effort at a future time.

4) Code Cops outstanding issues

Watts explained the Code Cops have submitted a document to the council listing their questions relating to varying sections of code language in the proposed faculty salary policy (Exhibit 1).

24-62.C

Watts explained the concern surrounds the possibility that there may not enough faculty members in a given department to delegate collegiate performance reviews to a committee of three.

- Council members explained the delegation was provided as an option for very-large departments to minimize administrative burden on all its faculty. In a department where the faculty population is small, the delegation is neither advisable nor necessary.

24-43.A & 24-62

Watts explained two sections of proposed code are purportedly in conflict, as Section 24-43.A (Procedure for Renewal of Appointments) explains the process for renewal of appointments, but does not mention a collegial review, and Section 24.62 (Collegial Performance Review) explains that one thing that comes out renewal of appointment is collegial review. Watts explained the council may have simply forgot to paste this information into the relative section of code.

- It was noted the intent of the FCFA was that before reappointment there would be a collegial performance review. Cameron explained a collegial performance review would precede a reappointment, which is the same for promotions (as the code is drafted). Watts explained it is not clear in 24-43.A that the collegial performance review comes first, which is the comment from the Code Cops. It was noted the first process-related step for reappointment is the collegial review, which needs to be included explicitly in section 24-43.A. It was noted this change will also have to be replicated in the section detailing “promotion” in the faculty code. After discussion, it was found the code states that all tenured and non-tenured faculty do go through collegial performance reviews (in some cases conditional on length of appointment). Watts explained the council may take a careful look at this again sometime in the future if it becomes problematic after being implemented at the university.
- Another issue, Watts explained, is that 24-43.A.2 states the appointment renewal delegation committee “shall expire one calendar year after it is made”. However, in 24-62, it states the collegial performance review delegation needs to be affirmed or amended biennially (every two years). It was noted the FCFA may not have discussed this timeline issue, as the original working group on the faculty salary policy drafted some parts of the proposed code relating to the issue. Watts noted

24.43.A needs to be revisited by the council because it seems like a unit needs two sets of committees, not one. Watts noted he did not believe this was the council's intent, but other members noted they were not certain these were the same committee. Watts explained he will do a little more research and transmit the council's point of view to the SEC if this comes up in the next meeting of that body, wherein the second consideration of the proposed salary policy will begin.

Watts explained these issues are the only left from the Code Cops relating to the proposed salary policy.

5) Discussion of librarians as faculty proposal

Watts explained he would like to glean the council sentiment on the recently-presented proposal to change the status of UW librarians from academic staff to faculty. He noted it will be difficult to advance this effort quickly, given the current faculty union drive, and the fact that the librarians have their own "code," which needs to be aligned with the faculty code somehow if the proposal is accepted and implemented. Watts explained it would be best to consult with faculty senate leadership requesting they hold discussion with administration on this topic - but only if the council agrees with the librarians' proposal in the first place. He asked for members to give their opinions.

Katz explained he believes the effort is worthy of the FCFA's time, and that he supports the change.

Johnson explained he hopes the librarians understand that changing to faculty status may alter some of their job benefits, including sick leave, vacation leave, advancement in rank, and so on. He explained librarians work very closely with faculty at the UW, and that he supports the notion of changing their status to faculty.

Landis explained given librarians' service to schools and to students (especially in the "digital age") - their various class presentations and individual student support services - she agrees with Johnson. She explained she has many questions over the process of changing their academic personnel status, and wonders how they envision the process to progress if the proposal is accepted.

Rees explained the big question for him is whether or not the UW will end up with a library-based department, or another school - if faculty would have their own unit, or if their appointments would be within other schools.

Adam explained implementation will be difficult, though she agrees the librarians have demonstrated they do a lot of what faculty do at the UW.

After some discussion, it was noted that the UW is unique in Washington State in that its librarians do not have faculty status.

Cameron explained the librarians do have their own code and promotion system which they themselves govern at the UW, which is unique as well. She explained librarians currently accrue leave time with associated benefits of accrual, and wonders if they intend to stop accruing time. There was discussion that a change of status may require a change to these benefits.

Watts explained Killien (Secretary of the Faculty, Faculty Senate & Governance) noted she has spoken with librarians and told them some of this information. He noted he also supports the librarian status change.

After some more discussion of the potential advantages and disadvantages of the proposal for librarians, Watts explained the proper next step for faculty senate leadership is to understand whether or not the administration is in agreement with the proposal, and then to create a taskforce to hash out the details. Watts noted it is not the responsibility of the council to devise the process for implementation of this proposal.

Reddy questioned what the implications would be for bringing librarians into the tenured faculty system, he asked: “does how we understand tenure change?”

Watts explained a council vote will be taken on this question. He explained all three groups (faculty, librarians, and administration) need to agree on the right way forward before anything concrete may actually happen, and many of the posed questions will need to be answered.

A vote was taken on if members of the FCFA approve of exploring the status change of librarians to members of the faculty at the UW. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Watts noted he will speak with senate leadership and discover the appropriate steps forward.

6) Lecturer issues

The council discussed several documents showing data on lectures at the UW available on the council's google drive. Watts lead the conversation and explained he has formulated a simple slideshow highlighting his interpretation, comments, and questions after perusing this data for council to utilize.

Watts explained all data included was taken before Provost Cauce's university directive on part-time lecturers, which had a positive effect on the lecturer situation at the university. Watts explained there was a significant amount of people surveyed who explained they wanted to be part-time lecturers and stated that title fit them best. He noted there was a great deal of raw data, and “no opinion held by 100 percent of the responders.”

Watts explained surveyed PT lecturers often remarked they had or were currently mentoring graduate students. He questioned if these PT lecturers were really in the right job class code given this activity. Katz explained he is aware of several PT lecturers who mentor, yet prefer to be PT. He explained many PT lecturers in the School of Public Health do not want to be on the tenure track. Johnson explained this is true for the School of Social Work, as well. Watts explained mentoring graduate students seems like something faculty do long-term. After some discussion, it was noted many PT lecturers mentor first-year master's students. Katz explained the lecturer track in the School of Public Health has long been used for people who want to be in academia, do research, teaching, and service, take administrative positions, but do not want to be in a tenure-track position. He noted these faculty are not hired simply to fill the curriculum gaps of the school. Rees explained only senior lecturers or principal lecturers may sit on a senior thesis committee.

After some discussion, it was noted the lecturer track clearly has been used very differently by varying units, schools, and colleges. Watts explained one question for the council is does it think this is appropriate. Watts noted the FCFA makes sure the faculty code reflects the make-up and needs of the faculty.

Landis explained in her unit they have many PT lecturers and very few FT lecturers. She explained the PT lecturers are on less than an annual appointment, in some cases (hired on a quarter-by-quarter basis). She remarked that she doubts lecturers in her unit would have filled out this survey, as many are not invested in the decisions that are being made at the department or university level.

Johnson agreed that faculty are used differently in his own department.

Cameron clarified that these lecturer appointments are being made by the faculty in the corresponding unit of whom are voting on the appointments, or delegating the decisions to the chair and a small faculty committee. Cameron explained the way the university governance system is designed, there is faculty governance at multiple levels.

Watts explained the data shows approximately 30% of PT lecturers noted they wanted to be part-time. He explained some unit-head feedback on the uses of PT lecturers:

- Deal with uncertain funding, adds flexibility
- Mentoring for grad students and post-docs
- Full time positions mean voting on tenure track hiring
- Costs less so fits in the budget

Watts explained PT lecturers are allowed no participation in departmental decisions, though a substantial fraction want to be full-time. He noted the surveys did not address how comfortable these faculty felt with the duration of their appointment. Many PT lecturers called out the fact that they did not have an obvious career path. Watts noted changes to the faculty code could have a direct effect on some of these issues.

There was some interest in if data may be broken down by race and gender to notice any inequalities in hiring or promotion. It was noted getting to the core of how departments use lecturers is not data that is available in these surveys.

Watts explained the council needs to consider what can be changed within the faculty code to correct some of these lecturer issues, and that will be the council's next task.

7) Good of the order

Nothing was stated for the good of the order.

8) Adjourn

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

Present: **Faculty:** Alissa Ackerman, Margaret Adam, Kurt Johnson, Carol Landis, Chandan Reddy, Gordon Watts (chair), Aaron Katz
Ex-officio reps: Julian Rees
President's designees: Cheryl Cameron

Absent: **Faculty:** Steve Buck, David Goldstein, Joseph Janes, Lea Vaughn
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Freddy Mora

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – 2015-01-30 - Code Cop Outstanding Issues.docx

Code Cop Outstanding Issues

1/30/2016 edition

Two further issues were discovered while completing the review.

Insufficient Reviewers in 24-62C

C. Optional Delegation to a Performance Review Committee

The voting faculty of a unit may, by majority vote, delegate the authority to carry out collegial performance reviews of all faculty or all non-tier eligible faculty to a committee of three or more faculty members. This delegation is subject to the following rules:

What happens when a department doesn't have three members? What happens in a department with just a single full professor.

Code Cops will ask us to review this more carefully when/if the legislation passes.

24-43A and 24-62 are in Conflict

24-43 is titled "Procedure for Renewal of Appointments". 24-62 is titled "Collegial Performance Review" 24-43A reads:

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24–31, Subsection B shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal faculty members who are not tier-eligible (according to Section 24-62, Subsection D) to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation:

1. Does not alter faculty rank requirements for considering appointment renewals, and
2. Shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

24-62 reads:

The purpose of a collegial performance review is:

- To determine whether the performance of a faculty member is satisfactory or unsatisfactory;
- To consider a faculty member for a possible tier advancement;
- To consider reappointment of faculty members;
- To consider recommending a faculty member for a possible promotion in rank.

....

The voting faculty of a unit may, by majority vote, delegate the authority to carry out collegial performance reviews of all faculty or all non-tier eligible faculty to a committee of three or more faculty members. This delegation is subject to the following rules:

1. The vote must stipulate whether the committee being formed will perform collegial reviews for

all faculty or all non-tier eligible faculty.

2. The faculty vote must stipulate whether the committee is empowered to carry out an initial review and make recommendations which are then voted upon by the eligible faculty of the unit as described in Section G below, or is empowered to complete collegial performance evaluations without requiring a faculty vote.
3. This delegation does not alter the faculty rank or title requirements for collegial performance evaluations described in Section B above.
4. The faculty shall vote whether to affirm or amend this delegation biennially.

Conflicts:

- 1) 24-43A doesn't mention Collegial Performance Review. FCFA's intent is to have a collegial performance review.
- 2) 24-43 says committee should expire after one year, 24-62 says after 2 years. FCFA's intent?

More general comment: 24-43 probably needs to be re-written to really incorporate Collegial reviews... and may become mostly a "see this section" reference?