

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, October 26, 2010, 9:00 a.m.
142 Gerberding Hall

Meeting synopsis:

1. Lecturer Issues
 2. Review of Minutes
 3. Adjourn
-

Call to Order

Council Chair Rich Christie began the meeting at 9:05 a.m.

Lecturer Issues

The council discussed a number of issues related to the lecturers and instructors.

Elizabeth O’Neill, Principal Lecturer in English and Interdisciplinary Writing, introduced several areas of confusion in the Faculty Code. In some places, “instructors” seems to refer to all faculty outside of tenure lines, and in some places it is a special designation. Section 24-57 requires annual collegial review of teaching for instructors and assistant professors, and three year reviews for professors – there is no mention of lecturers at all. She would like to suggest annual review for instructors, lecturers, and assistant professors, and that the three-year review be required for senior lecturers, principal lecturers, and associate and full professors. The reason is partly for clarity; lecturers appear to be invisible, appearing only erratically in the code. This codifies their existence. Also, when subject to an annual review, principal and senior lecturers can feel they are permanently on probation, which undermines a sense of collegiality when asking long-time colleagues to provide annual reviews that they themselves are not subject to.

Christie raised issues that Miceal Vaughn, Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature, had brought to his attention. The term “promotion” is used with tenure track faculty, and lecturers are appointed. Advertising the advancement from lecturer to principal or senior lecturer as a promotion can lead to confusion or an expectation of tenure. He has gone through the faculty code and pulled out contradictions.

Christie distributed a document detailing three main issues: the rank of lecturers, senior lecturers and principal lecturers among the faculty; whether lecturers, senior lecturers and principal lecturers are appointed or promoted; and that the different lecturer titles are not used consistently in the code, and may be confused with instructors.

The council discussed the relationship between the Academic Human Resources website and the Faculty Code. It was clarified that the Academic HR website is intended to help classify job codes for administrators, not to serve as an interpretation of the code.

The council then discussed the status of lecturers, senior lecturers, and principal lecturers among the faculty. Christie detailed a number of places in the code that deal with titles and ranks. The principle issue is that the Code (25-54) says that each person below rank of professor is to be considered annually for promotion. Killien summarized the current system: there are three groups of faculty (tenure track, without tenure, and research) that follow a series of promotions (assistant, associate, full); and there is the group of lecturers, who have a different series of titles. She posed the question of whether the distinction between title and rank was an editorial distinction or a substantive issue. Christie said that the answer may lie in the answer to the question of appointments vs. promotions, and the group moved on to that issue.

The council discussed lecturer appointments, both their code provisions and histories. O'Neill said that lecturers do not have access to tenure or a union, but only access to the Faculty Code. Christie identified inconsistencies in the code. One that has caused confusion is section 24-52 – whether it captures the intended policy and whether it applies to lecturers. The council had a long and wide-ranging discussion on the matter, hinging on what lecturers are promotable, but no consensus on revisions was reached. However, the council did arrive at a general consensus on the need for increased consistency and clarity in the code.

Finally, the council moved on to the third main lecturer issue, which is that different lecturer titles are not used consistently in the code, and may be confused with instructors. Christie pointed out section 24-57A in the code, which doesn't say anything about lecturers. Discussion centered on the importance of annual collegial reviews for instructional faculty, and the current practice of conducting such reviews. One suggestion was to have reviews conducted at the time prior to reappointment. It was then pointed out that this could lead to a review only every 5 years for certain cases. The council did not arrive at a consensus on the topic and will continue the discussion in the future.

Review of Minutes

The minutes of the May 11 and May 25, 2010 meetings were approved. The note of proceedings from the October 12, 2010 meeting was accepted with a minor change.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 a.m.

Minutes by Craig Bosman, Faculty Council Support Analyst. <cbosman@uw.edu>

Present:

Faculty:	Christie (Chair), Ricker, Bryant-Bertail, Kirtley
President's Designee:	Cameron
Ex Officio:	Anderson
Guests:	Marcia Killien

Absent:

Faculty:	Phillips, O'Brien, Wilcock
Ex Officio:	Fauchald