

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
January 7, 2014, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from December 10, 2013
 3. Announcements
 4. Professor of Practice
 5. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Watts at 9:30 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from December 10, 2013

The minutes from December 10, 2013 were approved as written.

3) Announcements

Killien explained that the voting period for the Class A legislation on Academic Freedom will end on January 8th. Once the votes are tallied her office will release the results to the voting faculty via email.

Watts reminded the council that the Provost will be present at FCFA's meeting on February 4th and urged members to be there on time.

Killien's minor changes to the Faculty Code have been drafted into Class A legislation and will be reviewed by the Senate Executive Committee at its upcoming meeting. The housekeeping changes approved by FCFA are complete and have been incorporated into the Faculty Code.

Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) sent Watts some initial code language concerning the faculty salary policy. Discussion ensued. At one point there was an expectation that a group would be formed with representatives from FCFA to develop legislation regarding salary policy. Initial code language is being drafted by Jack Johnson (President's Chief of Staff) and Jack Lee.

4) Professor of Practice

Watts summarized the recent discussions related to a new, proposed job classification: Professor of Practice (PoP). The first few discussions covered a variety of concerns and issues which have fallen under several main categories of concern:

- Would this position erode tenure-track faculty?
- Is the title correct?
- Does this position exist elsewhere on campus?

- Is this applicable to current UW faculty, or just individuals outside of UW?
- Is this new class of faculty appropriately defined?
- What voting rights should this new position have?

If this proposal goes forward a clear justification for the change needs to be prepared because it will garner many questions from faculty. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that the PoP position is meant to be the capstone of an individual's career, and having someone entering UW from outside would nix the message of a traditional career path. This proposal is similar to "Artist in Residence", but PoP would not be heavily used and "Artist in Residence" does not fit the role this new classification is intended for.

The PoP classification is used by many institutions so it makes sense to adopt a similar position as long as UW does not already have a similar job classification. Concern was raised surrounding how funding will be available for this new classification. For example, research scientists are paid differently than traditional, tenure-track faculty. Discussion ensued. Research scientists are actually classified as professional staff. PoP would be classified as faculty and funding sources could come from state funds (if supporting development of a state tuition-funded program) or connected to grant activity, similar to current faculty appointments. A question was raised asking why these individuals would be hired as faculty but not staff. Cameron explained that these positions would be teaching appointments.

A question was raised asking if there is another faculty title that currently exists for this classification. While the appointment is similar to what is available in the research track, it would not be focused on research. A question was raised asking the difference between a "clinical professor" and PoP. The PoP appointment would allow for multiple year appointments compared to annual renewals. A comment was raised stating this would create confusion because departments would have two similar positions; the only difference would be the length of appointment. Cameron clarified that the PoP position would be appointing a "distinguished" title to the individual. A comment was raised that UW already has too many faculty classifications. Discussion ensued.

While there are already several different classifications within UW, the word "clinical" does not appear appropriate for this type of appointment since it is not applicable for the rest of the institution. Killien suggested a change to the title in order to address confusion related to clinical appointments and the term "practice": Professor of Professional Practice. Killien expressed concern about title creep since this is an appointment limited to a small number of people. With the addition of PoP it may lead to other titles for unique positions.

A question was raised asking what other institutions are using this title. Cameron listed the following universities:

- University of Virginia
- University of Maryland
- Duke University
- Tulane University
- University of Oregon

A question was raised asking if these are nominal titles or if the individuals are expected to participate in the department. Those appointed as PoP are expected to have an impact by taking what they have done

outside of UW and bring their expertise to disseminate and expand within the department. A comment was raised that this role is not reflected in the title and could be expanded upon.

Concern was raised that this position would just recognize the prestige of having this individual in the department without improving programs in the department. Cameron used Arizona State University as an example of an institution which uses the prestige of a PoP to the advantage of the institution and explained that the position has an equal, or greater, impact for the university.

Concern was raised about the title and whether the candidate comes from industry or academia. For example, the word “professional” would not be appropriate for an academic who comes from outside UW. Discussion ensued. The term “professional” refers to the practice of a specific focus (professional) area and the individual could be a distinguished professional with academic training. A comment was raised that there still needs to be a clarification between “professional” and “clinical” in the title as this still raises confusion.

Concern was raised that this position would allow distinguished individuals to enter UW as faculty while UW librarians do not have similar opportunities. While that is a relevant concern, the intent is to invite outside individuals to augment academic programs that currently exist. Additionally, the candidate would need some sort of faculty appointment as they are expected to be teaching. Discussion ensued.

Concern was raised that this position could side-step tenure-track faculty appointments, similar to tenure erosion which is occurring across the US. A comment was raised that this appointment could be used inappropriately and the AAUP is strongly against similar full-time, non-tenure appointments. However, the utility for this position within a department appears to be useful and may not be as problematic because the displacing of tenure-track faculty would be small at UW.

While displacement of tenure-track faculty is not as problematic at UW, there is still concern about the appointment and review process of this position. Similar to other faculty positions, the appointment of PoP candidates would be made by voting faculty members. However, there is still uncertainty on who would be eligible to vote on reappointments.

A question was raised asking what it would take to violate the appointment process. For example, would departments violate the concept of “distinguished” professionals when hiring candidates? Additionally, there could be abuse in hiring when there is a strong industry connection in which a PoP candidate is hired with strings attached. While that is a valid concern, it is similar to a condition which currently exists. Concern was raised that this could be worse in which UW is hiring PoP candidates that become an arm of a corporation. Cameron explained that UW Advancement is aware of these concerns and is very cautious about major gifts to UW. Discussion ensued. If an individual comes to UW and has a real impact on the department, and the company provides UW with a large gift, then that should be seen as a win-win for the university.

A comment was raised to remember where the impetus of the hire is coming from. For example, the desire for a PoP could come from the individual department, the UW as a whole, or an outside entity. Discussion ensued. Cameron explained that the PoP classification is different than an endowed position, such as a PACCAR-endowed chair. Concern was raised that this position would open the door for an outside entity to add particular individuals to faculty ranks at UW. Cameron restated this is already happening and is an issue that UW Advancement is already aware of.

Units that are seeking to add a PoP to their departments have the ability to conduct a competitive search to identify distinguished professionals or request a search waiver if they have a particular individual in mind to bolster their programs. A comment was raised that distinguished individuals may be recruited who do not have graduate credentials, or academic degrees at all. While their inclusion in the department could further the mission of UW, the lack of an academic degree is a technical issue that needs to be resolved and may cause problems when discussed by the faculty.

A comment was raised that the PoP classification is not uncharted territory because many institutions are already doing this. If this was something that was not working well in the past then peer institutions would not continue to allow this type of job classification.

A question was raised asking if the candidate could be hired on with a “professor emeritus” title rather than PoP. This is not the same because this is a courtesy appointment and not related to a tenure-track appointment. Also, PoP would not be the same level as “visiting professor” because there is more prestige attached to the job classification. A question was raised asking if individuals working in a professional capacity at UW could move to a faculty appointment with this role. This option could be possible for such individuals. A follow-up question asked if retiring deans at UW could move to this role if they decide to not keep up with their research career. Discussion ensued. Deans are already tenured faculty so they would just be returning to their regular appointment. A question was raised about researchers who just want to teach without any pressure for merit reviews. Cameron explained that it would need to meet the “distinguished” level in order to appoint such an individual. A comment was raised stating there are several examples at UW.

A question was raised asking if professional staff at UW could move into this position. For example, an individual who is involved with external relations in DC could be hired to teach courses related to their expertise. Cameron reiterated that it would still need to meet the “distinguished” level in order to appoint such an individual and is not consistent to what the deans have been discussing.

A question was raised asking Cameron to find examples of PoP faculty at peer institutions and determine why they are considered “distinguished” when they do not have PhDs.

In the current proposal PoP faculty would have the same voting rights as research faculty. This means PoP faculty can vote on all new appointments but not on the promotion of tenure-track faculty. Additionally, PoP faculty would vote on academic curriculum and legislation. A comment was raised that this would add to the quorum of all voting members. Discussion ensued. It appears that the voting rights make sense since PoP faculty will likely be active and engaged in their department.

Concern was raised that while PoP faculty would be actively engaged, they could inadvertently cause damage to their program if they are not aware of the larger mission of the department. Concern was also raised that there is confusion about voting seniority since PoP are located above senior lecturers. Discussion ensued. PoP faculty would not have individuals to vote on other than new hires, and there is nowhere else to put them within the Faculty Code. Discussion ensued about voting rights and seniority.

A comment was raised that it seems inappropriate for a PoP faculty member, who may come to UW with a narrow scope and world vision, to evaluate the merit of career faculty. Discussion ensued. There are ways to accommodate this concern, such as reviewing the section that covers merit review in the Faculty Code.

5) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Watts at 11:00 a.m.

Minutes by Grayson Court, Faculty Council Support Analyst, gcourt@uw.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Watts (Chair), Adam, Buck, Johnson, Landis
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: Zanotto, Henchy, Rees
 Guests: Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty)

Absent: **Faculty:** Janes, O'Brien, Stygall, Vaughn
 Ex-Officio Reps: