

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
February 18, 2014, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from January 21st and February 4th
 3. Professor of Practice
 4. Adjourn
-

1) Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Watts at 9:30 a.m. Due to lack of quorum the council was not able to take official actions.

2) Approval of the Minutes from January 21st and February 4th

Due to lack of quorum the minutes from January 21st and February 4th were not approved.

Watts clarified that minutes will still be taken when quorum is not reached in order for people to review council discussions. Watts explained this policy is consistent with other university faculty councils. Discussion ensued.

Members discussed methods to reach quorum at future meetings.

3) Professor of Practice

Members discussed listing Professor of Practice (PoP) appointments in Section 21-31 and Section 21-32 within the Faculty Code. The difficulty of placing PoP alongside current faculty classifications is due to the diverse nature of the appointment.

A comment was raised that the voting status of PoP appointments needs to be resolved before identifying how PoP will be ranked alongside other faculty positions. Council members discussed PoP voting privileges for new hires, reappointments and merit reviews. Voting privileges for new hires is the same as any other faculty member: any voting faculty member can participate. Current proposed language ranks PoPs equivalent to principle lecturers. Members discussed ranking PoPs lower - above or below Lecturers and Artists in Residence. A comment was made that there are currently 3-4 Artists in Residence at UW.

A question was raised asking if a department can define the role of PoP at the time of hire. Discussion ensued. It would be beneficial to make PoP appointments clear in the Faculty Code rather than allow for open interpretation for individual units whose work varies tremendously.

Discussion moved back to positioning PoP amongst currently faculty ranks. A comment was raised expressing confusion that PoPs would be hired to develop programs where lecturers are hired but could

perhaps not vote on the lecturers' reappointments. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that this situation already occurs: not all teaching programs are directed by senior faculty within a department. At this point the group ranked PoPs above lectures and below senior lecturers for the rest of the discussion.

A question was raised asking if there is any particular department that has more lecturers than professors. This is a concern since lecturers could see PoP appointments as a way to bring in outside individuals which could infringe on their job security. There were no examples provided of departments with more lecturers than professors, but a comment was raised that English relies heavily on lecturers. Discussion ensued about the titles of different faculty classifications and their rankings within the Faculty Code.

A question was raised asking who votes on PoP merit reviews. Merit reviews are critical for this appointment classification because PoPs may be coming in without prior teaching experience. The reviews will be used to provide close supervision that ensures they can effectively teach. A question was raised asking how UW would define "meritorious" for PoP appointments if they are not in a lecturer or professorial tracks. A comment was raised that the individuals who vote in merit reviews should be the same as those who vote on reappointments. In researching the Faculty Code all voting members of an academic unit make recommendations to the dean who will then make the final decision for reappointment. Concern was raised that there is little safeguard to protect against deans reappointing PoPs when faculty want them removed. Members discussed whether the protection against PoP appointments should be stronger than current faculty classifications. A comment was raised expressing support to maintain the method that currently exists, and if a problem arises the issue would be relatively small.

The way the proposed changes to the Faculty Code is currently written allows PoP appointees to vote on the renewal of lecturers and artists in residence, promotion of lecturers, and merit of lecturers and artists in residence. This limitation in scope means that PoP appointments cannot be involved in the judgment of assistant professors. Members discussed preferences in having PoP vote on the merit, hiring and renewal of lecturers. A comment was raised that each department works differently and it depends on the appointment within the individual unit.

A question was raised about renewals of assistant professors. PoPs would not be able to vote, the only faculty ranks that have voting privileges are associate and full professors. Discussion ensued about voting privileges and responsibilities as described in the Faculty Code and possible changes to clarify faculty rankings. Members discussed if the Faculty Code should provide a special clarification for PoP appointments as it does for research faculty. This led to the realization that the proposed additional code section detailing what a PoP was allowed to vote on could be eliminated.

Members discussed questions that were sent to Cameron regarding concerns surrounding PoP appointments. A question was raised about political appointments when deans force the appointment individuals against the wishes of the department. Members discussed procedures for new appointments which state that the chair will submit the relevant information to voting members and the voting faculty must approve the appointment by a majority vote. The vote would then be sent to the dean for consideration if the vote was successful. If there is not a majority vote approving the appointment then it is not a matter for consideration by the dean.

A question was raised about three-year reviews for PoP appointments wondering how the department can ensure quality in teaching within that time frame. Specifically, it would be beneficial to have more frequent evaluations. A comment was raised expressing hope that the offer letter will make it clear that the candidate will be subject to teaching evaluations.

Members discussed the different ways a PoP could be hired – it was pointed out that both competitively and non-competitively recruited individuals could be offered appointments. The appointment of an individual without a competitive recruitment would require the submission of a search waiver request. Competitive recruitments might specifically target a PoP or be more broad and include a variety of appointment types including PoP. Concern was raised that this would allow departments to recruit regular faculty and PoP at the same time which goes against the original intent of the proposal. Cameron explained that there are times when a search includes the possibility of a range of appointment types to provide flexibility in meeting unit needs and indeed, this is already happening with the current range of options. Discussion ensued about how departments will use PoP appointments which can be influenced by the type of program the department is looking to develop, the length of time the program has been in existence, and the level of investment by the department.

Cameron provided examples of current PoP appointments at Harvard, Tufts University and Pennsylvania State University.

Section 24-57 describes the procedure for assessing teaching effectiveness of faculty. Concern was raised that PoP appointees should be reviewed early in their appointment in order to receive constructive feedback before they establish themselves in the department. A comment was raised that the draft code currently states teaching evaluations will be conducted “at least every three years” which allows departments the flexibility to review PoP appointees at their discretion. Ultimately, the department will be dealing with PoP appointments directly and a comment was raised expressing doubt that the council can develop a structure on how to manage PoPs at the departmental level.

Concern was raised that these individuals are coming to UW without any teaching background and students should not be stuck with a person who does not know how to teach. One way to deal with this issue is to include PoP appointments in the annual chair conference cycle. A comment was raised that the goal of reviews is to document career development which does not apply to PoP appointments. If a chair is bringing in a new person without a strong educational background one should trust the chair is meeting with them on a regular basis to address issues and concerns.

Members discussed whether the use of the term “distinguished” tied to PoP appointments is clear. The council has discussed this issue in the past but will address this at an upcoming meeting.

4) 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), Buck, Landis, Vaughn
Ex-Officio Reps: Henchy, Rees
President’s Designee: Cameron

Absent: **Faculty:** Adam, Janes, Johnson, O'Brien, Stygall
Ex-Officio Reps: Zanotto