

University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
March 4, 2014, 9:30 am – 11:00 am  
Gerberding 142

**Meeting Synopsis:**

1. Call to Order
  2. Review of the Minutes from January 21st, February 4th and February 18th
  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 January 21st, February 4th and February 18th**

The minutes from January 21st, February 4th and February 18th were approved as amended.

**3) Announcements**

Watts reported that the council's recently-approved changes to the Faculty Code have been sent out for a full faculty vote.

Watts reported on a big update to the proposed changes to the code to implement the faculty salary policy. Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) and Jack Johnson (President's Chief of Staff) will begin discussions fairly soon to develop a final proposal. The timeline is set to have code language submitted to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) before the final Faculty Senate meeting. Lee recently provided a discussion board for faculty to provide feedback on the proposal. While there has been little feedback at this time there have been discussions about how current faculty would fall into the preset tiered system. A question was raised asking if the salary proposal was publicly available. An email was initially sent out to all voting faculty members but anyone with a UW NetId can access the proposal and post comments.

Discussion moved to teaching assignments and availability during Spring Quarter in order for the council to reach quorum at future meetings. Watts hopes to have a council vote on Professor of Practice (PoP) at the upcoming meeting. Additionally, Watts hopes to discuss faculty salary policy at the first meeting in Spring Quarter.

**4) Professor of Practice**

Watts explained that as a result of discussion at the last FCFA meeting the council agreed to list PoP appointments below Senior Lecturers and above Lecturers, in addition to eliminating the section which specially states what PoP can and cannot vote on.

Watts asked for council feedback to gain a sense of how comfortable members are with the proposal. A question was raised asking if there is any language that unilaterally describes the types of people that the appointment would be used for. A comment was raised that many people are asking how the PoP title will be used in different departments. For example, concern has been raised that the term “distinguished” does not provide a narrow enough definition of the person that will fill the position. Additionally, the PoP title lacks the qualifying language that acknowledges the intent of limiting the overall number of PoP positions. Concern was raised that by stating PoP appointments are “rarely used” contradicts previous statements that open searches could include PoP as a hiring option. A comment was raised that some peer institutions keep open a standing position so the university can quickly target a potential individual when the opportunity arises.

A comment was raised that the important concern is not whether the department regularly offers the PoP appointment, but whether the department fills the position on a regular basis. The concern is more problematic if the PoP appointment becomes a common hiring practice rather than as a marketing strategy for the department. Discussion ensued about different hiring practices, methods to bring in PoP appointments and clarifying the intent of the proposal. A suggestion was made to readjust the order of “academicians” and “practitioners” within the PoP description to better define the title. A question was raised about the definition of “distinguished” and how to clarify the term. If the Faculty Senate sees that departments are abusing the position then faculty could revisit the code and make the necessary adjustments. Discussion ensued about future changes that could possibly occur when PoP appointments are in place. A comment was raised that faculty vote in the appointment of PoPs so they have control in whether the individual becomes part of the department. Discussion ensued about personal experiences in departments and certain hiring practices. A comment was raised that the key thing to prevent is hiring PoPs over the hiring of new Assistant Professors. Concern was raised that there is no language which emphasizes this concern. Discussion ensued. The council cannot write this into code but this could be reflected in the rationale statement of the Class A legislation.

Discussion moved to the following paragraph dealing with the acquisition of tenure through service. The intent of the language is to clarify that tenure cannot be granted or acquired through this position. Discussion ensued about parallel language located elsewhere in the Faculty Code to ensure consistency. A suggestion was raised to use the term “untenured term appointment”. A comment was raised reiterating the importance of creating consistency within the code while at the same time clarifying that the appointment does not attach tenure to the position. Members discussed specific changes to the proposal, in particular moving the reference to not being able to earn tenure to the end of the paragraph describing the position.

Once the proposal has been updated with the council’s suggestions it will be circulated to people outside the council and members of the Faculty Senate leadership in order to generate comments and feedback. Watts stated that the goal is to have a final proposal available at the next meeting ready for a discussion and possible vote.

## **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:** Henchy, Rees

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