

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
April 1, 2014, 9:30 am – 11:00 am
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
 2. Review of the Minutes from March 18th
 3. Announcements
 4. Professor of Practice
 5. Faculty Salary Policy
 6. 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 March 18th

The minutes from March 18th were approved as written.

3) Announcements

Watts announced the Class A legislation regarding minor changes to the Faculty Code was formally approved.

4) Professor of Practice

Watts explained that he hopes to approve the Professor of Practice (PoP) proposal today in order to be included on the upcoming SEC agenda. Watts is waiting for the Board of Deans and Chancellors (BODC) to provide feedback on the proposal to determine if this legislation should go forward.

Watts reported that he solicited feedback from Senate leadership and received a mixed review. There was concern that the initial appointments would be forced upon the department. Watts clarified that the votes required for a typical hiring process were the same as for a PoP. A suggestion has been made to limit the use of this appointment type by specifying a cap in the number of PoP appointments. This has been discussed in the past in FCFA but the problem is that the Faculty Code does not require this for other job classifications. And another big concern raised by the faculty senate leadership was whether PoP appointments should come with voting rights at all.

Members discussed the concerns raised by faculty leadership. A comment was raised supporting the concept of PoP as a way to improve unit programming. This would likely be more of an issue on a departmental level rather than across the campus as a whole. A comment was raised reminding members that this position is a “distinguished” title appointment and not a glorified lecturer position. Watts explained that he researched what other universities have been doing and the description ranges from vague to very descriptive.

Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty) emphasized the fact that other discussions covering PoP appointments are addressing the exact same concerns as this council. The same arguments are coming up each time and one should consider if it is due to educating people about the proposal, or if there is simply a fundamental difference in opinion. PoP brings with it a philosophical discussion which will be repeated at every level.

Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty) was in attendance and stated the biggest takeaway is that PoP appointments can be seen as a step towards undermining tenure-track positions. Lee warned that this concern will be brought up and generate a great deal of discussion. Watts clarified that PoP appointees will not go through the tenure process and the wording “limited use” is meant to address this concern. A comment was raised that PoP appointments are for individuals who are near retirement and done with a traditional career. The “erosion of tenure” is not really affected by PoP appointments because it is not targeting new professors who will have a long career at UW. A comment was raised that the continuous hiring of adjunct faculty and lecturers is the true cause of erosion of tenure.

Members discussed how PoP will be used and its comparison with other appointments, such as “Without Tenure” classifications. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that PoP seems to be tied to fundraising for individual departments where individuals with money are able to develop their own programs within UW. Discussion ensued about whether faculty approval is followed when making the decision to appoint an individual to PoP. Members disagreed if a unit can override a faculty approval/rejection vote and how the decision would be finalized. A comment was made that the underlying problem is departments would be spending limited funding which could go towards unit adjustments.

Lee expressed concern about allowing voting rights for PoP appointments. A comment was raised that previous discussions always assumed that PoP would have voting rights. Watts explained that in his research approximately half of universities using PoP allow for voting rights. The cons of voting is diluting the faculty vote, but the argument for voting is it allows PoP to have influence on the hiring of lecturers who will participate in the programs they are developing. Additionally, voting would allow PoP to have a role in approving the curriculum they are developing.

Watts asked members their opinion on PoP voting rights. Members were split on whether PoP should be allowed to vote or not. A comment was raised expressing confusion that a department would aggressively recruit a PoP candidate, then say they cannot vote. A comment was raised stating that many voting faculty members will be nervous if PoP voting rights were included in the proposal. A suggestion was made to have voting rights more similar to lecturers. For example, lecturers have to be full-time in order to vote in a department.

Watts explained that Cameron will be meeting with BODC tomorrow and report back on their feedback regarding the proposal and removing voting rights. Depending on BODC’s feedback Watts will determine how to move forward with the legislation. The council took a straw poll to get a sense if members wanted PoP to have voting rights. Three members indicated support for PoP voting rights, one member indicated opposition to PoP voting rights. Watts indicated that if Senate leadership does not approve of PoP voting rights they can adjust it at a later time.

Members discussed whether to approve the proposal as currently written or wait for later in the quarter. Killien noted that the council currently has quorum and the majority of the voting members

support the proposal as currently written. Killien cautioned that if the legislation is not sent to SEC today the PoP proposal would have to wait until next year to be approved by the Faculty Senate. Members discussed how the SEC and Senate would react to this legislation. Watts expressed concern that if SEC does not approve of the legislation it would be sent back to the council for further deliberation, thereby achieving nothing. A comment was raised expressing skepticism that the legislation would pass the Faculty Senate this year. The only way this could pass is if FCFA approves this proposal, BODC supports the language, and SEC and Faculty Senate approve the legislation during their next meetings. Members discussed the strategy of passing the proposal as currently written and possible outcomes.

Watts led members through the suggested changes that were provided earlier from both Senate leadership and Cameron. After members agreed on the final language a motion was made to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded.

The council voted as followed:

- Approve – 4
- Reject – 0

Watts declared that the proposal received unanimous approval. Watts will provide a copy of the proposal to Cameron to present at the upcoming BODC meeting.

5) Faculty Salary Policy

Lee will be meeting with the Salary Task Force tomorrow and requested feedback to bring to the meeting. Watts explained that FCFA spent a great deal of time making sure the promotion and merit review process was transparent to the faculty member under review and expressed concern that the salary proposal should not inhibit the work that was done last year. Watts specifically addressed the new tier ranking system and asked that transparency be present in the tier promotion process. Lee explained there has been pushback on this process due to concern about the excess workload that would be required.

Members discussed the parallels to the University of California system, how the tiered system would impact associate professors, and the reason for promotion raises.

Watts stated that members will review Lee's slideshow to identify the major themes that are moving the new salary proposal and discuss the role FCFA will play during this quarter. Watts encouraged members to review the proposal prior to the next meeting.

6) 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, Janes, Landis, Stygall
Ex-Officio Reps: Henchy
Guest: Marcia Killien (Secretary of the Faculty), Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate)

Absent: **Faculty:** Buck, Johnson, O'Brien, Vaughn (on leave)
President's Designee: Cameron
Ex-Officio Reps: Zanotto, Rees