Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Review of the minutes from December 5th, 2017
3. Chair’s report
4. Lecturer issues
5. Good of the order
6. Adjourn

1) Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:05 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from December 5th, 2017

The minutes from December 5th, 2017 were approved as written.

3) Chair’s report

Janes explained in a recent Senate Executive Committee meeting, Faculty Legislative Representative JoAnn Taricani provided some preliminary information on the short session of the Washington State Legislature which had recently started in Olympia. Taricani reported that a bill proposing to add a faculty member regent to the UW Board of Regents (also applicable to other institutions in the state) is under consideration again during this session.

4) Lecturer issues

Janes noted he would like the council to come to a consensus on lecturer issues to be addressed through legislative changes in the Faculty Code, and finalize a small group of FCFA members to work on developing that code language.

Janes noted over the holiday break, a flurry of emails went out over the American Association of University Professors (AUUP) UW list-serve discussing issues associated with lecturers at the UW. He explained these emails have been collated in a document to be viewed in the meeting and discussed (Exhibit 1). A disclaimer was made that some of the information within the emails may not be factually accurate, as some emails were later rescinded by the author that appear in the exhibit. There was some discussion.
It was noted the emails often make use of the word “temporary” to describe a particular population of part-time lecturers, and the word appears to be used often and regularly among UW faculty.

**Discussion of data**

A member noted a useful thing to do in the FCFA given the tenor of the email discussion would be to gain data on the part-time lecturer population and evaluate hiring trends. Discussion centered on issues associated with lecturers being hired into 3-year contracts and then not being reappointed after that contract expires. One member felt that a recent university mandate to convert a lecturer to a fulltime position after the 3-year period expires may contribute to their being let go and another lecturer being hired (enabling the department to avoid adding a permanent full-time lecturer position).

It was noted use of institutional data can help make sense of the depth and severity of the issues discussed in the AAUP emails (Exhibit 1). A member noted a large lack of communication seemed evident between administration and faculty through the emails. He noted communication about outcomes in relation to part-time lecturer positions causes issues. He explained perhaps centralization in faculty onboarding might help set a standard for stricter guidelines and better practices.

There continued to be discussion of gathering data to be used in evaluating the severity of the current lecturer situation at the UW. Janes requested a list be compiled of the kinds of data FCFA members would like to seek out in order to determine if that data is available for review.

Members debated whether time spent reviewing data would be constructive, or if it would further hamper work on the development of code language. There was some discussion of using data to justify the codifying (within the Faculty Code) of the Provost’s Hiring Guidelines. It was noted data alone does not always deliver an actionable conclusion, and a particular course of action taken at a point in time cannot always be said to have been good or bad based on related data. There was some discussion of action the FCFA should take. Members discussed whether gaining additional data would provide information useful to the effort of developing code.

**Course of action**

Watts suggested the discussion of data be held via email by FCFA members rather than during meetings. He explained he would attempt to recover lecturer data discussed in the previous academic year for this purpose.

**Developing code language**

Janes asked for volunteers to work on code language for several topic areas, including: promotion of lecturers, voting hierarchy in faculty personnel decisions, and codification of the Provost’s Hiring Guidelines. Janes noted data will help the FCFA understand how much further it should go in the development of new policies (based on the severity of known issues).
Jacoby, Vaughan, and Katz volunteered to work on code language. Janes noted some code language was previously drafted for these topic areas during the last academic year (2016-2017), and that he would pass these on to the small group after the meeting.

5) Good of the order

Vaughan announced an event would be held on Wednesday, January 17th, in HUB room 145 at 1:30 p.m. with the topic of “faculty pre-retirement planning.” The event is hosted by the UW Retirement Association.

6) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:18 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: Faculty: Joseph Janes (chair), Kurt Johnson, Gordon Watts, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Kamran Nemati, Dan Jacoby, Tom Hazlet, Miceal Vaughan
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Ziyan Bai, Bryan Crockett
President’s designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: George Sandison

Absent: Faculty: Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Aaron Katz, Eric Bugyis
Ex-officio reps: N/A

Exhibits
Exhibit 1 – 2018-01-08 - AAUP Lecture Messages
These are a collection of messages concerning lecturers that have circulated on the AAUP mailing list over the past month or so.

Apologies for them not being in date or thread order! Note that, as it often happens on the AAUP list, the topic wanders from the original subject, so don’t pass off a particular stream of messages based on the subject heading alone! If I’ve missed any messages, apologies that is 100% my fault (Gordon) and was not intentional!
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Subject: Slashed Terms For Senior & Principal Lecturers

From: Carrie Mathews

Dear Colleagues:

We in the English Department at UW Seattle just discovered that two of our lecturer colleagues on renewable five-year contracts who were up for reappointment this year had their terms cut to three years. One is a principal lecturer, the other a senior lecturer. The department recommended that both be reappointed for the usual five-year term.

Some of you may recall that for a brief period following the 2008 recession, UW lecturers were put on short term reappoints: what had been five year reappointments were reduced to three, and three year terms were cut to one. In that instance, however, we believe the reduction of appointment terms was publicly announced, in effect for all units, and temporary, as the administration pledged to restore regular terms as soon as possible. In this case, however, we are not aware of any announcement or clear rationale for these cuts, nor do we know whether this is an unannounced tri-campus university-wide cut, or a UW Seattle College of Arts & Sciences-wide cut, or whether lecturers in particular departments have been singled out for shorter reappointment terms.

What is happening in your departments? Have you or your colleagues who are senior or principal lecturers up for reappointment this year (including a recent program director in the case of English!) had their terms reduced?

Please let us know.

All best,

Carrie Matthews

Senior Lecturer & Program Director, Interdisciplinary Writing Program

Department of English, UW-Seattle
UW Faculty Forward Steering Committee

From: David S Goldstein davidgs@uw.edu

Carrie, Eva, et al.,

My unit, the School of Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences on the Bothell campus, renewed a competitively-hired full-time lecturer for a five-year contract (longer than her previous appointment, not shorter). Our trend in the last few years has been to renew contracts for lecturer-track faculty members for the same term or longer term, mostly depending on how long the faculty member has been with us. I know of no instance on the Bothell campus—at least not in my unit, which comprises roughly eighty full-time faculty members, about half of whom are in the lecturer track—in which someone was reappointed for a shorter term.

The situation your describing is puzzling, and I sure would want to know who made that decision (the chair?) and why, given that the faculty recommended five-year contract renewals.

David

From: Michael Reagan

Hi all,

At UWT the SIAS faculty council was informed that Provost Baldasty has made changes to temporary faculty at UWT and that these changes are system wide.

These changes include making no new temporary full time hires, moving all temporary full timers to a one-year position, and that part-time lecture hires should be discontinued as much as possible and if done should be made on a competitive basis.

My understanding of these changes are that there are contradictory goals here. While there are no funds for new lecture positions, the goal is to make adjunct work at all UW campuses more regular through competitive longer-term hires to meet on going instructional needs. There is also the possibility for "line-conversations" at some point in the future says the administration. In the meantime, the lecturers who have been with UW on temporary contracts, some for a decade, are now being let go this year. I know of at least one already who is being laid off. And from the information I have, there is no promise for those lectures to be rehired on the new terms, or that there will be funds available for these new competitive lecture positions. Although perhaps someone from the administration can clarify this for us.

thanks,

- Michael

From: Marc D. Servetnick
At UW Bothell, we recommended that Lecturer be reappointed to a 5-year term. She was indeed reappointed to a 5-year term.

Marc Servetnick
Professor and Chair

From: Anne C Bartlett

Dear Michael and all,

There seems to be some confusion here about Lecturers in SIAS at UW Tacoma.

Temporary Lecturers are hired for one year at a time with a limit of three years of employment. See: Temporary Lecturer Full-Time (Formerly Lecturer Full-Time) http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/lecturer-full-time/

Lecturers, Senior Lecturers and Principal Lecturers are competitively hired on multi-year contracts. Our practice is to provide three-year contracts for competitively-hired Full-Time Lecturers until promotion to Senior Lecturer, when we provide five-year contracts.

It is true that the system-wide goal is to hire faculty competitively on multi-year contracts. This may involve requesting multi-year lines to address ongoing needs.

I know of no one in SIAS who is being laid off. It may be that faculty on one-year contracts are ineligible for additional contracts. Currently we are searching for several faculty who will be offered multi-year contracts: See: Lecturer Full-Time (formerly Lecturer, Full-time, Competitive Recruitment, http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/academic-titles-ranks/lecturer-full-time-competitive-recruitment/)

Neither of these scenarios constitutes a layoff.

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify.

Very best wishes,

Anne
From: Lauren Montgomery

At UW Tacoma, we are in the middle of the reappointment process and so can’t yet say if any terms have been shortened this year. In the past years this has not happened, and lecturers were reappointed to the same length, or longer terms. However, it is possible that the administration could shorten recommended contract lengths based on forecasts of demand for courses, and we are engaged in a campus-wide academic planning exercise to assure faculty input on such long term planning.

The hiring changes mentioned below by Michael Beyea, and announced in an SIAS faculty council meeting, were based on a misunderstanding, and were subsequently corrected by the Dean to say that we may still hire temporary lecturers and may offer them longer than 1 year terms. But there is indeed a concerted effort to reduce reliance on temporary positions and to hire lecturers competitively whenever possible.

Lauren Montgomery

SIAS Senior Lecturer

UWT Faculty Assembly Chair

From: Nancy Beadie

Is the English Department sure that the slashed terms are not the result of just one of the many snafus of Workday?

Nancy

From: Ariel E. Wetzel

I am a lecturer at UWT on my third consecutive one-year contract, recently reclassified as "temporary." I received official notice last week that my contract would not be renewed. This may not be called "layoff," but I will be unemployed nonetheless. My major, Writing Studies, continues to rely on non-competitive lecturers to teach first-year writing to fill "emergency" need.
From: Michael Berry

Greetings,

I echo Ariel Wetzel’s sentiments from earlier: while I have not been laid off, my course load at UWT has been gradually diminished: it’s likely that I will no longer be able to continue teaching there.

I have been a part-time lecturer at UW Tacoma since October 2011; I’m also an artist-in-residence at the School of Music on the Seattle campus. I left my position as Associate Professor at Texas Tech University to move to the Pacific Northwest in May of that year. In autumn of 2016, I was asked if I would consider transitioning to a full-time lecturer position at UWT, which I was enthusiastic about. I was later told that there was no money available to hire me on full time, and that such a hire would also require justification for including music classes in the Communications, Art, and Culture program. My classes always fill, and fill quickly: this past summer, my two classes (which are capped at 25 students each) had 39 and 19 students “rejected” (i.e., on a waiting list), respectively. That seems to me to indicate a need (or at least a desire on the part of students) for music classes on campus.

Not long after I was told that there was no funding for a position (early October 2016, if I recall), I saw a job posted for a full-time lecturer in music at UWT. I applied for the position, puzzled as to how there was suddenly money, and made it to the phone interview stage, after which point the search was canceled. A second job description, this one somewhat broader but still centered in Visual and Performing Arts, was announced early in 2017, and I applied for it. The deadline for applications was September 15, with a potential start date as early as winter quarter 2018. I did not even get a phone interview for the second position.

I heard from UWT that next year the division would have to request “extra” money for my position, and that the money may or may not materialize. I’ve been offered one summer class for 2017, and only two classes for the 2018-19 academic year (historically, I’ve taught four).

Michael Berry
Lecturer, UW Tacoma
Subject: Lecturers

From: Alex Morrow

While I appreciate Dean Bartlett's clarification about the terms being used here, as a lecturer at UWT for several years in SIAS, I would encourage everyone to carefully review what is actually happening on the ground. In particular, these two descriptions: "the system-wide goal is to hire faculty competitively on multi-year contracts" and "I know of no one in SIAS who is being laid off." There are numerous faculty at UWT teaching courses that are integral to degree completion, yet there has been precious little concerted effort to convert those positions from temporary to multi-year. For the few that have endured that process, these were individuals finally being recognized for a decade or more of teaching in a temporary capacity. Moreover, the constant fluidity of faculty suggest that informal layoffs occur all the time - forced to leave from lack of opportunity or stability.

I joined the UWT faculty in 2015 to teach courses central to degree completion - Introduction to Social Science and Introduction to Labor Studies. I was, by the way, the fourth lecturer to teach Labor Studies in six years; it is a requirement for the EGLS major. This past year, UWT could not offer me enough courses to even maintain my health insurance let alone pay for the cost of childcare while working. I had no courses in the Fall. There were many courses in the catalog that I could teach or had taught. They were divided among numerous other part-time lecturers. I chose to leave. I suppose technically that does not constitute being "laid off." Though as Ariel points out, this would have been my third year and my position, such as it was, would not have been renewed.

I had a long email exchange with President Caufe about this subject, in which I challenged the stance she has taken on lecturer issues on this listserv. I respectfully suggested that too often members of the administration get on this list to correct, define, or otherwise suggest that UW is doing something to change this situation. I don't think the hiring trends bear this out. Among lecturers, there is no confusion about what is going on.

--

Alex Morrow
Ph.D. | Lecturer | History and Ethnic, Gender, Labor Studies
Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
University of Washington | Tacoma

From: Katie Baird

Dear Colleagues:
It might be useful to hear a longer term perspective to the “temporary” lecture dilemma that my colleague Alex (below) references. I hope (?) it is a problem now particular to only the Tacoma campus. I think a bit of history explains why we are in the situation we find ourselves in today.

Six years ago, faculty and administrative leaders (led by then Provost Cauce) on all three campuses engaged in a series of meetings over the year to tackle the problem of large numbers of “temporary” (or “non-competitively hired”) faculty members. The problem was that these faculty were hired “uncompetitively,” meaning the manner in which they were hired did not meet the criteria for an open and competitive search. Because of that, we could never provide such faculty members with anything other than a one year appointment, nor could they ever be promoted. Their insecure status also made them vulnerable to exploitation. On the Tacoma campus, these faculty accounted for something like 25 percent of all our classes taught.

It was easy for everyone involved to agree that this practice of hiring faculty (primarily from local connections and provided with a one year contract) had little to recommend it; in addition, it was out of compliance with federal equal opportunity laws requiring us to conduct open searches for faculty. After prolonged conversations, Provost Cauce and others on the committee (of which I was a member) decided we would end the practice; all positions with ongoing need would henceforth be converted to a competitive position (either lecturer or tenure track), with the “uncompetitive” or “temporary” (terms used interchangeably) lines reserved for truly emergency conditions where a competitive search was not possible. Even sabbatical replacements were to be replaced with competitively-hired faculty, albeit probably with one-year contracts.

We all knew that transitioning to this new way of hiring faculty was going to be difficult, particularly on the Tacoma campus as so many faculty positions would now be required to be put up for a national search. To this end, Provost Cauce made provisions for the short term continuation of our past practice by allowing the rehiring for temporary faculty for up to three years. This would allow us to phase in our extensive hiring effort, as well as give notice to temporary faculty that their position would be up for a national search.

The expectation in this short term fix was that after three years, all campuses would have converted all non-competitively hired lines into permanent ones (or phased them out), except for clear emergency situations. If in fact any emergency, temporary position wound up with ongoing need, we would immediately convert it to a competitive line requiring an open, competitive search.

As evident from the stream of emails here, we in fact have not phased out this practice, at least not on my campus (Tacoma). While thankfully today we have many fewer temporary (non-competitively hired) faculty positions, we do continue to hire them, and for many, we have continued to renew their contracts, with the three years treated as a maximum allowable rather than as a temporary allowance established six years ago. Not surprisingly, the distinction between competitively-hired versus non-competitively hired faculty is lost on most, and a great deal of
dissatisfaction (as readers on this line can note) remains among non-competitively hired faculty who are repeatedly rehired – until they are not.

In short, while constraints were put in place six years ago to limit our ability to hire non-competitive faculty, this constraint has not been accompanied by a cultural change. And so, our struggle with the temporary status of many of our faculty members -- the exact same struggle that we sought to solve six years ago -- continues.

Best,

Katie

Katie Baird
Professor of Economics

From: Elizabeth Sundermann
I want to thank all who have written, but especially my colleague, Katie Baird, for the history, and Trevor G., for the reminder that the road to hell is oft paved with good intentions.

I worked with Katie and other faculty and administration across the system to make what we saw as important, more ethical, and lasting changes a few years back. As both Katie and Trevor note, such changes were not as important or more ethical in the long term: Without a culture change, they were splints (?) to a broken system. I, personally, greatly benefitted from these changes but have been frustrated and a heart-broken they didn't make a bigger/longer-term difference, especially as I see current colleagues suffer.

So, my ask to all: what are we going to do now? Seriously, we need to tackle these (lecturer) issues again. UWT (and UW) is too good a place, imo, to not address these challenges to higher education, labor rights, and our personal colleagues, not to mention our students.

From: Rania Hussein
First, I want to thank all who raised or contributed to this important discussion. I also thank Elizabeth for her call to action.

I want to share my experience at UW Bothell to shed some light on issues that may be relevant to others in any of the 3 campuses.
I started in 2012 as a part time lecturer of electrical engineering then was switched to an annual full time non-competitive contract in 2014. My 3 years as full time ended last spring and then I was switched back to the part time status.

Between 2015 and 2017, I applied to 3 searches for full time competitive hire (4 openings at Bothell and 1 at Tacoma) but didn’t get any of them. I want to mention that I joined UW with a solid teaching experience under my belt so my performance has been very good with high students rating in the course evaluations. However, I’ll put that aside, will assume that my teaching experience only started when I joined the UW system, and will ask a question. Isn’t my work experience at UW supposed to develop me to be a competitive educator and give me the experience I need to secure a full time position when there’s an opening especially in my own university? If not then does this mean that the years put were a waste of time with no return other than a temporary status?

As a result, I realized that I should look for other opportunities elsewhere and decided to test the water in the industry and so I spoke with 2 headhunters about my options. I was basically told that being in a teaching position for a long time doesn’t translate to an appropriate industry experience. I know that many would debate this and say maybe I couldn’t sell myself well and this may be true and which brings me to more questions. Are there resources to develop the part time/ temporary faculty professionally so that they can find another job when the university no longer needs them? Are there some sort of coaching or career services like those offered to students to help us part-time/ temporary faculty transition to other opportunities?

Moving on, in fall 2017, Bothell offered me a “multi-year part time competitive position”. It guarantees “at least 66%” of employment which means teaching at least 2 courses every quarter. So under this “competitive” contract I can work for more than 66%, up to 99% (1% shy of a full time status). This means at a minimum I’ll be teaching 6 courses per academic year (excluding summer) with potentially teaching the same or exceed what a full time lecturer typically teach. However, I will be holding a part time status and be paid per course. Additionally, this position is not eligible for voting and is not promotable. I wonder what is the significance of labeling such contracts as “competitive” if they don’t translate to a fair status that allows career growth.

As many faculty, I have always put the quality of instruction and the best interest of my students first and gave the job 100% dedication. I admit that being in the classroom has been a source of joy to me and the recognition I received from my students in the course evaluations, and being a finalist for the 2017 distinguished teaching award at UWB, have been flattering. I joined UW seeking a career growth so I don’t want to think that I shot myself in the foot because of my commitment and dedication. I speak for myself but maybe there are others in the same boat.
Apparantly many of our colleagues who are involved in the making of policies are on this list and so I’m sharing my experience for two reasons:

1. To raise awareness of serious issues that can affect people’s careers in a negative way especially those whose work at the University is their primary job. This doesn’t pertain to issues facing temporary/ part time lecturers only but potentially to full time lecturers as well.

2. Be part of the solution. All efforts to address the issues faced by lecturers are definitely appreciated and no doubt that the policies made had the best intention at heart. I believe that solutions should stem from answering a simple question “how important is the role of lecturers to the university and to students?”. Addressing the question frankly and without any sugar coating will be a great start in changing the culture in my opinion. In response to Elizabeth’s question of what we should do, Maybe a first step is to form or join a committee of faculty who are interested in these particular issues and brainstorm ideas and actions? If anyone prefers to discuss offline please feel free to email me at this email or at raniahussein@gmail.com. I’m happy to be part of any serious effort.

I hope that the discussions on this listserv translate into action plans otherwise it’ll become a forum to vent frustrations without a tangible change.

Thanks all for your time reading my lengthy email and have a great winter break.

Rania Hussein, Ph.D.
Lecturer- part time
Electrical engineering, school of STEM
UW Bothell.

From: Elizabeth Simmons-O’Neill

Dear All,

Thank you to colleagues raising concerns about systemic problems faced by lecturers at UW.

Following up on Rania Hussein’s post, the threat to full time lecturers is not just a potential problem. The competitive multi-year lectureships several colleagues have mentioned as a solution are already under attack. In my department, Senior and Principal lecturers -- colleagues who were hired in competitive national searches, and have provided decades of meritorious service to the University -- have unexpectedly found their reappointment terms reduced by 40% (from five years to just three).
Sharing information, as we have begun to do here, is one way to begin to take action. Carrie Matthews and Eva Cherniavsky's listserv message of December 16, pasted in below, outlines the situation in English, and ends by asking list members: "What is happening in your departments? Have you or your colleagues who are senior or principal lecturers up for reappointment this year (including a recent program director in the case of English!) had their terms reduced? Please let us know."

Elizabeth Simmons-O'Neill
Principal Lecturer, English and Interdisciplinary Writing
Associate Director, Expository Writing Program
UW - Seattle

From: Michael Honey

Colleagues,

As a founding faculty of UWT (1990) I'd like to add something to this string of posts about the unfairness of what happens to non-tenure track faculty. We at UWT were expanding like mad for many years, until now we are not; we had funding from the legislature, until now we don't. But we never had adequate funding even as our student body and our curriculum expanded. We tried to find ways as a faculty to expand our ranks with what resources we could muster.

As one example of the problem we face, our Ethnic, Gender and Labor Studies Major at UWT remains robust, but we have not been able to get funding to add much needed faculty positions. During years or quarters when faculty (I originally taught most of the labor studies courses) went on leave with fellowships or course buy outs to do research, we were able at times to bring in younger scholars like Alex Morrow. I always thought that a full-time tenure track or lecturer position to bolster our labor studies courses would open up that he and others could compete for. The demand among our diverse, largely working-class student population for EGLS courses is always there. But, as Alex points out, in this we have been disappointed, time and again.

I wonder, as older faculty leave the system whether their courses will be replaced; will part of our curriculum simply collapse? Already, some of our most important courses aren't taught often enough to allow students with an EGLS major to graduate in a timely way. Why do we live in a state full of some of the world's richest millionaires and billionaires and our economy is growing fabulously, yet we can't adequately fund either K-12 or higher education? I think we know the answer. It is part of the systemic crisis of a retrograde tax system. We can't fix the problem of providing faculty and courses adequate to the needs of our students without also addressing that systemic crisis. We need a strategy.

Where do we go from here? I'm sorry to pose this question without a clear answer.

All best regards to everyone, Michael Honey, UWT
From: Carrie Matthews

Dear Colleagues,

It would be nice if our response to funding woes were not to cannibalize young faculty and to imperil long-serving faculty in non-tenure-track positions. Whatever the good intentions (and, I know, a LOT of work over many years by many people), these things seem to be true:

1. Some "temporary" (a new designation, I believe?) faculty with years of teaching and service at UW are offered the opportunity to compete in a national search for their positions. Some aren't.

2. For those offered the opportunity, there seems to be uncertainty about how much their teaching and service at UW (and accompanying institutional knowledge) is valued in comparison to, say, the scholarly promise of a newly minted PhD who has not yet labored for years in a teaching-intensive position without support for research.

3. For those not offered the opportunity to shift from "noncompetitive" to "competitive" positions, questions have been raised about professional development opportunities available during their tenure (pun intended) at UW. (In other words, are we unwittingly facilitating this national "churning" phenomenon?)

4. Some part-time UW faculty are not offered sufficient teaching to afford health insurance or to pay for child care.

5. On the particular issue Eva and I posted about--reappointment terms for 'competitively' hired full-time lecturers--here's what I think I know:

Some senior and principal lecturers on five-year contracts in other departments (not only in English) on the UW Seattle campus who were up for reappointment for this year have also had their reappointment terms slashed to three years. Additionally, we have a couple reports of lecturers on three-year contracts having had their reappointment terms cut to two years and to one year, respectively.

Other 'competitive' lecturers up for reappointment this year (at all ranks, on all three campuses) report having received the expected term of reappointment.
No one has provided a rationale for the cuts to reappointment terms or for the disparities among terms of reappointment. For the instances where we have data, we know that the department recommended the usual term of reappointment or a longer term. (Thanks to those of you who emailed me privately, too; I understand the sense of risk in posting publicly.)

Given the public-facing emails about UW's successful fundraising campaigns, I wonder if the state legislature is aware of the situation of so many UW faculty members? After all, the vast majority of faculty at UW are in contingent rather than tenure-track positions.

Apologies for any errors I've made here: corrections and additional information welcomed!

All best,
Carrie

Carrie Matthews
Senior Lecturer & Program Director, Interdisciplinary Writing Program
Department of English, UW-Seattle
UW Faculty Forward Steering Committee

On Thu, Dec 28, 2017 at 5:12 PM, Michael K. Honey <mhoney@uw.edu> wrote:

Colleagues,

As a founding faculty of UWT (1990) I'd like to add something to this string of posts about the unfairness of what happens to non-tenure track faculty. We at UWT were expanding like mad for many years, until now we are not; we had funding from the legislature, until now we don't. But we never had adequate funding even as our student body and our curriculum expanded. We tried to find ways as a faculty to expand our ranks with what resources we could muster.

From: Philip Bereano

It's not just finances, Michael. Ideology also comes into play at times.

None of my courses were continued after I retired. Not surprising since advisers in the College of Engineering never suggested them to students. Somehow, in this age of frantic technological change, understanding the social dimensions of those processes or assessing the impacts to variously affected groups is de-emphasized in this environment as "sending the wrong message" regarding the activities
and products of powerful donors. As we see reflected in the various actions of the Trump administration, it is "burdensome" to industry to deal with environmental and social impacts. I know the College was under pressure to get me silenced, altho my work was recognized elsewhere in the US and abroad.

Maybe the Ds now controlling the Legislature will be more sympathetic, Michael.

Phil Bereano
***************************
Philip L. Bereano
Professor Emeritus
Technology and Public Policy
University of Washington
Seattle, Wash. 98195
***************************

Subject: Op.Ed. Article in today’s NYT by Bruni
From: Bob Charlson

Hello all,

I imagine that there are at least a few readers of this website who do not subscribe to the NY Times, and in any case, what Bruni said today certainly rang a bell for me. We, the faculty of a fine university, badly need to improve our image. The UW is more than a football team, and we need to demonstrate that so that the public support us. Read on, and add your remarks! Bob Charlson

\ SundayReview | OP-ED COLUMNIST

Higher Ed’s Low Moment

Frank Bruni DEC. 30, 2017
Continue reading the main storyShare This Page
When all was said and done, the tax overhaul that President Trump signed into law a little more than a week ago didn’t beat up on higher education to the extent that earlier drafts of the legislation did. Americans who were deducting interest on student loans will still be able to do so. The tuition waivers that many graduate students receive won’t be treated as income.

But that doesn’t change the fact that those facets of the tax code, meant to promote and reward advanced learning, were up for debate. Or that the House of Representatives initially passed a bill that would have eliminated such incentives for the acquisition of bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degrees. Or that the law ultimately did create new taxes on the endowments of the richest schools.

Or this unsettling, dangerous paradox: At a time when a college degree is one of the surest harbingers of higher earnings and better economic security, college itself is regarded with skepticism by many Americans and outright contempt by no small number of them.

Its tumble from grace came into sharp focus in 2017, so the end of this year is a fitting moment to examine what happened and how to fix it. Repair is imperative, because the continued competitiveness of the American economy depends on the skills of our work force, the intellectual nimbleness of our citizens, the boldness of our scientific research and the genius of our inventions. Our colleges and universities are central to that. When they lose support, we all lose.

Just how far they’ve fallen was suggested by a Pew survey this year that sent shock waves through the world of higher education. Asked if colleges were having a positive or negative effect on America, 58 percent of Republicans and conservative-leaning independents said negative. That was up from just 37 percent two years earlier.

A Gallup poll found that only 44 percent of all Americans had a “great deal” or “quite a lot” of confidence in the country’s colleges and universities, while 56 percent had only “some” or “very little.” College — once a great aspiration — was now a polarizing question mark.

That’s not so surprising, given Americans’ intensifying resentment of anything that smacks of elitism and given Republicans’ attacks on science and intellectuals. As Ron Daniels, the president of Johns Hopkins University, recently told me, “Even if we were completely unblemished in the way in which we pursued our mission, it would be hard to imagine that in Trump’s America, we wouldn’t be targets for scorn.”

Margaret Spellings, who was education secretary in the George W. Bush administration and is now president of the University of North Carolina, said that colleges are plenty blemished and that this reckoning was years in the making. Too many of them had maintained too aloof a posture.
Spellings told me that when she read the headline atop a mid-December article in Politico — “University presidents: We’ve been blindsided” — she thought, “Where have you been, girlfriend?”

My conversations with Spellings, Daniels and Hiram Chodosh, president of Claremont McKenna College, actually filled me with hope, because not one of them was baffled by the bind that colleges are in. All of them conceded some culpability. And all of them identified, and expressed a commitment to, necessary changes.

“The tax proposals, though self-defeating, emerge from an understandable and growing public frustration,” Chodosh said. “Let’s face it. Like the general society, we have an increasing divide in higher education between the haves and the have-nots. Our sticker price is high.” He added that “our policies are opaque, confusing and tend to squeeze out middle-class families who are unaware, or just above the line, of eligibility for aid. Even among the privileged, few can get in.”

Chodosh’s “our” refers to America’s most exclusive colleges, with the lowest acceptance rates, and one problem, fostered by those of us in the media as much as anyone else, is an undue obsession with those schools to the exclusion of others. Higher education encompasses community colleges, technical schools and scores of public universities without storied names. They educate exponentially more students than the Ivy League does, and our lopsided conversation about the Ivy and its ilk have deepened the divisions that Chodosh mentioned.

But then so have exclusive colleges’ recruitment and admissions practices, which overlooked students from middle-class and poor backgrounds to a point where, according to a study released this year, many of the celebrated schools, like Yale and Princeton, had more students from families in the top 1 percent of income than students from families in the bottom 60 percent.

But that study used college data through 2011; since then, many colleges have expanded their efforts at socioeconomic diversity. And college presidents are both publicly and privately voluble about their need to keep improving on that. To wit: More than 85 colleges — including Hopkins, U.N.C., Claremont McKenna and all eight Ivies — have joined the American Talent Initiative, promoted by Michael Bloomberg and unveiled at the end of 2016. These colleges have committed to increasing their percentages of students from low- and moderate-income families.

I also hear more college presidents talking with more concern about their campuses’ images as enclaves of a distinctly illiberal liberalism. Especially ugly episodes this year at Middlebury College and The Evergreen State College fed that impression and, I think, increased many presidents’ resolve to do something about it.
Daniels bluntly acknowledged “the lack of political diversity on our campuses,” saying, “Not only is this bad for our students in terms of preparing them for leadership roles in a very politically polarized country, but it has grave consequences for broader political debate in the country.” He mentioned a new facet of orientation for incoming students at Hopkins that stresses the importance of free speech, drawing on experts from across the political spectrum. Other colleges have taken similar steps.

They’re trying to explain themselves better — a simple, obvious thing that somehow fell by the wayside over recent decades. Not all Americans accept on faith the value of higher education to individual students and to society as a whole. Not all Americans understand how universities function as vital engines of many cities’ and states’ economies or as cradles of the very innovation that keeps America great.

“Higher education has enjoyed this sort of send-us-the-money, leave-us-alone luxury for a long time, and that’s just not the case anymore,” Spellings said. “We’ve got to prove what we do.” If 2017 was the year when our most celebrated colleges belatedly woke up to that, may 2018 be the year when they successfully attend to it.

From: Pedro Verdugo verdugo@uw.edu

After 30 plus years of teachers’ low salaries, bureaucratized, and poorly funded K-12 education, what kind of appreciation can low income high school or middle school’s graduates have for science, culture, and art, which are the hallmark of our universities?

Since mediaeval times the ruling classes have known that keeping laypeople ignorant makes it easy to control them. Starting with the arrival of slavery to this land, the far right learn very well this rule. Present government, and the majority in congress are now not hiding any longer their concern for education as dangerous, not to be funded, and accessible only to does who can pay; it’s a market commodity.

Universities need more than ever, to reach out and eventually create programs that will allow a whole section of the country to learn that our campuses can empower and make them better citizens.

When K-12 teachers become as well paid as physicians, engineers, or attorneys; and admission to the colleges of education becomes as hard as medical college, high schools will produce fellow citizens that will “know better” and value our campuses. In a society ruled by market, you get what you pay for. With few exceptions, low pay often equals negative selection.

In the meantime—even if it isn’t our traditional mission—universities, across the whole country, need to reach out; create curriculums, like the recently started certification programs, that’ll give access and empower kids that otherwise don’t have opportunities to a better paid work force, and who eventually will become the best advocates of our campuses. For as long as there is a section of our people that remains poorly educated and with no access to college, resentment for our universities as elitist and foreign to the life of most Americans, will certainly endure.
Subject: “Temporary” Lecturers

From: Dan Jacoby

Making good policy regarding lecturers has been a top priority of the AAUP chapter for at least 6 years. The faculty have been unable to execute the impressive recommendations of the 2014 tri-campus lecturers task force supervised by then Senate Chair Kate O’Neill.

That task force wrote, "we do not differentiate between part-time and full-time lecturers because we think that the reasons appropriate, open and competitive searches are generally best practice for recruiting lecturers to fill full-time positions hold equally true for recruiting lecturers to fill most part-time positions.[1] The distinction between full- and part-time lecturers should turn on the instructional need and not on the caliber of the lecturer or the hiring process.... [and further] note that UW Faculty Code does not have a separate title for part-time and full[-time lecturers].”

Instead, the administration has issued periodic guidelines. The faculty as a whole has apparently not chose to deliberate these policies believing that it more important to deal with “low hanging fruit” involving full-time lecturer policies. Those policies are important, but they are likely to remain a smaller component of the lecturer

While we all know and appreciate the motivations underlying competitive searches—current guidelines create two major grey areas. 1) As noted “temporary lecturers” serving for 3 years at more >.5FTE will not be reappointed without search, but no search is guaranteed. 2) In the absence of search it appears that those “temporary” part-time lecturers may instead be appointed infinitely to < .5FTE positions where they would join other lecturers who may teach as many as four courses per year while enjoying the status of “temporary” part-time lecturers. The job classification and guidelines on this point are actually vague (they appear below). However they are surely inconsistent with the 2014 Tri-campus Task Force recommendations.
I happily agree with Katie Beard on almost everything else she says, but with respect to the raw numbers of part-time faculty it is not clear that they are going down, nor that new job classifications may not be supplanting old ones. There are two main reasons it is important to address the temporary” part-time lecturer issue. First, these faculty play an important part in our instructional force and it looks like we are potentially creating alienated permanent underclass that will be deprived of benefits, opportunities for promotion, and avenues for effective participation. Second, as important as EEO search is, the available data suggests that there are a significant number of part-time faculty who have been hire for long periods, and at some point, the burden needs to shift from employee to the institution for failure to regularize positions so as to allow for promotions and other job rights.

You may ask why this is of importance to the AAUP? We are the national body most influential in securing conditions that foster academic freedom through tenure. For a long time, our prevailing rule was that faculty rehired for longer than 7 years should be granted de facto tenure. Obviously, educational hiring in the US has increasingly bypassed this doctrine. However, unless faculty with tenure speak out for their colleagues we are likely to see further erosion that will affect us all. It would be helpful for faculty to write to the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) where lecturer legislation is currently under discussion.

Dan Jacoby
AAUP, President
Member FCFA

Lecturer Part-Time – Temporary (formerly Lecturer Part-time)

Appointment Details

- Title: Lecturer Part-Time – Temporary (formerly Lecturer, Part-time)
- Service Period: 3, 6, 9 or 12 months
- Limitations on Appointment: Lecturer Part-Time – Temporary is an instructional title that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles (Faculty Code Section 24-34 B).
- Length of Appointment: May be on an annual part-time basis, or quarter-by-quarter up to 100%. Part-time appointment as lecturer is for the period stated in the letter of appointment. (Faculty Code Section 24-41 B).
  - Pursuant to the Provost's Guidelines for the Appointment of Full-Time and Part-Time Lecturers, if appointed on or after September 16, 2016, and appointment renewal on a quarter to quarter basis
leads to the equivalent of an annual appointments at 50% or greater, reappointment is limited to three consecutive academic years.

- If appointed prior to September 16, 2016, on an annual basis at 50% or greater or on a quarter to quarter basis that has led to the equivalent of annual appointments at 50% or greater, the appointment as Part-time Lecturer cannot be extended beyond the 2018-19 academic year, unless an exception is approved.

- Eligible for tenure: No
- **Voting Rights**: No
- Salary Requirements: Must meet University minimum
- Full-time/Part-time: Part-time
- Promotable Title: No
- Competitive Recruitment Required: No

**Provosts Guidelines for Lecturer Part-time—Temporary**

http://ap.washington.edu/ahr/policies/lecturer-guidelines/

**Lecturer Part-Time – Temporary**

- Formerly Job Class Code 0185
- If appointed on or after September 16, 2016, and appointment renewal on a quarter to quarter basis leads to the equivalent of an annual appointments at 50% or greater, reappointment is limited to three consecutive academic years.
- If appointed prior to September 16, 2016, on an annual basis at 50% or greater FTE or on a quarter to quarter basis that has led to the equivalent of annual appointments at 50% or greater FTE, the appointment as Lecturer Part-Time – Temporary cannot be extended beyond the 2018-19 academic year, unless an exception is approved.
- An exception to this limitation may be granted by the Office of the Provost in the case of an individual who has been in the appointment for ten or more years based on a request from a dean or chancellor supported by evidence that the faculty member (1) meets the unit’s instructional needs, and (2) has been evaluated as demonstrating consistently meritorious performance. These requests should articulate an exceptional circumstance where a competitive recruitment would be detrimental to the unit, its mission, and/or the faculty member who has long held the appointment.
- Notice of appointment limitations should be included in the offer letter and the reappointment letter, if applicable
The decision about whether an open search ought to be conducted should depend on careful planning and definition of the instructional need or position. We recognize that some part-time appointments are part-time because they are designed to fill short-term, temporary needs, as in the case when a faculty member is on leave. It may be appropriate to make those appointments without open searches especially in those instances where the need was not foreseen and there is not time to search. We think those kinds of part-time appointments are quite distinguishable from part-time appointments that may be used to cobble together an array of fairly regular course offerings that might be taught by one or more full-time lecturers. We also think that the temporary part-time appointment is distinguishable from the ongoing, regular, part-time appointment.

From: Trevor Griffey

Hi all,

The below email exchange perfectly illustrates how policies supposedly intended to do something to address the deprofessionalization of college faculty can make things worse rather than better if they are not accompanied by an increased investment in faculty salaries.

In the below example, it appears that UW Tacoma is firing lecturers with job experience. And to whatever degree that it cannot convert those lecturer lines to more stable and professional positions, it is therefore replacing experienced lecturers with new lecturers.

In the University of California system, the American Federation of Teachers has identified a practice it calls "churning"—whereby a requirement that departments provide multi-year contracts to lecturers who have taught more than 6 years has resulted in UC departments firing its lecturers before they get to year 5 or 6, and replacing them with fresh young recruits to fill the same position.

Also in California, the state legislature has limited the number of courses that lecturers can teach at any community college to three, supposedly to prevent schools from replacing tenure track faculty with adjuncts. But since legislators have not provided a dedicated revenue stream to increase tenure density, community college administrators have instead simply increased the number of adjunct faculty they use, while paying them wages that ensure that they will have to teach at multiple schools to make a living.

All of these practices create a pseudo-reform at the expense of not just faculty but students, because they punish teaching expertise and undermine faculty morale. There is little or no financial benefit to replacing experienced lecturers with inexperienced ones, since schools without faculty unions (like the UW) usually don't give COLAs to its non-tenure track instructors let alone provide them raises. Similarly, there may be no financial benefit to preventing part-time lecturers from teaching three courses per quarter, if reducing lecturers' workload simply results in hiring more lecturers. And there is little pedagogical benefit to privileging inexperienced teachers over experienced ones.

Why then implement these kinds of reforms? I think it's because schools are addicted to disposable
faculty, but ashamed of their addiction. They want to increase or reduce the number of faculty based upon last-minute student enrollment figures, but they don't like it when people point out that hiring someone for 10-20 years on quarter-to-quarter or year-to-year contracts seems unethical. If certain classes of faculty are classified as "temporary", however, and are automatically terminated after a certain number of years, then it de-personalizes the exploitation, and becomes less difficult to treat colleagues whom you like and respect as disposable.

UW's commitment to increasing the use of open searches and providing increased job security to lecturers is commendable. But it should also be cognizant that limitations upon how many years lecturers may teach, if not complemented by real financial commitments to improve teaching lines, will have the effect of punishing experienced teachers and reducing the quality of instruction.

Trevor Griffey