Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Announcements
3. Review of the Minutes from January 7, 2014
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) Announcements

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.

The Class A legislation which was sent to SEC passed and has been forwarded to the Faculty Senate. There was discussion about changing the length of time of Class B legislation from 21 to 14 days but the concerns were resolved. The term “signed” was removed because faculty members now use electronic balloting. An additional change was made to clarify that the 5% objection to Class B legislation is not specific to just one section of the proposed changes, but to anything within the legislation itself. Watts reported that he did not express any objections to the changes since he felt that FCFA would have supported the adjustments.

Watts explained that SEC discussed Section 22.44.D (Terms of Senators) which addressed vacating the seats of Senators who have been absent for 3 Senate meetings without being excused. SEC agreed that if a Senator has 3 unexcused absences then the Secretary should contact the individual unit to explain they no longer serve in the Faculty Senate. The unit will then be required to conduct its own election to fill the vacant seat. Watts explained that this allows the Faculty Senate to control quorum at meetings. Concern was raised about the nature of elections for individual units. Discussion ensued. Individual units coordinate the election of their Senators and report the results to the Secretary of the Faculty.

Watts reviewed a preliminary draft regarding faculty salary raises. The code language was pretty thin without incorporating some of the major issues. Watts is having conversations with Jack Lee (Chair of the Faculty Senate) and Jack Johnson (President’s Chief of Staff) and will invite a member from the council to help with drafting code language.

3) Approval of the Minutes from January 7, 2014

The minutes from January 7, 2014 were approved as written.
4) Professor of Practice

Watts mentioned that Cameron is not present but will be able to answer any questions that come out of today’s meeting.

Concern was raised that the examples of Professors of Practice (PoP) provided by Cameron lacked diversity. For example, all the individuals were white men. Concern was raised that the PoP position could be subject to external influences. Discussion ensued.

Watts summarized a variety of concerns that have been addressed in the past, including:

- Does this position exist elsewhere on campus?
- Would this position lead to erosion of tenure?
- What voting rights should this new position have?

A question was raised asking why UW needs this new position. The Board of Deans originally asked for this job classification. Additionally, this position occurs across the country amongst peer institutions. Concern was raised that UW needs to make sure PoP stays separate from other faculty ranks. Discussion ensued. Voting rights are similar to research faculty in which PoP can vote on appointments, and vote on departmental business. Watts clarified that PoP cannot vote on reappointments. The proposal also indicates PoP can participate in merit reviews. Discussion ensued about the general role PoP would play at the UW. The primary role of PoP is to teach while revitalizing the department.

Concern was raised PoP’s elsewhere were individuals appointed by Presidents of the institutions. A comment was raised stating any PoP candidates at UW should not be selected in a similar fashion.

Section 21-32.A

A question was raised asking why PoP and Principal Lecturers are included on the same line within the Faculty Code. Discussion ensued. Council members expressed confusion that the PoP appointment was supposed to be tied to promotion for lecturers. Discussion ensued. The council had a long conversation about this issue and PoP is not connected to a ladder position. Concern was still raised that having the two positions on the same line indicates PoPs are ranked like a Principal Lecturer. Discussion ensued about the definition of the PoP appointment compared to current job classifications. Concern was raised that putting PoP parallel with Principal Lecturers sends a message which is not fulfilled in later provisions within the Faculty Code. Discussion ensued about where to list PoP amongst the faculty ranks.

PoP is currently listed below Research Assistant Professor but above Full-time Principal Lecturer. A question was raised asking about the meaning of the order in both Section 21-32. Discussion ensued. One reason the order matters is when faculty members are conducting merit evaluations. Discussion ensued about who votes for tenure-track faculty, the rationale for designating voting rights and how the rankings are described in the Faculty Code.

Watts asked members if PoP should be allowed to vote as members of the faculty. A comment was raised that the council will need to address concerns about the corporatizing of UW. For example, these individuals may have values antithetical towards academic culture. Additionally, many people will be confused about the infusion of corporate values into the UW community. Although council members do not hold these feelings, the council should anticipate this argument because it will be likely some faculty
members will object to this proposal on these grounds of corporatizing academia. Discussion ensued with members providing their personal experiences in debating this issue with peers. Concern was raised that allowing PoP to participate in merit reviews can affect salaries of tenure-track faculty.

Section 21-32.D (Proposed)

Within this section PoP is listed as having fewer rights than Research Professor. Watts clarified that PoP would not vote on any faculty promotions. A comment was raised that PoP should be located on the bottom every list within the Faculty Code. Discussion ensued about PoP voting rights. Concern was raised about PoP’s ability to vote on merit. For example, a candidate who comes from industry or the military who knows nothing about academics should not vote on the merit of faculty members. Discussion ensued about PoPs exerting their persuasion and influence.

A question was raised asking how PoP candidates would come to UW. PoP could come to the UW from a competitive search or as an offer from an outside company. Concern was raised that offers from companies would be controversial. Watts explained that this is not different than what is currently happening and the Office of Advancement is aware of these concerns. Discussion ensued. There are many types of permutations that could result from this position, but in the end the department has to vote on the decision to accept the PoP candidate. Concern was raised that the department could be bribed to accept PoP candidates.

A comment was raised that while faculty votes are required they are sometimes just viewed as advisory without any decision-making authority. Discussion ensued about the differences of hiring new faculty members and voting outcomes. Some departments work differently than others. Concern was raised that the PoP position would encourage political appointments where deans would provide favors for other deans. Additionally, it is possible that a department chair could be influential in accepting a PoP candidate if they are adamant in adding the individual to the department.

Discussion moved back to PoP voting on personnel matters. Council members did not voice objection to allowing PoP to vote on personnel matters, but concern was raised about participating in merit reviews. PoP would be treated like other faculty and it is up to the department to determine how they participate. Discussion ensued. The council should propose a solution to find out why PoP can participate in the merit review process since they are coming to the UW under new circumstances. Concern was raised that PoP should not participate in merit reviews when it is tied to salary increases for traditional faculty members. Watts explained that UW needs to balance the needs of the institution while at the same time respecting the people who are being hired. Concern was raised that UW needs to identify a mechanism that prevents bad teachers who are brought in simply because they are considered “distinguished” in their field. Additionally, UW would need to provide a mechanism to review these individuals to ensure they are effective at their duties. While reappointment is every 5 years, concern was raised that departments would be stuck with these individuals for 5 years until they are removed.

Section 24-35 (Proposed)

This section would be a new addition to the Faculty Code which acts as the job description of PoP candidates. Discussion ensued. “Distinguished” is a broad term which will be interpreted differently by each department. Concern was raised that UW should avoid situations in which retiring members of Congress are brought in who do not hold the same values as the institution, similar to a recent example
at a peer institution. A question was raised asking the definition of a “distinguished practitioner”. The term signifies that the individual contributed to a major impact within their field. The challenge to drafting the PoP job description is difficult because the council does not want to over-specify. A suggestion was raised to ask Cameron about how the language will protect unit faculty against undesired PoP appointments. A comment was raised that UW will not likely turn down a member of Congress who is a PoP candidate. Discussion ensued. Having a member of Congress would be useful for both students and the institution. Concern was raised that while it is fine to have a PoP in a department who is “distinguished”, UW needs to ensure the individual is not on the books for solely for grant purposes, but with the goal to teach and develop programs. A comment was raised that defining “distinguished” and “practitioner” will always be debated, not matter what.

The PoP position would not be acquired through service and appointments are not to exceed 5 years. AAUP has expressed displeasure about this appointment type because it is a non-tenured position which could erode tenured-faculty. For example, if UW had 50 of these positions on campus it would effectively erode tenure. However, the protection against this problem hinges on the “distinguished” requirement described in the job classification. Discussion ensued about different job classifications at UW. Concern was raised that PoP candidates should do real work but questions remain if there is a way to ensure that in the job description. In most cases it is up to the individual unit to ensure the PoP is doing the job they were hired to do.

All faculty members can vote on the renewal of PoP. Discussion ensued about how departments vote differently. It is likely that if a dean has a candidate in mind they will discuss the prospect with the department before being formally introduced. The college chair would then discuss this with the faculty. Discussion ensued if this would actually happen and if faculty members would vote on it because some department chairs work differently than others. A question was raised if renewal should be considered by the entire department. If these individuals are coming to UW to teach it makes sense that the people who are experts in teaching should determine if the department’s mission is benefiting from the PoP. Watts explained that the administration would likely respond that this form of renewing PoP would be recruitment difficult. A comment was raised that there are many types of faculty within departments who play different roles and they should all be involved when reviewing PoP.

Concern was raised that PoPs could be brought into a department to teach high-demand courses that lecturers want to teach. A question was raised asking why UW should allow that to happen. Watts explained that PoP are supposed to be very distinguished within their field and the reason they will be recruited is to improve undergraduate courses. Lecturers would have the ability to vote on their appointment so they could have the ability to address that concern. If this becomes a significant problem then the Faculty Senate could address the issue.

Watts asked the council if the section should still be included. There were no objections.

Section 24-41.F.5.1 (Proposed)

This new section would address PoP reviews and reappointments. Discussion ensued. The proposal states that the dean shall determine whether the appointment shall be renewed and inform the faculty member in writing of the decision. A renewal decision is not required where an initial appointment is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the same time of appointment and not eligible for renewal. This addition would also apply to Research Associate Professors and Research Professors. A
question was raised asking the reason why the PoP position is identified as subject to renewal. Watts will pass on this question for Cameron to answer.

Watts asked council members if they are in agreement that this proposal should go forward. While FCFA does not have a choice, they can have some influence on the decision. Discussion ensued. A comment was raised that the PoP position can be advantageous for students and the university.

Section 24-57.A

This addition to the code would provide for annual collegial evaluations for Associate Professors, Professors, Senior Lecturers, Principal Lecturers and PoP. A comment was raised that this adds PoP alongside more senior ranks. By forcing annual teaching reviews units might be persuaded to keep the number of PoP low within their departments.

5) Adjourn

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