****

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes**

May 16, 2017 1:30-2:30pm CP 206 C

***Present:*** *Sarah Hampson, Marian Harris, Greg Benner, Jennifer Heckman, Susan Johnson.* ***Excused:*** *D.C. Grant, Jim Thatcher.* ***Guest/Sub:*** *Monika Sobolewska.*

1. **Consent Agenda**

The April 18, 2017 Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes were approved.

Chair’s Report and Discussion Items:

1. **Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments** *Appendix A*

FAC members reported on whether or not they had received feedback from their units:

* SIAS – See Appendix A. SIAS faculty’s main concern was how the wording may impact the practices, i.e. will the words impact the practices in a negative way that is not intended?
	+ FAC will review SIAS’s feedback and highlight key points
	+ The faculty involved in the Unionization effort put forth a letter that included concerns about non-competitive faculty appointments as well. It is possible that part of SIAS’s reaction to the proposed policy was due to how SIAS reacted to aforementioned letter, as well as, other political/climate things going on in SIAS
	+ SIAS encountered a “catch 22;” in wanting to comply with policy, they requested a competitively hired lecture but were not given one. Since they need to fill these courses with instructors (these courses are deemed essential) they will most likely be filled with part-time lecturers.
* IT- An early draft of the proposed policy was shared with IT several months ago, but at the time, IT faculty did not share any feedback. The next draft be brought back to IT faculty, as well.
	+ Monika shared that she made a request to her Dean for EC/FAC to be on the agenda at every faculty meeting in order to update and share proposed policies, etc.
	+ IT relies on part-time faculty who come to teach as industry professionals
	+ They are also using part-time faculty to fill classes when they don’t have enough full-time faculty; they are growing too fast to catch up with full-time faculty

FAC members agreed that the next iteration of this policy won’t be ready for review until the next academic year. It is a work in progress. Chair, Marian Harris, will communicate this to EC and Faculty Assembly leadership. FAC members discussed the following aspects of this policy:

* The turnaround on a competitive hire is about a year to 1.5 years; thus, an academic unit would have to begin that process immediately upon filling the position with a non-competitively hired person to follow this policy.
* Continued concerns about unintended consequences, namely, more reliance on part-time lectures because the competitive-hire process is lengthy and often doesn’t get filled due to budgetary constraints
* \*Add language to this policy for bringing in “clinical” instructors and other unique instructional needs, i.e. “exceptions can be made for clinical and professional adjunct faculty” to broadly address both.

**ACTION:** Chair, Marian Harris will follow up with Jim Thatcher, Urban Studies representative, who volunteered to include \*new language into the policy.

1. **Representative from SW/CJ Program for 2017-2018**

Gillian Marshall will represent SW&CJ during 2017-2018 while Marian Harris is on sabbatical. FA Administration will contact her with committee information.

1. [**Climate Survey**](https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/file/download/79460ea3ddbf8287d2e7d9632a6e7bfbd1a958d86cef6a0c28a80d2ae1e5c01d?inline=1) – *Marian Harris*

Richard Wilkinson, Associate Vice Chancellor for Organizational Effectiveness and Development, is supportive of the Rankin & Associates Climate Survey Proposal. Chair, Marian Harris, will be meeting with Chancellor Pagano sometime before FAC’s final meeting (6.6.17). EVCAA Lavitt has commented that this proposal is expensive (total cost: $71,920), especially in light of the Faculty of Color climate survey having just been conducted in summer 2016 (the results are confidential.) Marian emphasized that FAC is insistent that faculty, staff, and students be surveyed and not just faculty. FAC members talked about the potential benefits of having the tri-campus climate survey conducted first, i.e. it would be funded by UW; they will be using Rankin & Associates as well; it could shine light on discrepancies among the three campuses and could help to inform a future UW Tacoma climate survey. FAC members commented on how the tri-campus survey might not touch on UW Tacoma issues or collect needed data because it’s being funded by another source. There were suggestions to try and influence the creation of the tri-campus survey to better serve UW Tacoma. Perhaps speak with Herb Simon who is a UW Regent who lives in Tacoma, asking him to help advocate for a survey that can benefit UW Tacoma in specific ways. FAC member, Susan Johnson, was willing to meet with the UW team designing the survey and advocate for Tacoma.

The next steps will be determined by Marian’s meeting with the Chancellor and the presentation to the Executive Council. She asked that FAC members champion a campus climate survey for faculty, staff, and students during 2017-2018 while she is away on sabbatical. FAC members hope for positive feedback on this effort in light of their ongoing charge on race & equity issues.

1. **Parking for Faculty**

Chair, Marian Harris, brought this up as an issue for FAC to take up next year. FAC members spoke about the parking costs that add up (i.e. permits and parking tickets when one’s permit lot is full and one has to find on-street parking). FAC members acknowledged that this is also a top concern for students and talked about partnering with them to put pressure on campus leaders for a solution. Marian will also contact the new ASUWT President for 2017-2018, Arwa Dubad, to partner with student about parking and transportation issues.

Additionally, when faculty and staff invite folks from the community to campus to present in classes, etc. the community members have trouble finding parking. Can spots for parents, visitors, community guests, and faculty be designated and reserved? It is embarrassing when important guests cannot find a parking spot. The City of Tacoma may limit the number of parking spots that UW Tacoma is allowed to have.

FAC members also discussed the reduced route times and stops of the UW Express Bus (#586) from UW Tacoma to UW Seattle and the barriers that this presents for students and cross-campus collaboration. The bus no longer stops at our campus. There is a general lack of funding for public transit in the region. UW should have more influence for which bus routes stay and which are cut. There is no lobbying for us. FAC members talked about contacting UW Tacoma’s transportation point-person, James Sinding. They viewed a memo prepared by Lauren Montgomery, FA vice chair, to James. The memo is based on a conversation that EC had with James in December 2016 and makes requests for James and his team to consider as they construct a Parking Plan. FA Administrator will circulate memo to FAC members.

Lastly, FAC members decided to contact Tacoma Mayor, Marilyn Strickland since she is on the Sound Transit Board. Marian will write a letter to Mayor Strickland and FAC member, Susan Johnson, will follow up with the Mayor in the 2017 fall quarter.

**Action:** Marian will circulate the letter to Mayor Strickland to ask for feedback and then alert FAC when Mayor Strickland responds.

1. **Adjourn**

Appendix A

Dear SIAS Faculty,

As your elected representative to the Faculty Affairs Committee (a campus-wide committee which falls under the Faculty Assembly) I would like to share with you a proposed policy on non-competitive faculty appointments.

Our committee has been working on a campus-wide policy that would help to standardize the way we conduct full-time non-competitive appointments at UWT. We now have a draft of the policy that we are sharing with our respective units. Attached, you will find a draft of the policy, as well as comments that the Executive Committee of Faculty Assembly made on it. Can you please take a look at this proposed policy and send me your feedback so that I can relay that to our full committee?

I would like to receive your feedback no later than **Monday, May 15th**. Thanks very much!

Best wishes,

Sarah

Not sure this is a viable policy – this implies that if we hire a non-competitive faculty member (lecturer) full time for a year that we then have to create a competitive position for them the next year that they can apply for? – Not realistic as we may not have this position the next year – we hire people all the time to fill in as sabbatical replacements, maternity leaves, admin replacements and other forms of leaves – often this involves hiring a full time temporary replacement (esp. in high demand areas of the curriculum) and if possible if we have a number of like courses that need to be filled on a temporary basis we try to piece together a full time temporary position rather than a bunch of part-time courses because that is better for the instructor (pay and benefits); the students (in terms of continuity) and administratively (in terms of mentoring load, tracking and paperwork for staff). Often there is short time frame to hire these positions and they are often in very specific areas – some easier to find than others.

My 2 cents

CG

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Cheryl Greengrove

Hi Sarah,

Thanks for this!

Overall, I support this version. I especially appreciate the parts about initiating a comp hiring search and assuming interest on the part of the non-comp faculty in being part of that. I have bristled at some discussion elsewhere that non-comps be explicitly told not to expect a renewed contract. (I know this might not take care of that, but it does seem to counteract it).

I had a few questions/comments: I wasn't sure what was meant by the notes

-add part-time, or similar policy

-equity for race and rank (lecturers)

Or Marian Harris' note that "the same kind of people are always hired."

I'm also not sure I understand what "a diversity focused and inclusive process" means exactly, especially the first part; all our processes should be inclusive and value diversity, but "diversity focused" suggests a greater weight to it than other considerations, such as teaching experience, scholarship record, urban-serving focus, etc. That greater weight might be warranted for some searches, but I'm not sure if it needs to be called out in the policy language itself, especially if the preamble language "To ensure equity, inclusiveness and diversity are incorporated in all aspects of the faculty hiring process"  remains.

Those are my two cents :) Thanks again,

LeAnne

Hi Sarah,

Thanks for asking for feedback on this. I understand the overall intent, and agree with the sentiment, but I have some concerns about implementation of the proposed policy. I think it’s really important to make sure this does not have an unintended consequence of forcing us to have a revolving door of one year appointments, since this is not good for our students or our lecturers. Once we have brought in someone who is doing a good job, the best outcome is to immediately open up a competitive lecturer search and allow that person to apply, but keep them here until that happens. But if we don’t get a competitive hire for whatever reason, this policy would tie our hands and we would need to send away someone who was doing a good job, in favor of a new one-year hire. Again, not good for our students, and not good for the lecturer who has to look for a job elsewhere despite having done a great job for us. And not good for us, needing to train and mentor new people over and over again.

Also, I don’t think one year is a realistic timeline. It would need to be minimum two years, based on my understanding of the current ‘permission to hire’ process. Here’s a concrete example:

Let’s say we get our first info on projected majors of next year’s admitted students now (an email came out last week). Based on this info, we realize that we need to add sections of courses required for a particular major. Ideally, if we have enough demand to justify it, we benefit our students and the lecturer in question if we can hire a full time rather than part time lecturer. So, now we have a newly hired non-competitive lecturer for AY 17/18 (which we only learned that we needed in May 2017). Under this policy, we would need to conduct a competitive lecturer search next year to ‘convert’ that position for AY18/19, because the person we hired for AY17/18 would need to leave by 18/19 or get in via a competitive search. To not lose that person, we would need to be approved for the search, but that request would have needed to be submitted last October/November to be considered in time for this year’s approval process.

So, if we do adopt the policy, I’d strongly argue for changing it from a one year limit to a two year limit.

Thanks!

Erica

Hi Sarah,

Thanks for sending out!

I put my comments in the attached.  Few summary points:

1) I suggest you discuss up front what we mean by "noncompetitive hires".  Label it someone other than "noncompetitive" which I think is so commonly used it loses its zing:   We hire faculty in a manner out of compliance with federal law, and not consistent with a process that seeks out the best candidate for the job, one that gives every eligible candidate a **fair**shot at the job.  Even say, "We use an old-boy network".  If we labeled it "old boy network" rather than "noncompetitive hire", it would get everyone's attention fast, and appeals to budget problems to justify it would evaporate.

 2)  It’s probably not a big point, but I strongly disagree with the statement about making sure non-comps can apply to the comp. job that follows.  What if you hire someone who is not really tenure-track material?  Would the position have to be a lecturer position then?  Or what if you want to make the case for a tenured hire, but the non-comp hire is someone like Luke?  Can you not have a tenure hire since Luke wouldn't be able to apply?

This presumption that the non-comp should be able to apply is based, I believe, on wanting to “protect” the non-comp faculty we have already hired.  But I believe this is misplaced.  In fact, I think it's an indication of the problem you face with too many non-comp faculty:  your hiring practices become influenced by their presence on campus, and your desire to protect them, rather than what faculty member we need most.

3)  The attached statement is mostly about process of rehiring non-comp, but does not address the conditions under which faculty agree that using the old-boy network is called for.  This should be limited.  For instance we've known for about 4 months that Mary has a sabbatical next year.  Why not hire competitively for one year?  Why insist on using the old boy network to replace Mary?  Give everyone a shot at that one year job.  (OK, I know, we only get 2 classes to replace her!).  Similarly, we've known for about 3 months that we wouldn't bring Charlie back.  Why are we forced to replace Charlie by means of an old-boy network?  Why can't we find the best candidate nationwide?  It is, after all, what federal EEO law requires.

4)  Just to throw in something tangential.  I've been advocating for a change to the title of Non-comp hire.  You guessed it "Old Boy Hire".  Ha ha.  No really.  What about "Visiting Lecturer".  Limit of one year, and no voting rights, no service expectation.  They are a temporary fill in, and should be treated as such.  With voting rights, you have the weird situation where temporary faculty are voting on long term policy, long term faculty, etc.,   I was a non-comp hire back east on year.  It would have been weird for me to attend faculty meetings, vote, etc.  What's weird is that it isn't weird on our campus!

Thanks for asking!

Katie

Katie Baird

Hi Sarah,

Do you know what document stipulates that the one-year contract can be repeated at most 3 times? Perhaps that is from HR.

I'm not sure if this is the right space for this (campus-wide vs SIAS) but we do need a constructive review process for contingent faculty so that they are given the opportunity to grow. They deserve a chance to emerge out of the contingent position holding patterns many are caught in. Jim's proposal at the SIAS meeting (2 times ago?) could perhaps be discussed campus-wide. It's a discussion that I hope continues and results in a process.

Julie

Hi Sarah,

This looks OK, and is clear. In addition, non-competitively hired faculty need to be clearly told about the policy and communicated that they have no special standing with respect to the competitive position.

Why would we ever hire without making this a consideration and part of the criteria given our student needs? Certainly more effort should be made at the time of NON-competitive hiring to bring in a diverse pool of resumes from which to hire— even if it is not considered competitive per se it is important to make a minimal effort on this at that time. Given the job market for academic and saturation of a highly educated workforce in this region, it should NOT be that hard to find instructors who are also from underrepresented groups.

I also suggest that the hiring unit be required to report what efforts to attract a potentially diverse candidate were made be documented and shared along with information on the non-competitive hire— at a minimum. Even though it might be a non-competitive hire, we should still be making an effort to hire by reaching out through professional networks more regionally. In addition, why are we not vetting non-competitive candidates more carefully with a mini-committee of three that is charged with such tasks to reaching out to potentially qualified candidates from URM communities??

Best,
Ariana

Hi Sarah,

I have a question about the following language from the policy:

"Whenever a non-competitive full-time position is filled, the competitive hiring process must be immediately undertaken to fill the position through a diversity focused and inclusive process for the following year."

What about non-competitive, full-time hires that represent sabbatical replacements or similar accommodations for temporary leave? The way this is worded seems like the faculty on leave would have to reapply for their own job! Maybe I'm misunderstanding something.

Will

Hi Sarah  I think my biggest concern regarding this policy is that it does nothing (that I can tell) to ensure that a competitive position will be created.  I worry that the non-competitive hires will just be fired each year and replaced with other desperate PhDs.  I am also concerned about what sort of morale this creates for a one year hire. What effect does this have on their teaching if they know they have no possibility of continuing in this role?  Until I see a fairly comprehensive policy in T & P regarding these issues of inequity and bias, it's hard for to support something that just seems to rather cruelly treat faculty who are already treated badly as it is.

I hope this helps.

Best,

Danica

Hi Sarah,

I'm responding privately because this is such a difficult issue with so many moving parts.

I tend to share Danica's concerns about establishing a clear procedure to go with this policy. One problem that has come up with competitive searches this year is that even when faculty prioritize competitive searches to replace noncompetitive lines, administrators further up the food chain ultimately have the final say. (I'm thinking, of course, of the Writing Studies/CAC situation, but I think that's more a concrete example of a broader problem than a one-off situation.)

How much authority does Faculty Assembly have to make or enforce policies like this? I have an idea, but I don't know how workable it might be.

What I'm thinking is that the policy could explicitly state that competitive lines which kick in as a result of this policy must automatically jump to the top of the dean's /director's list of requested searches. Such a requirement would take judgment calls out of the picture entirely, and I think that's good for two reasons:

1) Faculty's decision to adopt these practices (assuming they vote to do so) couldn't be undone by this or that administrator.

2) If resources are a problem for a competitive line, they should be a problem for a similar noncompetitive line--we shouldn't make exploitation a solution to budget problems. And if we choose not to hire a noncompetitive lecturer one year because we're concerned about funding a competitive lecturer the next year, we should simply not staff those sections and let the chancellor and Seattle admin deal with the fallout on that. Hell, maybe it will motivate admin to do a better job of lobbying Olympia for funding.

Anyhow, those are my two cents. I'm happy to discuss these ideas or the policy itself further if you have any questions.

Best,
Jim

We have been plagued by a policy of replacing full time faculty with part time. Maybe this is the surprise opportunity to reverse that? It would cause a crisis in terms of how to teach all the students we have with the limited number of faculty we have. Maybe that would bring about a change. I am afraid we are 2/3 of the way toward a faculty of non-tenure tracks. What do you think? I don't want to say more until I see what others think... [Anonymous]

In response to Danica's question, I am wondering in the document Sarah sent out, that one year just means a one year contract that can be renewed for three years, which is what I thought the original Faculty Assembly proposal said? Could Sarah please clarify this? Libi

[My response]: Hi Libi,

My apologies for the delay in responding to your question. The committee is proposing that after a non-competitive hire is made to fill in an emergency need, that a competitive search to fill this position be undertaken immediately, so that a position is not filled with a non-competitively hired faculty member for longer than one year. The length of time for the competitively hired position isn't stipulated, just the fact that it must be competitive. One of the primary purposes of this is to deal with the problems that hiring faculty non-competitively poses for our commitment to diversifying our faculty. Does this clarify?

All the best,

Sarah

Sarah,

I agree with Danica’s concerns. I feel what we need is a better way to hire PT faculty that entices a more diverse faculty pool to apply rather than a punitive policy for those that take the position. The problem as I see it is not that hiring PT faculty creates the problem, rather it is our practices in finding those faculty that creates the issue.

Thanks for representing and bringing this to us!

Cheers,

Jim

Thanks for the explanation. It gives rise to a different concern on my part.

Yes, I agree that we should hire full time lecturers to fill emergency needs such as a faculty member going on sabbatical. Still, what we seem to be doing is committing to hiring a non-tenure track person whenever an FT vacancy becomes a regular thing. The language suggest that, should a tenure-line faculty member disappear from the face of the earth, she/he will be replaced long term by a competitively hired lecturer. At the very least, the language might allow for more rank openness. Ideally, the language would commit to a TT hire at least when the vacancy was due to the departure of a TT faculty member.

Michael

Hi Sarah,

I didn’t want to send this out to the entire group to reduce emails bouncing around, but I think it’s really important to have a period for review and approval before it automatically becomes a competitive lecturer line. If it is automatic that a non-competitive full time hire turns into a competitive position after one year that means that the campus would have essentially decided on that position at the time the non-competitive hire was made. But if you look at the actual timing of this, usually these non-competitive hires are very rushed decisions, hinging on other critical information that isn’t available in time to make a leisurely decision.

I’ll give you a concrete example. We (SAM) are still waiting to have our final schedule (which we submitted in the fall) approved so that we can hire part time and full time non-competitive lecturers that are needed to cover our curriculum for next year. That means that a good quarter of our classes that are in the schedule for fall 2017 are still TBD, which is not good, and a separate issue… When we finally receive that approval (hopefully soon), we will scramble to hire approximately five full time positions. One biology, three to four math, one physics full time, plus a host of part time hires. Why are we hiring at the last minute? Some of these are positions that we didn’t know for sure we would need until recently, e.g., physics to replace Linda Dawson when she retires at the end of this year. We got a competitive hire to replace her but that won’t kick in until 18/19, so we need a full time hire to bridge the gap. We actually requested a physics competitive lecturer line last year, but didn’t get it. Two of the math hires are to replace current full time lecturers Alan Bartlett and Olga Shatunova who were hired for new competitive lecturer positions starting next year. Those were new positions based on new need, so now we need to backfill by hiring two new non-competitive full time lecturers. We only knew that this was the outcome of the search this week, so it’s not something we can plan ahead for. The other additional math hire is to cover new sections required due to a change in the math requirements for the Computer Science and Systems major which was announced earlier this year but wasn’t really certain so we couldn’t act on it sooner (nor did we have authorization for the resources). The biology position is to support growth due to the biomed major, above and beyond our projections. This is the only one that we might have been able to submit to an approval process sooner.

If we were to go to the admin and say we need five full time non-competitive lecturers ASAP, to be hired in the next month, and they knew they would therefore be authorizing competitive hires in the next year, they might hold up the hires, which would be a real problem. What we really need is a better and faster budget/resource review process.

If we allowed two years as non-competitive lecturer, then a nearly automatic ‘conversion’ to a competitive position, this would be far better for all concerned. Our non-competitive lecturers would have time in position to establish a teaching record and be competitive for the full search. We’d have time to decide whether we should have a tenure or lecturer line for the position. Students would benefit from additional stability. We’d avoid the need to conduct unneeded searches.

Thanks for bringing this feedback to the committee!

Erica

If we don't take care, we won't have tenured faculty at UWT. [Anonymous]

Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments

It is understandable and normal for our campus to engage in some instances of emergency hiring, hiring that necessitates hiring a faculty member without taking the time and care to seek nationally for the best and most qualified candidate. On our campus, we call this hiring faculty ~~some level of~~ non-competitively. ~~Hiring (and the use of temporary or adjunct faculty) to be~~ customary. To satisfy unanticipated circumstances and emergency situations. However, such practices, if used for non-emergency situations, are not only against federal law, they also do not enhance our commitment to

~~To ensure~~ equity, inclusiveness and diversity.  ~~are incorporated in all aspects of the faculty hiring~~ ~~process,~~ the Faculty Affairs Committee herewith proposes the following policy on when and how non-competitive hiring practices are to be used. ~~Process:~~

Non-competitive full-time faculty appointments may be made for a maximum of one year. ~~To~~ ~~satisfy unexpected shortcomings in faculty course coverage~~. Whenever a non-competitive full- time position is filled, the competitive hiring process must be immediately undertaken to fill the position through a diversity focused and inclusive process for the following year. Non- competitive hires are assumed\* to be included in the candidate pool for the competitively hired position, unless they opt out of the process, but are not afforded special treatment due to their incumbency. I disagree with this. Noncompetitive hires may not fit what we need. Right now, for instance, we hare hiring an non-comp econ faculty. Whoever we get is unlikely to be who we really want. If our hands are tied (as this could be read) that our job ad needs to be one that this person could apply to, then that is not good policy.

Final note: the last paragraph is about process. What about a few notes about conditions under which an emergency hire is merited? And when it is not merited? This refers to the \*initial\* hire. If emergencies are limited to real emergencies, then the \*rehiring\* issue will be limited.

\* Eligible to apply / If non-comp hires are part of pool

-add part-time, or similar policy

-equity for race and rank (lecturers)

Draft Version 1.0 / 2016-11-30 ; edits added at EC 2.17.17

Notes from EC 2.17.17:

• Proposed Policy on Non-Competitive Faculty Appointments – Appendix C - *Marian Harris*

EC members agreed with the spirit/idea of this policy as it aims for equity in hiring

practices, but brought up many complicated considerations that might affect the language of the policy. FAC chair, Marian Harris, said that she would meet with Alison Hendricks from Academic HR about this to learn of any other considerations to bring in.

There are still too many ways around a competitive hiring process and due to that, the same kind of people are always hired. Could this be a policy with a procedure to follow?

Sometimes even if the procedure is followed the results are not ideal because it can be challenging to find qualified people to teach specific content. In giving thought to part-time positions, perhaps write a campus-level policy without specifics, but with language around having a clear process so that all are aware of the process. A few EC members had specific wording edits. They should follow up specifically with FAC chair, Marian Harris.