

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
Faculty Assembly Faculty Affairs (FA) Minutes
Thursday, October 4, 2012
1:30-2:30pm
CP 324

Attendance: Donald Chinn (Chair), Katie Adamson, Chris Demaske, Matthew Weinstein, Anne Wessells

Absent: Jindal Rupinder

- 1. The minutes from May 14, 2012 were approved.**
- 2. General discussion of issue that the committee could address this academic year.**

Chinn briefly discussed the charge of the committee as well as the charges of all of the standing committees of Faculty Assembly.

The committee discussed a variety of potential topics and issues for the academic year, including investigation of teaching effectiveness across the campus, merit, workload, raises, and lecturer issues. The committee generally agreed that these were all important and related issues.

The Executive Council met immediately before the Faculty Affairs meeting, and Katie Baird, the Chair of Faculty Assembly proposed charges for the committee this academic year. (See attached agenda item from the October 4, 2012 meeting of the Executive Council.) The committee was willing to take on these charges for the year.

As a first step toward developing guidelines regarding raises, the committee agreed to first identify current policies and practices with the programs regarding raises. Each member of the committee should find the appropriate documents for next meeting.

- 3. The meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.**

(From the October 4, 2012 agenda of the Executive Council.)

3. Standing Committee Charges

a. Process for Raises

Faculty Assembly has been charged with developing guidelines for possible funds that will be available for increases in faculty salaries beginning the next biennium. We can provide two types of guidelines: one, clarify what the code requires and perhaps present some comparative perspective in terms of what UWS and UWB are doing. We can also provide some guidelines in terms of what we might recommend to units in terms of process, information, and criteria (or process over criteria).

We'd like to recommend that Faculty Affairs takes this up this fall, and that it targets late November for a report back to EC.

b. Lecturers and Follow Up Discussion

There is ongoing interest in policy and practice surrounding non-tenure track (NTT) faculty members. One issue is the "mix" of faculty, and the consequences for students and the quality of education of different mixes. While in general NTT faculty are excellent and often bring something that TT faculty cannot (such a professional experience in particular workplaces), they usually are not researchers and may not bring the deep theoretical knowledge and application that TT faculty bring.

A second important issue that this trend raises is the extent to which students are taught by faculty to whom we've made a weak commitment and who are (or feel) vulnerable to being let go. These facts may compromise the quality of education students receive. NTT faculty may be less likely to talk with other faculty, may be less aware of how the university works and therefore less able to see how their particular classes fit into the broader curriculum and curricular objectives, and they may be less able to advise students such as we all do on a regular, informal basis. Their increased vulnerability may make them more concerned about high teaching evaluations which may cause them to forego good practices in favor of popular ones. Finally, the weak commitment from the institution leaves them with less bargaining power vis-à-vis their TT counterparts, and they may feel unfairly pressured to volunteer for more service activities than do others.

Based on this, we recommend that Faculty Affairs takes up this issue in the Winter/Spring with the following charge:

1. Inquire into practices used elsewhere to both protect otherwise vulnerable employees, and to create engaged and committed employees who have low job security and may be viewed as second-class citizens. What do other campuses do, for instance, since this must be a widespread problem? What about places (eg Microsoft or elsewhere) that might rely to some significant extent on temporary workers?

2. Develop a set of criteria for faculty hires that most merit multi-year contracts.
3. Investigate mechanisms, policies and practices that can provide faculty with greater job security.
4. Investigate existing process of review and evaluation of lecturers and make recommendations

We'd like to recommend that Faculty Affairs takes this up in the winter/spring, and that it targets early March for a draft report back to EC.