

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
February 25, 2020
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from February 11, 2020 (attachment)
 3. Announcements
 4. Part-time and temporary lecturers
 5. Clinical Faculty
 6. Procedure for promotions
 7. Good of the order
 8. Adjourn
-

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 11:01 a.m. Chair Lee added one item (Announcements) to the agenda.

2. Review of the minutes from February 11, 2020 (attachment)

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Announcements

Chair Lee updated the council on the Class A legislation proposed by the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) that FCFA approved subject to a proposed amendment. FCMA accepted the proposed amendment and the legislation will be heard at the next Senate Executive Committee meeting.

4. Part-time and temporary lecturers

Chair Lee provided background information on part-time and temporary lecturers.

The council has agreed that there needs to be a clear pathway for people who are principally employed outside of UW. It has also agreed that there needs to be a pathway for hiring someone for short-term unanticipated needs.

There are three proposals that have been made in the council:

1. Decrease the maximum cumulative length of appointments done without a search.
 - The goal of this proposal is to make regularized appointments sooner.
 - One option is to reduce the three year term limit to one contract cycle. Another option is to reduce the three year term limit to one year.
2. Apply the above cumulative length of appointments also to all part-time lecturers under 50%.

3. Establish a path for promotion for part-time and temporary lecturers who were hired without a search or with an attenuated search, but have been here for a number of years and demonstrated their merit.

- Instead of a national search for an Assistant Teaching Professor position, the part-time or temporary lecturer could face an internal review to ensure that they meet the criteria for appointment/promotion. However, a national search could confer legitimacy to the promotion.

A subcommittee of Chair Lee, Dan Jacoby, and Aaron Katz was appointed to bring proposed Faculty Code language to the council at the next meeting.

5. Clinical Faculty

Chair Lee gave an overview of the issue with clinical faculty. FCFA has been asked by the School of Medicine to amend the Faculty Code to increase the maximum contract length for salaried clinical faculty.

Units around campus use clinical faculty titles differently, which complicates the issue. Increasing the maximum contract length might also change the expectations around salaried clinical faculty appointments.

The council decided to gather more information about clinical faculty before proposing amendments.

A subcommittee of Chair Lee and Teresa Ward was appointed to discuss Clinical Faculty titles and gain a better understanding of how they are used.

6. Procedure for promotions

Chair Lee gave an update on procedure for promotions in some smaller units (Exhibit 1).

There are some departments where there are not enough faculty members superior in rank to vote on tenure and promotion. Class A legislation passed a few years ago also made it more difficult to get faculty outside of a department to sit on a subcommittee.

A possible solution is to ensure that there are at least three people voting and also allow faculty outside of the department with relevant knowledge to vote. There are three questions that need to be answered before Faculty Code language can be written:

1. Does the council want to allow expanded voting for the subcommittee and departmental vote?
2. Does the council want to allow fewer than three people to vote or require expanded voting if there are fewer than three voters?
3. Who chooses the committee and does the candidate have a say?

A subcommittee of Chair Lee, Jacob Vigdor, and Jim Gregory was appointed to bring proposed Faculty Code language to the council at the next meeting.

7. Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 12:33 p.m.

Minutes by Jordan Smith, jjsmith4@uw.edu, assistant to the chair

Present: **Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Jack Lee (chair), Jeremy Davis, James Gregory, Megan Callow, Tom Hazlet, Dan Jacoby, Jacob Vigdor, Aaron Katz, Mary Pat Wenderoth, Teresa Ward
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Cass Hartnett, Aileen Trilles
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend

Absent: **Faculty Code Section 21-61 A:** Dawn Lehman
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Mícheál Vaughan, Jennette Kachmar

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – Procedure for promotion

Exhibit 1

Memorandum

February 23, 2020

To: Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

From: Jake Vigdor

Re: Regulations on minimum number of deliberating faculty in promotion and tenure decisions

What should occur when only a small number of faculty (two, one, or even zero) are eligible to vote in departmental deliberations on promotion and tenure (Faculty Code 24-54 A)? This memo reviews policies and procedures in place at peer institutions and suggests a code revision should FCFA decide the problem warrants intervention.

Findings

Many peer institutions have no written policy, or at least no readily accessible written policy (e.g., the UC system, Wisconsin, Illinois, Florida, Colorado). Among those that do, policies vary along several dimensions. Please see the table on the following page, and the complete text of relevant policies and procedures at the end of this memo.

- Some institutions establish a required minimum number of deliberating faculty. The most common statutory minimum is three. Some institutions establish no minimum but codify provisions for the addition of faculty to deliberations if and when the decision is made to do so.
- Institutions vary in codifying which faculty members are eligible to serve as supplemental deliberators. In most cases, they must be of sufficient rank. In some cases, guidance specifies that the additional faculty are to be drawn from the candidate's discipline or otherwise have relevant subject matter expertise. In one case, emeritus faculty may be eligible to serve.
- The authority to appoint supplemental deliberators from the pool of eligible faculty members generally rests with a dean or provost. In many cases a department chair (sometimes in consultation with faculty).
- Institutions vary in terms of the rights granted to the candidate. In some cases the candidate is required to have a voice in the process. In others candidate participation is permitted or even advised but not required. In others no specific provisions are made.

Exhibit 1

University	Legal minimum	Who is eligible?	Who selects from among the eligible?	Is the candidate involved?
Minnesota	No required minimum	Tenured faculty members from other unit(s)	Dept chair/dean proposes to provost, who provides written authorization. Candidates may offer suggestions.	Candidates may offer suggestions.
Arizona	3	Faculty of sufficient rank from other unit(s)	Faculty & chair in consultation with dean.	Not specified.
Oregon	No required minimum	Appropriate faculty from other unit(s)	Chair in consultation with dean.	No requirement, but "advisable."
Utah	3	Faculty of sufficient rank; emeritus faculty	Chair recommends to dean; dean appoints.	Required consultation with candidate, who may submit written comments on proposed members.
Penn State	2 (3 for review committees)	Faculty from candidate's discipline on other campuses, or faculty from related disciplines.	Not specified.	Not specified.
Maryland	3 for review committees	Eligible faculty from related units	Dean at his/her discretion	Not specified

Commentary

In the majority of cases reviewed, there is either no written policy or a vague one offering considerable discretion to departments. Thus the University of Washington does not appear to be an outlier.

Suggested Code Revision

If a code revision were to be considered to address this concern, it could consist of an additional paragraph to be inserted at the end of section 24-54 subsection A. For example:

Exhibit 1

“In scenarios where there are fewer than three faculty eligible to decide the recommendation in the department, or undepartmentalized college or school, the dean in consultation with the faculty may appoint one or more faculty drawn from other units at the University to participate and vote. Any faculty member so appointed must meet the rank and title criteria established in this subsection. Candidates for promotion shall be informed of any such appointment and have the opportunity to submit written comments.”

In suggesting this particular language, note the following:

- The appointment of supplemental faculty is optional, but could be made mandatory by changing “may” to “shall.”
- Any recommendation made by the deliberating faculty is advisory to the dean. If the dean, in consultation with the faculty, were to appoint a supplemental deliberator that caused concern with the candidate, the candidate would have the opportunity to voice that concern, which the dean would then consider alongside the recommendation.
- Omitting discussion of department chairs from this paragraph circumvents the issue of how to create a parallel process in departmentalized and non-departmentalized units.

Original text of peer institution policies

University of California System

No written policy.

Minnesota

<https://policy.umn.edu/hr/tenure-proc01>

“It may be appropriate for small units that have few tenured faculty members to include, in annual review of probationary faculty and in the discussion and vote on tenure, a tenured faculty member or members from another unit or units in the college, campus, or University. Including additional tenured faculty members may also be warranted in consideration of a candidate whose work encompasses multiple disciplines. In order for tenured faculty members from outside the unit to participate, the head of the initiating unit and/or the dean or chancellor must submit a written request to, and obtain authorization in writing from, the executive vice president and provost. The request must identify the candidate under consideration and give the name(s) and appointment homes of those faculty members who will be asked to vote on the candidate and the reasons for including them. Candidates may request that additional faculty member(s) be added for their annual review and tenure and/or promotion decision; this request must be approved by the unit head, dean or chancellor, and the executive vice president and provost.”

Exhibit 1

Arizona

<https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/promotion-and-tenure>

Provided there are sufficient numbers of faculty members to warrant such a committee, each college, department, or other unit will have a Standing Advisory Committee on Faculty Status to advise the dean and immediate administrative head before recommendations on reviews for tenure, promotion, and nonrenewal are forwarded to higher levels. Each such committee will include at least three tenured faculty members from the unit. If a unit does not have sufficient faculty members to constitute such a committee, then the faculty and administrative head will consult with the appropriate dean on forming such a committee from other units. In promotion or tenure matters the advisory committees will be so constituted that recommendations will be made only by faculty members holding rank superior to the rank of the faculty member being considered, except in the case of full professors where the committee members will each be a full professor. Standing Advisory Committees generally will meet without the administrator whom they advise.

Oregon

<https://provost.uoregon.edu/department-review>

Most departments appoint personnel or promotion committees to carry out the initial review of the dossier. (Some departments simply define all eligible faculty members in the department as the committee responsible for the initial review.) The departmental shared governance policy specifies whether or not such a committee is to be convened.

If such a committee is used, it should include only faculty members eligible to vote on the case. If there are too few eligible faculty members to form a review committee within the candidate's department, the department head should consult with the dean to establish a committee, drawing appropriate faculty members from outside the department.

While there is no requirement to consult with the candidate regarding the selection of members for such a committee, it is advisable to do so in order to avoid any potential concerns about the appropriateness of the committee.

The committee should review, evaluate, and critically discuss the full file, including the external evaluations and all the materials contained in the supplementary file. Following this discussion, the committee should conduct a vote by signed ballot. The signed ballots should be retained in a safe and confidential place. Only the final vote tally should be revealed in the committee's report.

Exhibit 1

Utah

<https://regulations.utah.edu/academics/6-303.php>

Small academic unit rule. Any department (or division) advisory committee making a formal RPT recommendation must include at least three members eligible to vote by tenure status and rank. If the unit does not have at least three eligible members, the department (or division) chairperson must recommend to the dean one or more faculty members with the appropriate tenure status and rank and with some knowledge of the candidate's field from other units of the University of Utah or from appropriate emeritus faculty. In advance of the chairperson's contacting such faculty members, the chairperson shall notify the candidate of the potential persons to be asked, and the candidate must be offered the opportunity to comment in writing on the suitability of the potential committee members. The final selection rests with the dean.

Colorado

No written policy

Illinois

No written policy

Wisconsin

No written policy

Indiana

No written policy

Penn State

<https://policy.psu.edu/policies/ac23#J>

Only tenured faculty should be eligible to serve on peer tenure and promotion committees, and only faculty of higher rank than the candidate should make recommendations about promotion. In unusual circumstances, e.g., insufficient numbers of tenured and

Exhibit 1

higher-ranked faculty, exceptions to this provision may be permitted by the Executive Vice President and Provost on request by the academic unit.

Promotion and tenure committees shall consist of members of the faculty selected by procedures approved by the unit's faculty, the campus chancellor (if applicable), and the dean. Only tenured and tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote for members of all promotion and tenure committees. The faculty of the unit concerned should determine the size of the review committee, but in no case should a review committee consist of fewer than three members.

In order to ensure continuity in the review process, the procedures shall provide that some members of the review committee at each level shall, where possible, serve for at least two years. When terms of specified length are used, the terms of committee members should be staggered.

There will be three levels of review. The first-level faculty review for faculty in University Park Colleges and Single Campus Colleges shall be conducted by a committee of tenured faculty members in the candidate's department, division, or equivalent academic unit whenever possible. The first-level faculty review for faculty in the University College shall be conducted by a committee of tenured faculty members at the candidate's campus whenever possible. This committee shall include at least two tenured faculty members from the candidate's department, division, or discipline. If too few appropriate faculty members exist at a particular campus, faculty members in the candidate's discipline from other campuses shall serve, or, if necessary, faculty members from closely related disciplines shall serve.

Maryland

<https://president.umd.edu/sites/president.umd.edu/files/documents/policies/II-100A.pdf>

if there are fewer than three (3) eligible faculty members in the first-level unit, the Dean at his/her discretion shall appoint one or more eligible faculty members from related units as voting members of the first-level review committee, to ensure that the review committee shall contain at least three (3) persons.

Florida

No written policy

Washington State

Exhibit 1

<https://provost.wsu.edu/promotion-and-tenure/>

All tenured faculty should complete recommendations on the granting of tenure. There must be at least five faculty recommendations, not including the chair, for promotion and/or tenure. If there are fewer than 5 tenured faculty members in the unit, the tenured members shall recommend additional such persons via the department chair/school director and dean to the Provost. The Provost shall determine which of these persons will complete the tenure form. All tenured associate and full professors or equivalent should submit recommendations on the appointment or promotion to associate professor. All tenured full professors should complete recommendations on the appointment or promotion to full professor. If there are fewer than 5 tenured full professors in the unit, the tenured members shall recommend additional such persons via the department chair/school director and dean to the Provost. The Provost shall determine which of these persons will complete the tenure form.

DRAFT