Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
2. Chair’s welcome and introductions
3. Announcements
   ○ Report on COVID-19 action items regarding PT lecturers
   ○ Report on Class A legislation on P&T procedures in small departments (attachment)
4. Review of the minutes from May 26, 2020 (attachment)
5. Charge Letter Review (attachment)
6. Proposed Class A legislation to remove Senior Lecturer and Research Associate from the code (attachments)
7. Survey of part-time and temporary lecturers
8. Good of the Order
9. Adjourn

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 11:01 a.m.

2. Chair’s welcome and introductions

Chair Lee began the council meeting with an overview of the council’s upcoming legislation work and member introductions.

3. Announcements
   a. Report on COVID-19 action items regarding PT lecturers
   b. Report on Class A legislation on P&T procedures in small departments (attachment)

Chair Lee noted that the charges from the previous Spring regarding part-time lecturers’ NETID access have been partly addressed. Off-quarter part-time lecturers NETID are active in a hiatus status, such as in summer. There are no fall or spring hiatus terms. Anyone on annual appointment should have NETID active year-round.

It was noted that if someone has a confirmed future start date (signed contract or accepted offer) it would be consistent with current practice to allow their department to put them into the Workday system immediately to access NETID resources (although it’s not clear whether this is routinely done). However, if they finished their contract quarter, and have not been
officially re-hired for another quarter, they will lose NETID access, due to concerns about security, licensing, and compliance issues.

A member questioned how to communicate this information to part-time faculty. FCFA could ask senate leadership to send announcement or send information directly to colleges. Another member noted that this has been a continuing problem, as not every part-time faculty member has fixed contracts. Problems extend not just to NETID, but also access to library or course preparation. They suggested extending NETID access for one quarter after contract. It was mentioned that students have access up to 6 months post-graduation to their NETID.

Chair Lee will explore whether broadened extensions of NETIDs can accomplished through a technical fix, or will need a policy change. He will report back at the next meeting.

Another topic mentioned focused on senate leadership communication with deans, urging them not to overly rely on temporary positions during the current financial crisis. This was postponed as the provost’s office was in the process of updating lecturer guidelines for all academic titles, which is now completed on the Provost’s academic guidelines webpage. Early in Summer 2020 the Provost sent notice detailing restrictions on hiring, which was similar to the communication FCFA had planned to send.

Chair Lee mentioned the Class A Legislation regarding the promotion and procedures in small units legislation was unanimously passed and in process to the senate (Exhibit 4).

A member stated the teaching professor track change was successfully completed by the September 16 effective date, which represented a remarkable achievement given the complexity of the changes.

4. Review of the minutes from May 26, 2020 (attachment)

The minutes from May 26, 2020 were approved as written.

5. Charge Letter Review (attachment)

Chair Lee described the charges for the FCFA 2020-2021 charge letter and asked members to consider any changes before publication (Exhibit 1).

Council members noted concern with a shortened timeline for Class A and Class B legislation with email voting. The senate does send an email reminder to voting faculty, but this may not be enough time to allow all voting faculty to review. Another member mentioned that opposition to policy takes time to coordinate and consult for the next meeting. A member questioned why this change needs to be made and what policy caused this discussion. It was noted that legislation which needs to be passed by the end of year (spring quarter) creates issues with a three-week timeline. Another member noted that Catalyst
timestamps everything which would allow us to review when votes are cast. There was a consensus that the timeline for Class A legislation should be shortened to two weeks, not one.

A member asked about the augmented promotion and tenure review. The Provost has suggested including a comprehensive list of criteria (teaching, service, research). The Provost is considering a system for evaluations to happen every 3 years, rather than 1 year. The council will review this information should the Provost bring it before FCFA.

Another member requested clarification on clinical faculty issues. It was noted that code language changes for clinical faculty would affect all, including dental.

FCWA is proposing a Class C resolution regarding caregivers. They would like feedback within a week. Chair Lee will send the draft resolution to council members to review.

The chair also asked council members to prepare for possible extra meetings this year

6. **Proposed Class A legislation to remove Senior Lecturer and Research Associate from the code (attachments)**

Chair Lee shared a draft legislation with the council (Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3). With these legislations passed, only full-time temporary lecturers would remain. The council considered using this opportunity to remove voting rights for full-time temporary lecturers. A member noted acting instructors would be parallel to this.

Another option is to wait on this topic until a more comprehensive solution is found for part-time and full-time lecturers. This might allow the most vulnerable faculty, especially under threat due to COVID-19, to voice their concerns before their voting rights are removed.

A member noted that temporary full-time faculty have not had a competitive search which is why they should not have voting rights. About 40 temporary full-time faculty, as of last year, remain and their numbers have declined annually. A member asked if it were possible to include in the legislation an operative date of next Autumn, to allow those faculty time to prepare. It would need to be specified to not allow the legislation to become effective immediately after approval. Chair Lee will edit the drafts for both Senior Lecturer and Research Associate.

7. **Survey of part-time and temporary lecturers**

The survey taskforce from the previous year met over Summer 2020 and shared an update with the council. The survey information would be obtained from faculty and college. The scope would focus on part-time and full-time temporary, acting, clinical, instructors, teaching associate, and affiliate faculty. However, colleges and departments may use different terms in their programs, which could require another set of questions. Clinical faculty may need their
own survey. The taskforce also presented a list of questions which the survey should aim to answer.

There is a continued issue around participant privacy. The taskforce concluded an anonymous survey would be the best solution, although it may allow individuals to submit more than one answer or allow non-participants access. Previously, the senate passed a Class C resolution encouraging the Provost to work with faculty in gathering this information.

Another member from the taskforce noted there have been surveys done with a similar intent. They could provide a baseline for questions to determine evolving faculty trends as real value of survey data increases with more response data. They emphasized the need to find a way to encourage responses. There is no guarantee information in the public workplace is exempt from public records requests, despite federal level human subject protection. The general solution would be to use an interface which does not authenticate participants. The strongest protections need to allow for anonymity.

A member asked about the administrative part of the survey, to determine if it should be sent to all departments or just colleges. UW does keep information on which departments have these faculty titles. There are specific units which have more temporary appointments than others. It was suggested to utilize deans and request directly for response from departments.

8. Good of the Order

Nothing was stated.

9. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Minutes by Alexandra Portillo, faculty council analyst, xanport@uw.edu

Present: Faculty Code Section 21-61 A: Jack Lee (chair), Megan Callow, Jeremy Davis, James Gregory, Aaron Katz, Jacob Vigdor, Teresa Ward, Mary Pat Wenderoth, Karam Dana
Faculty Code Section 21-61 B: Mícheál Vaughan, Xin Ying Hsu, Cass Hartnett
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend, Dan Jacoby

Absent: 

Exhibits

Exhibit 1 - FCFA 2020-2021 charge letter.docx
Exhibit 2 - Code Revisions - Research Associates.docx
Dear Professor Lee:

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs is charged with responsibility “for all matters of policy relating to the interests of the faculty, such as appointment, tenure, promotion, professional leave, compensation (including salary and fringe benefits), academic freedom, standards of academic performance, and professional ethics” (Faculty Code, Sec 42-36). Activities historically performed include identifying issues and areas of interest on behalf of all UW faculty, especially those relating to potential revisions to the University of Washington Faculty Code, and carrying out the initial stages of those revisions with appropriate feedback from key stakeholders and relevant administrators.

Our recommendation is that the council identify specific goals that can be accomplished by the end of the 2020-21 academic year.

The Senate office did a background review to help identify goals for your council. This included review of minutes from last year’s meetings, review of discussions at Faculty Senate meetings, and selected outreach for topics. Recommended goals and / or topics for discussion include:

- Resubmit Class A legislation on P&T procedures in small departments
- Shorten timelines for voting on Class A and B legislation
- Remove the titles “Research Associate” & "Senior Lecturer" from the Faculty Code
- Voting rights for faculty on leave
- Promotion and Tenure process:
  - Should there be an appeal of a negative promotion or tenure decision by the provost or dean or vice chancellor?
  - Who has the right to postpone a mandatory tenure and promotion decision?
  - Revisit the issue of recusal of EFC members in P&T votes
- Complete the survey of part-time and temporary lecturers, and consider possible code changes based on results of the survey
- Consider the provost's suggested new proposals for faculty performance evaluation if he decides to bring them to FCFA
- Assist with vetting the code language for implementing the new discipline & dispute resolution procedures
- Look at issues around clinical faculty

After your first council meeting, we will be available to discuss the goals your council identified. Thereafter, we will post your council’s goals on the Faculty Senate website to communicate the important work you are doing.
Many thanks to you and the members of your council, on behalf of Senate Leadership and the faculty of the University, for all your time and work this coming year. I wish you all the best and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Robin Angotti
Chair, Faculty Senate
UW Faculty Code Amendments to delete Research Associate title: Relevant sections and revisions

i) Section: 21-31 Membership in the Faculty

The University faculty consists of:

- The President,
- The Provost,
- The professors,
- The associate professors,
- The assistant professors,
- The senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
- The professors of practice,
- The lecturers and artists in residence,
- The instructors,
- The teaching and research associates,
- whether serving under visiting, acting, research, teaching, clinical, or affiliate appointment, whether serving part-time or full-time, and whether serving in an active or emeritus capacity. The faculty, beginning with the professor, are listed in order for purposes of determining voting eligibility based on superior rank.

ii) Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles

B. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles

5. Appointment to one of the ranks in Subsection A with a research title requires qualifications corresponding to those prescribed for that rank, with primary emphasis upon research. Tenure is not acquired under research appointments.

Research professor and research associate professor appointments are term appointments for a period not to exceed five years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the voting faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research assistant professor appointments are for a term not to exceed three years with renewals and extensions to a maximum of eight years (see Section 24-41, Subsection H.) The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in
which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-41.

Research associate appointments are for a term not to exceed three years, with renewals to a maximum of six years. The question of their renewal shall be considered by the faculty who are superior in academic rank to the person being considered and are faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school) in which the appointments are held. Such consideration shall be conducted in accord with the provisions of Section 24-53.

Research faculty titles and the qualifications for them are described in Section 24-35.

iii) Section 24-35 Research Personnel Appointments

A. Research titles designate appointments for faculty whose primary responsibility is research. The research titles are:

- Research professor
- Research associate professor
- Research assistant professor

B. Research professors, research associate professors, and research assistant professors are eligible for appointment to the graduate faculty, are expected to take active roles in generating research funding, and are eligible to act as principal investigators for grants and contracts. Research faculty may participate in the regular instructional program but are not required to do so, except insofar as required by their funding source.

C. Research associate is considered a junior rank equivalent to instructor. This junior faculty appointment, which requires the same qualifications as those of an instructor, normally serves to advance the competence of a person who has recently completed higher professional training, in most fields marked by a doctoral degree. Appointees will work under the direction of principal investigators for the benefit of the research programs, the department's educational program, and their own professional growth. Research associates may not be principal investigators on research grants or contracts.

iv) Section 24-52 Procedure for New Appointments

C. In making new appointments administrative officers shall act in the
manner prescribed below.

1. If the appointment is to be a departmental one other than that of chair, the chair shall submit all available information concerning candidates suggested by the department, the chair, or the dean to the voting members of the department faculty. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the appointment of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associates, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturers to an elected committee of its voting faculty. In an undepartmentalized college or school, this delegation may be made to an elected committee of its voting faculty. The delegation shall expire one calendar year after it is made.

V) Section 24-53 Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

When it is time to decide upon renewal of a nontenure appointment to the faculty (Section 24-41), the procedure described below shall be followed.

A. The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend renewal or termination of the appointment. Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be considered by voting faculty who are superior in rank to the person under consideration, except that the voting faculty at rank of professor shall consider whether to recommend renewal or non-renewal of the appointment of a research professor or teaching professor. Faculty with instructional titles outlined in Section 24-34, Subsections B.1 and B.2 shall be considered by voting faculty who hold a professorial rank or instructional title superior to the person under consideration. The voting faculty of an academic unit may, by majority vote, delegate authority to recommend the renewal of affiliate or clinical faculty, research associate, or annual or quarterly part-time lecturer appointments to an elected committee of its voting faculty.
Proposed Amendments to the Faculty Code: Deletion of all references to Senior Lecturer titles

Chapter 21
Organization of the University Faculty
Section 21-31 Membership in the Faculty
The University faculty consists of:
- The President,
- The Provost,
- The professors,
- The associate professors,
- The assistant professors,
- The senior lecturers and senior artists in residence,
- The professors of practice,
- The lecturers and artists in residence,
- The instructors,
- The teaching associates,

whether serving under visiting, acting, research, teaching, clinical, or affiliate appointment, whether serving part-time or full-time, and whether serving in an active or emeritus capacity. The faculty, beginning with the professor, are listed in order for purposes of determining voting eligibility based on superior rank.

Chapter 24
Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members
Section 24-34 Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles
A. Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles
   1. Lecturer and artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.
   2. Senior lecturer and senior artist in residence are instructional titles that may be conferred on persons who have special instructional roles and who have extensive training, competence, and experience in their discipline. Appointments may be renewed pursuant to Section 24-53.

Section 24-41 Duration of Nontenure Appointments
B. Lecturer, Artist in Residence, and Professor of Practice
   1. Appointment as a full-time artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.
      Appointment as a full-time lecturer shall be for a term not to exceed one year. Such appointments are limited to three consecutive years.
      The normal appointment period of a part-time lecturer or artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.
   2. Appointment as a full-time senior artist in residence shall be for a term not to exceed five years.
The normal appointment period of a part-time senior lecturer or senior artist in residence shall be for one year or less with exceptions to be reviewed by the Provost.

3. Except as provided in Subsection B.4 below, at least six months (or three months in the case of an initial annual appointment) before the expiration date of an appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, or professor of practice, the dean shall determine, pursuant to Section 24-53, whether this appointment shall be renewed and shall inform the faculty member in writing of the decision.

4. A renewal decision in accord with Subsection B.3 above is not required where an initial appointment of a full-time lecturer, artist in residence, senior artist in residence, or professor of practice, is for one year or less and the appointment is identified at the time of appointment as not eligible for renewal.

5. Part-time appointments as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, and senior artist in residence are for the period stated in the letter of appointment. If such appointments are to be renewed the procedures in Section 24-53 shall be followed in a timely manner with knowledge of funding availability and staffing needs.

Section 24-57 Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

All procedures regarding promotion, merit-based salary, and tenure considerations outlined in the relevant sections of the Faculty Code must be followed. Open communication among faculty, and between faculty and administration, must be maintained in order to insure informed decision making, to protect the rights of the individual and to aid the faculty in the development of their professional and scholarly careers.

Each faculty member must be allowed to pursue those areas of inquiry which are of personal scholarly interest; at the same time, however, each faculty member must be informed of the expectations a department holds for him or her and of the manner in which his or her activities contribute to the current and future goals of the department, school, college, and University. In order to enable the faculty member to establish priorities in the overall effort of professional career development and to fulfill the University's obligations of fair appraisal and continual monitoring of faculty development, the following procedural safeguards shall be adopted in each department, school, or college.

A. Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness

To implement the provision stipulated in Section 24-32, Subsection C, the standardized student assessment of teaching procedure which the University makes available may be used for obtaining student evaluation of teaching effectiveness, unless the college, school, or department has adopted an alternate procedure for student evaluation, in which case the latter may be used. Each faculty member shall have at least one course evaluated by students in any academic year during which that member teaches one or more courses. The teaching effectiveness of each faculty member also shall be evaluated by colleagues using procedures adopted within the appropriate department, school, or college.

The reference to full-time lecturers is removed from the following paragraph because all remaining lecturers are on at most one-year contracts, and the first sentence below requires an evaluation of teaching effectiveness before renewal.

The collegial evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be conducted prior to recommending any renewal of appointment or promotion of a faculty member. In addition, for faculty at the rank of assistant professor, or associate professor or professor "without tenure" under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D, or with the instructional title of lecturer, the collegial evaluation shall be conducted every year. For other faculty at the rank of associate professor or professor or with the title of senior lecturer, or professor of practice the collegial evaluation shall be conducted at least every three years. A written report of this evaluation shall be maintained and shared with
the faculty member.

B. Yearly Activity Report

Each department (or undepartmentalized college) shall adopt a suggested format by which each faculty member will have the opportunity to provide information on professional activities carried out during the prior year. These reports shall be prepared in writing by each faculty member and submitted to the chair (or dean) in a timely fashion each year, and shall be used as reference and as a source of information for consideration of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. These forms shall be used as evidence for recommendations of promotion, merit salary, or tenure. Such information may be updated by a faculty member at any time during the academic year.

C. Regular Conference with Faculty

Each year the chair, or where appropriate the dean or his or her designee, shall confer individually with all full-time lecturers, assistant professors, and associate professors and professors "without tenure" appointed under Chapter 25, Section 25-32, Subsection D. The chair (or dean or his or her designee) shall confer individually with the other associate professors and senior lecturers at least every two years, and with the other professors and professors of practice at least every three years. The purpose of the regular conference is to help individual faculty members plan and document their career goals. While the documentation of those goals will be part of the faculty member's record for subsequent determinations of merit, the regular conference should be distinct from the merit review pursuant to Section 24-55.

At each such conference, the chair, dean, or his or her designee, and the faculty members shall discuss:

1. The department's present needs and goals with respect to the department's mission statement and the faculty member's present teaching, scholarly and service responsibilities and accomplishments;

2. Shared goals for the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service in the forthcoming year (or years, as appropriate) in keeping with the department's needs and goals for the same period; and

3. A shared strategy for achieving those goals.

The chair, dean, or his or her designee and the faculty member shall discuss and identify any specific duties and responsibilities expected of, and resources available to, the faculty member during the coming year(s), taking into account the academic functions described in Section 24-32. The chair, dean, or his or her designee should make specific suggestions, as necessary, to improve or aid the faculty member's work.

Chapter 25

Tenure of the Faculty

Section 25-32 Criteria for Tenure

C. A faculty member does not acquire tenure under:

1. An acting appointment, or

2. A visiting appointment, or

3. Any appointment as lecturer, artist in residence, senior lecturer, senior artist in residence, or

4. An appointment as teaching associate, or

5. An appointment as professor of practice, or
6. Any appointment specified to be without tenure, or
7. An adjunct appointment, or
8. A research appointment, or
9. A teaching appointment, or
10. A clinical appointment, or
11. An affiliate appointment, or
12. Any other appointment for which the University does not provide the salary from its regularly appropriated funds, unless the President notifies the appointee in writing that tenure may be acquired under such appointment.
Class A legislation proposing changes to the Faculty Code, Chapter 24

On March 10, 2020, FCFA approved the following proposed Class A legislation for submission to the faculty senate, but it was not submitted because of the governor’s COVID-19 restrictions. On September 25, 2020, the proposed legislation was reaffirmed by the 2020-2021 membership of FCFA.

Background and Rationale

Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code describes the process for promotion of faculty members. The crux of the process is an optional subcommittee report, followed by a vote by the eligible voting faculty on whether to recommend promotion.

Before 2018, it was possible for a promotion subcommittee to include voting members of the faculty from outside the candidate’s own department or college, provided they were superior in academic rank and title to the person up for promotion. A change was made to the code in 2018 to adjust the voting hierarchy so that assistant professors would no longer vote on the promotion of senior lecturers to principal lecturers; but the wording of that code change inadvertently stipulated that members of a promotion subcommittee had to be members of the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school). This greatly reduced the number of faculty members available to serve on promotion subcommittees and caused hardships for some departments and colleges.

When FCFA was contemplating a way to fix this problem, we discovered a second problem that did not have to do with the 2018 change: sometimes, in very small departments, the number of faculty members of sufficient rank to vote on a particular promotion case can be extremely small, with only two, one, or even no faculty members eligible to vote. This can be particularly acute for promotion of a tenured faculty member from Associate Professor to Professor, in which case only tenured or WOT full professors can vote. Conducting a “departmental vote” (or college vote in an undepartmentalized college) with so few voting members can create a perception of unfairness and a lack of confidentiality on the part of those voting.

What We Propose to Do

To solve the first problem, we propose to explicitly allow promotion subcommittees to include members from outside the candidate’s department or college who have appropriate expertise, provided they are qualified by rank and title to vote on such a promotion case. Then to solve the second problem, we propose to require such a subcommittee (with three or more members) in cases where there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the candidate’s unit, and then to use the report of that subcommittee in lieu of a departmental vote. (Note that all subcommittee reports and departmental promotion votes are advisory to the chair and, ultimately, to the dean.)

What Will Change?

The biggest change will be that in cases where there are fewer than three voting faculty members in a unit who are eligible by rank and title to vote on a particular promotion case, there will no longer be an official departmental vote (or college vote in the undepartmentalized colleges) on the case. Instead, a subcommittee of at least three will be formed, which may include faculty members from outside the candidate’s department, college, school, or campus, and that committee’s report will serve in lieu of the departmental (or undepartmentalized college) vote. If there are any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s unit, they must be offered the opportunity to serve on the committee.

A more minor change is that in units that do have at least three eligible voting faculty members, we will revert to the situation before 2018: if a subcommittee does issue an initial report, it may contain members from outside the candidate’s unit.
The Proposed Class A Legislation:

Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate to submit to the faculty for approval or rejection that Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code be amended to read as shown below.

**Section 24-54 Procedure for Promotions**

Annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair (or chair’s designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean’s designee). At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the procedure below.

A. Promotion shall be based upon the attainment of the qualifications prescribed in Sections 24-32, 24-33, 24-34, and 24-35 for the various academic ranks and titles and not upon length of service. In arriving at recommendations for promotion, faculty, chairs, and deans shall consider the whole record of candidates’ qualifications described in Section 24-32.

The following paragraph defines “eligibility” to serve on a promotion subcommittee, to participate in departmental or college deliberations, and to vote on the case. (Further limitations are described below.) Sections 21-32 C and D referred to here stipulate that research faculty don’t vote on promotion of teaching faculty or vice versa, and neither research nor teaching faculty vote on promotion or tenure of tenure-track and WOT faculty.

Eligibility to deliberate and vote on a recommendation of promotion is limited to voting members of the faculty who are superior in academic rank and title to the person under consideration, subject to the limitations described in Section 21-32, Subsections C and D.

The voting members of the appropriate department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration shall decide whether to recommend promotion within the professorial ranks.

Research faculty and teaching faculty shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department, or undepartmentalized college or school, who are superior in academic rank to the person under consideration.

Artists in residence shall be considered by voting members of the appropriate department or undepartmentalized college or school who hold an appointment as associate professor or professor or an instructional title superior to that of the candidate being considered.

B. The record of the candidate being considered for promotion shall be assembled following the guidelines of the candidate’s college and unit. The candidate is responsible for assembling the promotion record, which shall include a self-assessment of the candidate’s qualifications for promotion. External letters of review shall be kept confidential from the candidate.
An initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion may be produced by a subcommittee. Such a subcommittee must consist of at least three eligible voting faculty members (where eligibility is defined in Subsection A above), and may include faculty drawn from other departments, schools, colleges, or campuses who have appropriate expertise. Members of the subcommittee shall be given the opportunity to review the candidate's record, including external letters.

The next paragraph describes the conditions under which a subcommittee must be formed. In that case, if there are any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s unit, they must be offered the opportunity to serve on the committee, because the committee’s report will be used in lieu of a departmental vote.

If there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the department (or undepartmentalized college or school), a subcommittee shall be formed as described above, and it shall include any eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school) who are available to serve.

For a department (or undepartmentalized college or school) where an initial report and/or recommendation on the qualifications of the candidate for promotion is produced by a subcommittee of the eligible voting faculty (as described above), the report shall be written. The department chair (or chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college, or the dean’s designee) shall provide the candidate with a written summary of the committee's report and recommendation. The written summary shall identify the members of the subcommittee. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary. The candidate may respond in writing within seven calendar days.

The chair or dean shall forward the candidate's response, if any, together with the committee's report to the eligible voting faculty of the department (or undepartmentalized college or school).

The next two paragraphs describe the procedure to be followed in case there are at least three eligible voting faculty members in the unit. The basic procedure is discussion of the case (including all subcommittee members if they so choose), followed by a vote (where only eligible voting members may be present), followed by a chair's report to the dean.

If there are three or more eligible voting faculty members in the candidate's department (or undepartmentalized college or school), those eligible voting faculty members shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record, and following the discussion they shall vote on the promotion question. If an initial report was produced by a subcommittee, all members of the subcommittee may choose to participate in the discussion, but only eligible voting faculty in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school) may be present for the vote. The eligible voting faculty (as described above) of the candidate’s department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record. A vote on the promotion question shall occur following the discussion.

The department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may then respond in writing to the department chair (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college) within seven calendar days.

And now the simpler procedure in the case that there are fewer than three eligible voting members in the unit.
If there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department (or undepartmentalized college or school), the recommendation of the subcommittee shall be used in lieu of a vote by the department (or undepartmentalized college or school).

If the candidate is a member of a departmentalized college or school, then in case the departmental recommendation (or the subcommittee recommendation in the event there are fewer than three eligible voting faculty members in the candidate’s department) is a departmental one, and is favorable or the promotion decision is mandatory or the candidate has written a response to the departmental decision, the chair shall transmit all documents produced in this promotion process to the appropriate dean, with his or her independent analysis and recommendation. The chair may, at his or her discretion, share the chair’s recommendations with the candidate.

Section 13-31, April 16, 1956; S-A 22, April 18, 1958; S-A 59, April 23, 1979; S-A 64, May 29, 1981; S-A 81, January 30, 1990; S-A 94, October 24, 1995; S-A 100, April 25, 2000; S-A 124, July 5, 2011; S-A 126, June 11, 2012; S-A 130, June 14, 2013; S-A 142, June 22, 2018: all with Presidential approval. [See also Executive Order No. 45.]