

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**  
November 13, 2018  
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.  
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

**Meeting Synopsis**

1. Call to order
  2. Review of the minutes from October 30, 2018
  3. Update on the work of the faculty discipline and dispute resolution task force (Zoe Barsness)
  4. Task Force on course evaluations (Jack Lee)
  5. Brief updates from subcommittees:
    - Equity & Inclusion (Purnima Dhavan)
    - EFCs (Aaron Katz)
    - Lecturer Issues (Jack Lee)
  6. Review Faculty Code language around non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process (Jacob Vigdor)
  7. Good of the order
  8. Adjourn
- 

**1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 11:00 a.m.

**2. Review of the minutes from October 30, 2018**

The minutes from October 30, 2018 will be reviewed by the council members and voted on during the next meeting (November 27, 2018).

**3. Update on the work of the faculty discipline and dispute resolution task force (Zoe Barsness)**

Zoe Barsness, Associate Professor at UWT Business and Chair of the Values and Principles Committee, updated the council on the work of the faculty discipline and dispute resolution task force. She provided a document to the council that outlines the ladder of dispute resolutions (Exhibit 1). She noted that once the code language is drafted the council (and other bodies) will be called upon to review before it is put forward for a vote.

A member asked for the definition of a brief adjudication. Barsness responded that there are already some instances in the code similar to brief adjudication. Brief adjudication may involve bringing together a group of peers at the local level or a subset of the faculty panel at the University level. The task force is still mapping out the details. The Administrative Procedures Act (APA) is constraining in terms of what types of disputes are amenable to the employment of a brief adjudication procedure. The idea of a brief adjudication procedure is to provide recourse beyond the administrative officer and the individual having a discussion with the option of an appeal, but overall it enhances the timeliness from the perspective of the individual and the institution. The chair noted that the APA has been interpreted by the courts to say there are two types of adjudication (full and brief) with some constraints. Because of

this, the University cannot have three types. The University has to follow the APA and the court's decision.

Mike Townsend, Secretary of the Faculty, further commented that APA for a full adjudication looks like a trial. The brief adjudication process only requires the each party is given an opportunity to be informed of the agency's view of the matter and an opportunity to explain the party's view of the matter. In the current procedures there are two forms (centrally and unit based). The centrally based process is outlined in Chapter 28. This approach involves a hearing officer that the Faculty Adjudication Panel appoints and is subject to review by faculty panel. In Chapter 25 there is a unit based procedure where the relevant supervisor provides a notice and opportunity to be heard.

A member further asked if the accused would have a say in what level of adjudication they would be placed under. Barsness responded that the task force is still working on this, but the level of recourse depends on the situation. The task force is trying to map the general pathways of recourse. A fraught area within the ladder is discrimination equity and inclusion because procedures to follow are more complex than other violations, such as grading.

Townsend further noted that compared to a regular court system this approach reduces the parties' ability to choose what form of recourse is taken. Barsness noted that there will be more opportunities to facilitate early intervention and resolve disputes without a full adjudication. The Values and Principles committee has a subgroup that is conducting a peer review of other systems/models.

Another member asked who is responsible for deciding what bucket in which a dispute is placed. The task force is still working on this. Currently, there are multiple pathways. The task force is considering how to streamline this.

#### **4. Task Force on course evaluations (Jack Lee)**

The chair shared that the Senate leadership is forming a task force to discuss student course evaluations in regards to design and utility. This falls under the council's purview as the task force will likely discuss the appropriateness of requiring course evaluations in promotion and tenure.

Mary Pat Wenderoth, Principal Lecturer in Biology, volunteered to represent the council on the task force.

#### **5. Brief updates from subcommittees:**

- Equity & Inclusion (Purnima Dhavan)
  - Dhavan mapped what organizations have done work on this issue. The subcommittee will work with The Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs and the chair, Brenda Williams, as well as the Faculty Council on Women in Academia. The chair recommended Dhavan reach out with George Sandison, Senate Chair, and potentially coordinate efforts.
- EFCs (Tom Hazlet)
  - Hazlet provided a document (Exhibit 2). They are looking at Section 23-45 of the Code and are now trying to determine an administrator pathway from a faculty pathway and the boundaries of shared governance.
- Lecturer Issues (Jack Lee)

- Going to go ahead with a proposal to change titles to Teaching associate/assistant and professor. “Teaching” is preferred over “Instructional.” This is parallel to research and clinical titles.
- Follow the suggestion of a council member and not change procedures or requirements for promotion and merit raises. The aim is just to change the titles so that they more accurately reflect the faculty role. There is a section in the code about ranks that will need to be altered. This change will include a section about teaching professors so that they do not vote on merit, promotion, or tenure for tenure-track faculty. This is in line with code language for Research Professors. There will be no change in who is eligible to apply for tenure.
- Also discussed an interim title for lecturers. This is not ready yet but will come soon.

**6. Review Faculty Code language around non-departmentalized tenure & promotion process (Jacob Vigdor)**

Jacob Vigdor, Professor in the Evans School, presented a memo (Exhibit 3) which provides alternatives that the council could explore as a viable option for non-departmentalized tenure and promotion processes.

Vigdor noted that option 2 was clearly favored among the non-departmentalized Elected Faculty Chairs; however, the council was not in favor of this option last year.

A member suggested that the Minnesota version was preferable and easy to implement. Another member asked if there was a place in the Minnesota version to include an advocate rather than saying “*Any member* of the campus-wide committee who is also a member of the candidate’s college or school shall be excused.” The intent is that it may be helpful in the process. Vigdor responded that it not guaranteed that a representative on one of these committees would be an advocate for the candidate.

A member expressed concern that a Dean is the last person to check off on a candidate’s dossier. The chair commented that there may be pushback because we are creating yet another elected committee. He further suggested that EFC’s sending representatives may be a better option rather than electing new members. Townsend commented that the EFCs are not part of this process because the EFCs are meant to focus on procedure rather than substance. Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, further noted that depending on the college they may have different structures to the EFCs.

Vigdor will reach out to representatives from Minnesota for additional questions about oversight. He will provide revise the language (including input from Townsend) and provide a new draft at the next meeting.

**7. Good of the order**

Nothing was stated.

**8. Adjourn**

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

*Minutes by Lauren Hatchett, lehatch@uw.edu, council analyst*

**Present:**                   **Faculty:** Jack Lee (chair), Steve Buck, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Kamran Nemati, Dan Jacoby, Tom Hazlet, Miceal Vaughan, Lauren Montgomery, James Gregory, Mary Pat Wenderoth  
**Ex-officio reps:** Padmaja Vrudhula  
**President's designee:** Cheryl Cameron  
**Guests:** Mike Townsend, Zoe Barsness

**Absent:**                   **Faculty:** Margaret Adam, Aaron Katz, Joseph Janes, Dawn Lehman  
**Ex-officio reps:** Bryan Crockett, Judith Henchy, JoAnn Taricani

**Exhibits**

Exhibit 1 – DisputeBuckets ValuesPrinciples Framework 20180425.pdf

Exhibit 2 – efc cleanup.docx

Exhibit 3 – tenure process-draft code revisions.docx