

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
December 5th, 2017
11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Odegaard Undergraduate Library 320

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to order
 2. Review of the minutes from November 21st, 2017
 3. Chair's report
 4. Non-departmentalized promotion/tenure processes
 5. Lecturers – discussion on titles/summarizing progress so far/plans going forward
 6. Good of the order
 7. Adjourn
-

1) Call to order

Janes called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

2) Review of the minutes from November 21st, 2017

The minutes from November 21st, 2017 were approved as amended. The council requested members' names (other than the chair) be omitted from FCFA records.

3) Chair's report

Dispute resolution taskforce

Janes explained a "Dispute Resolution Taskforce" headed by past Faculty Senate Chair, Zoe Barsness, and made up of faculty and administrative staff members has been charged to evaluate and potentially revise dispute resolution processes for faculty at the UW. He noted he recently attended the first of what will be a series of meetings to discuss dispute resolution procedures in-depth. It is the aim that the deliberations will lead to substantial revision of the Faculty Code wherein those procedures are defined – a process envisioned to include the FCFA during the 2018-2019 academic year.

4) Non-departmentalized promotion/tenure processes

A member explained he met with the School of Social Work and Information School Elected Faculty Councils (EFCs) to present and discuss the issue of differences between promotion and tenure processes in non-departmentalized and departmentalized units (discussed in previous 2017-2018 FCFA meetings). Recent conversations on the topic have led to some debate about whether or not there is a problem relating to the differences between promotion/tenure processes, and if it needs to be addressed.

The member noted in relation to common promotion and tenure practices at other universities, many institutions “route dossiers from all campus units to some form of campus-wide committee after a dean has reviewed the case and provided an individual recommendation. These committees are generally charged with producing an independent assessment of the case for the benefit of the provost, president, or other central administrator responsible for carrying a recommendation.” When some EFCs were asked to weigh the merits of this model, they felt that a committee made up of people outside of the faculty member’s unit would not be able to effectively review the candidate, as they lack expertise in his/her field. However, EFCs were generally more accepting of a model wherein the outside review committee was purely advisory (rather than a decision-making body). The member explained though some EFCs believe there is not a problem, FCFA’s position has been that there is an issue based in the fact that certain checks and balances systems appear to be missing/insufficient in non-departmentalized units’ tenure and promotion processes.

The member noted several EFCs were interested in the tenure and promotion process used at the University of Minnesota wherein “departmentalized units perform secondary reviews much the way they do here at UW , and non-departmentalized units submit dossiers to the ‘All-University Promotion and Tenure Committee,’ which is also charged with reviewing dossiers from branch campuses of the University.” Though the EFCs were favorable to that model, many could not theorize how the “All-University Promotion and Tenure Committee” would be instituted at the UW. Other FCFA members were asked for feedback and there was some discussion.

A member concluded the Minnesota variation seems to be receiving the most positive feedback from the FCFA and consulted EFCs. He noted it may be useful for the council to focus on the Minnesota variation going forward, as the model has been proven to be worthy of further exploration. Another member noted the University of Pittsburg variation should also be considered. It was noted the two models would be further discussed when FCFA reconvenes in January, 2018.

5) Lecturers – discussion on titles/summarizing progress so far/plans going forward

Janes explained the FCFA is now in position to move ahead on developing legislation in relation to several previously-discussed topics. He noted there is general council consensus surrounding developing legislation on codifying the Provost’s Hiring Guidelines, faculty hierarchy of voting on personnel actions, improving the promotion process for lecturers, and adding voting rights of part-time lecturers.

There was some discussion of codifying the Provost’s Hiring Guidelines. A member felt the current Guidelines were insufficient being that they do not address part-time lecturers working under 50% time. The member felt promotion and hiring/rehiring procedures for that population should be evaluated.

Janes asked for volunteers to work on drafting code language to be brought back to the FCFA for full review. Jacoby, Hazlet, Vaughan, Katz, and Buck volunteered. Dhavan and Watts volunteered to act as reserve members if more eyes were needed.

Janes concluded that abstract discussion in FCFA has run its course, and code language should now be drawn up and discussed. It was noted the deadline for FCFA to move Class A legislation through the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Faculty Senate is the end of winter quarter (March, 2018).

6) Good of the order

No comments were made.

7) Adjourn

Janes adjourned the meeting at 12:16 p.m.

Minutes by Joey Burgess, jmbg@uw.edu, council support analyst

Present: **Faculty:** Margaret Adam, Steve Buck, Joseph Janes (chair), Aaron Katz, Purnima Dhavan, Jacob Vigdor, Kamran Nemati, Dan Jacoby, Tom Hazlet, Miceal Vaughan
Ex-officio reps: Judith Henchy, Ziyang Bai, Bryan Crockett
President's designee: Cheryl Cameron
Guests: Mike Townsend

Absent: **Faculty:** Kurt Johnson, Gordon Watts, Eric Bugyis
Ex-officio reps: N/A