

**University of Washington**  
**Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs**  
November 21<sup>st</sup>, 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 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017
  3. Lecturer matters – promotion consideration & title changes
  4. Non-departmentalized promotion/tenure processes – review of proposals
  5. Good of the order
  6. Adjourn
- 

**1) Call to order**

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

**2) Review of the minutes from November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017**

The minutes from November 7<sup>th</sup>, 2017 were approved as amended.

**3) Update on SEC discussion**

Janes reported on several topics learned of in a recent Senate Executive Committee meeting.

He explained Faculty Legislative Representative, JoAnn Taricani, reported that state-level legislation on adding a faculty member regent to the UW Board of Regents (BoR) will go through the legislative process again during the next legislative session.

“Unit adjustment” raises were reported to be working as designed since their inception via Executive Order in fall, 2016. Moreover, a widespread initiative to increase Elected Faculty Council (EFC) engagement/participation in unit budgetary planning has been largely successful, as an increasing amount of EFCs are seeking consultation with their deans on budgetary decisions. Also at the meeting, the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations (aka. Code Cops) was charged to look at the bylaws of all the schools and colleges and campuses, particularly surrounding the makeup of their EFCs.

Janes explained he also presented the current status of the FCFA’s work surrounding lecturers in the meeting, not going into too much detail but providing an overview of topics under consideration and progress made.

There was some discussion of the idea for FCFA to deliver its legislative proposals during academic year 2017-2018 as a “package” (all legislation to be considered at one time), though ultimately no

recommendation was made relating to the practice. The SEC was appreciative of learning of FCFA's legislative plans before proposals come forward formally. Janes reported there was no pushback on reorganizing the hierarchy surrounding faculty personnel actions, and no pushback on codifying the Provost's Hiring Guidelines.

There was some discussion of the senate majority changing in Olympia to a slim Democrat majority, and the effect the change may have on political matters affecting higher education and the UW. A member recommended that the Faculty Legislative Representative be given explicit guidance on faculty's legislative priorities for the next legislative session.

#### **4) Lecturer matters – promotion consideration & title changes**

Janes explained he would like to revisit the topic of promotion consideration for lecturers. He recalled there was a dividing line in the council between making promotion consideration (for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer) a mandatory consideration, or essentially an encouraged practice. Janes noted the FCFA should decide whether it would reconceive of this matter, or continue with it.

A member begged the question of if lecturers would really be helped by legislation making promotion consideration mandatory. He noted being that tenure is not involved, he does not see a need to force lecturers to go up for promotion. Cameron (president's designee) shared data that of the 18 promotions from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer during academic year 2016-17, in 14 cases the lecturer had been in the Lecturer title for three years or less.

A member noted he would like to zero in on language substantiating a mandatory "offer" for promotion review. He explained it seems it should be an obligation of the chair to offer the review, and agreed lecturers should not be forced to be reviewed. Another member mentioned noted he heard from two lecturers that they felt it was inappropriate to ask for promotion consideration.

Cameron clarified that the first paragraph of Faculty Code section 24-54 states: "annually, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion by their department chair." Janes noted strengthening this clause without explicitly requiring promotion consideration is the difficult situation FCFA is dealing with. There was some discussion of if a lecturer moving from the Lecturer rank to the Senior Lecturer rank is actually treated as a "promotion" at the UW, or classified as a completely separate and new appointment. Cameron clarified it is generally treated as a promotion. A member suggested a footnote be inserted at the bottom of Section 24-54 page defining who the "eligible members of the faculty" are.

There was some discussion of the timing/conditions of lecturer promotion consideration, especially considering if a lecturer does not want to be considered. A member questioned if lecturers are actually being notified on an annual basis of the opportunity to be reviewed for promotion (as stipulated in Faculty Code Section 24-54).

A member questioned if a change was made to the Faculty Code requiring/strongly encouraging promotion consideration, would that addition to the Code empower/enable lecturers to take initiative

to be considered for promotion. Another member noted he believes that the change in the Code on its own without communication to unit heads about the mandate would not significantly help lecturers. There was brief attention called to the first passage in Faculty Code Section 24-57.C, where there is language on chairs, deans (or their designees) conferring individually with all full-time lecturers concerning their career goals.

A straw poll was taken of all FCFA members and guests present in favor of various options. Options included:

1. Mandatory promotion consideration for Lecturers without the ability for the lecturer to “opt out” of the review
2. Mandatory promotion consideration for Lecturers with the ability for the lecturer to “opt out” of the review
3. Strengthen support language for promotion consideration of Lecturers to occur (within the Faculty Code)
4. Continue with the status quo (make no change).

Janes summarized the vote; Options 2 and 3 were most favored, while Option 4 had no support, and Option 1 very little support.

Janes concluded the discussion has resulted in a better sense of the issue in FCFA. He noted it would be useful to ask lecturers, EFCs, and other groups the above questions and track their responses.

## **5) Non-departmentalized promotion/tenure processes – review of proposals**

Vigdor explained he has not consulted with any other EFCs since the time of the last FCFA meeting (concerning non-departmentalized promotion/tenure process). He explained he has drafted a memo that includes five completely different revisions for Faculty Code Section 24-54 (specifically subsections C. and D.) – with each option representing a different potential solution for the issue of incongruences between promotion/tenure processes in departmentalized and non-departmentalized units at the UW (Exhibit 1).

Vigdor presented a brief overview of the five options, explaining the majority of options are based off tenure & promotion procedures in use at other U.S. higher education institutions (Exhibit 1). He noted he is seeking FCFA input on the options.

Townsend (Secretary of the Faculty, Faculty Senate & Governance) explained other sections of the Faculty Code would need to be revised in order to enact the changes prescribed in the memo. One member spoke in favor of Option #2 and did not like Option #6 (Provost Committee Variation). Another member favored Option #4 (Minnesota Variation). Janes clarified Option #3 (Pittsburg Variation) is

designed to deal with the secondary review including the same people from the primary review (allowing those people to vote twice), as the approach avoids that problem.

Vigdor noted he does not believe a straw vote is necessary at this time. He noted he plans to consult additional EFCs and ask them for feedback on the Options. He noted it would be best if a consensus emerges around a particular Option, and that he is also seeking serious reservations relating to any Option. He noted he will return with any updates in two weeks for the next FCFA meeting.

## 6) Good of the order

Nothing was stated.

## 7) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:17 p.m.

---

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

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

**Absent:** **Faculty:** Eric Bugyis  
**Ex-officio reps:** JoAnn Taricani

### Exhibits

Exhibit 1 – tenureprocess\_draft\_coderevisions.doc

## Memorandum

November 17, 2017

To: Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs

From: Jake Vigdor

Re: Draft code revisions for tenure/promotion in non-departmentalized units.

Note that all revisions pertain to Faculty Code Section 24-54. Note further that this section describes a procedure that pertains only to "mandatory" promotion decisions, or in the event a faculty member requests that this procedure be followed.

Note further that the term "mandatory" is not explicitly defined in Faculty Code Chapter 24. The term appears six times in this section of the code, in 24-49 subsections D and E pertaining to part-time assistant professors, and four times in 24-54 itself. For purposes of this memorandum, the term "mandatory review" is interpreted to mean "the review for promotion from assistant to associate professor, which must occur by the time an assistant professor has attained a particular duration-of-service threshold."

### 1. ORIGINAL VERSION

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

### 2. OCCAM'S RAZOR VARIATION (eliminates secondary review requirement)

C. In departmentalized colleges or schools, the dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

In a non-departmentalized college or school, the voting faculty superior in rank and title to the candidate constitute a committee of the whole advisory to the dean, and the faculty vote described in Section 24-54, subsection B constitutes its recommendation to the dean.

### 3. PITTSBURGH VARIATION

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council ~~of the college or school~~. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case

presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. ~~In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.~~ The committee or council must consist of faculty superior in academic rank or title to the person under consideration who did not participate in the report-writing, discussion, or vote outlined in Section 24-54, subsection B.

#### 4. MINNESOTA VARIATION

C. The dean shall be advised by a committee or council of the college or school (or a campus-wide committee if undepartmentalized). This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school (or by the combined faculty of undepartmentalized units), shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department shall ~~may~~ be excused. Any member of the campus-wide committee who is also a member of the candidate's college or school shall be excused.

#### 5. WISCONSIN VARIATION

C. The dean shall be advised by a ~~divisional committee~~ committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the ~~combined~~ faculty of the ~~college or school~~ its constituent departments, colleges, and schools college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the ~~divisional~~ committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the ~~council or divisional~~ committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. ~~In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration,~~ Any member of the ~~divisional~~ committee ~~or council~~ who is also a member of the candidate's department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) shall ~~may~~ be excused.

#### 6. PROVOST COMMITTEE VARIATION (requiring revision to subsections C and D).

##### C.

The dean ~~may shall~~ be advised by a committee or council of the college or school. This advisory group, elected by the faculty of the college or school, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendations with reasons therefor to the dean. If the recommendation of the committee or council is not favorable, or if it conflicts with the faculty vote, then the council or committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be

omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. In a departmentalized school or college, when a candidate for promotion is under consideration, any member of the committee or council who is also a member of the candidate's department may be excused.

**D.**

After receiving the recommendation of this committee or council the dean shall **issue a decision or recommendation** ~~decide the matter~~.

Prior to the issuance of a decision or recommendation by the dean that is not favorable, the dean shall provide the candidate with his or her initial recommendation and reasons therefor. In such cases, the dean or the dean's designee shall then discuss the case with the candidate. The candidate may then respond in writing to the dean within seven calendar days of the discussion.

If the recommendation of the dean is favorable, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, the dean shall transmit his or her recommendation and the candidate's response, if it exists, to the candidate and to the Provost. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the report to the candidate.

If the promotion decision of the dean is not favorable and not mandatory, and the candidate has written a response to the dean, the dean shall transmit his or her decision and the candidate's response to the Provost for information purposes.

**If the promotion recommendation is both favorable and mandatory, the Provost shall be advised by a campus-wide committee on academic personnel. This advisory group, appointed by the Senate Executive Committee, shall consider each case presented to it and submit its recommendation to the Provost. If the recommendation of the committee is not favorable, then the committee recommendation with reasons therefor shall be provided to the candidate. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from this report. Any member of the committee who is also a member of the candidate's department (or the candidates' college or school if undepartmentalized) shall be excused.**

**After receiving the recommendation of this committee, where applicable, the Provost shall decide the matter.**