

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., November 22, 2011
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Agenda
- 3) Review of Minutes
- 4) Update on Pending Issues
- 5) Continued discussion of Promotion and Tenure
- 6) Adjournment

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Council Chair Rich Christie at 9:10 a.m. Christie had council members briefly introduce themselves to new ASUW representative Christine David.

2. Approval of the minutes from the November 8, 2011 Meeting

Minutes from the November 8, 2011 meeting were edited and approved.

3. Update on Pending Issues

Vandra Huber was requested to provide language regarding counseling process for non-meritorious faculty members after evaluation.

Transparency of Voting in Promotion and Tenure Process

In the discussion from the meeting on October 24th, Secretary of Faculty Marcia Killien commented on the difference between the Faculty Code and Academic Human Resources website in regards to transparency in votes during the promotion and tenure process of the voting. The Faculty Code¹ provides language that the promotion and tenure committee chair has the option of whether to reveal the outcome of votes to the candidate or not. Academic Human Resources states on its website² that no names or vote counts may be shared with the candidate, which conflicts with the Faculty Code's option to provide vote counts to the candidate. Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, will get clarification about origin of this language, and the ability to change the website to match optional disclosure of such votes to match language in the Faculty Code. Huber clarified that the intention of this clause within the Faculty Code was to provide a preliminary chance for candidates to respond to concerns prior to a vote, as she was Chair of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs when this language was amended to the Faculty Code. Larry Ricker clarified that either the Chair or Department could decide to disclose such information, allowing the possibility of vote being shared with candidates.

Rolling Voting in Promotion and Tenure Process

Secretary of the Faculty Killien also brought up questions regarding potential double-voting for Chairs or Deans in the promotion or tenure process, and whether this was fair. This is due to the fact that Chairs or Deans may vote as a faculty member, but also make an independent recommendation; small

¹ Found at: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#Sec2454>

² Found at: http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/faculty/promotion_tenure.html

departments can make this a larger issue as well. Some schools routinely excuse those who already voted prior, however Cameron noted this varies by school. Huber suggested that if the size of voting faculty was smaller than a minimum, the evaluation could be required to be redone or supplemented by additional faculty from related areas. Christie thought the modification of having a larger committee would be helpful, especially as this process is already in practice in some schools or departments, and this would decrease the need of the Dean or Chair to vote if there were a small number of faculty. There was consensus among council members that they were not comfortable with the current ambiguity, and that a larger committee size would be optimal. Christie asked if faculty members are part of a College P&T committee, should they vote on cases from their department. Carol Landis and Huber agreed that this should not be considered “double dipping” as perspectives will be different between department and college faculty. Christie closed the discussion, leaving it to be addressed during the next meeting.

4. Collegiality in Promotion and Tenure

Christie outlined the reasons why the council had decided not to alter the Faculty Code requiring collegiality of conduct at the University of Washington. In collegiality of service, different colleges and schools have different requirements already in existence, but a definition for such service is missing within the Faculty Code Section 24-32³ though a list of qualifications is provided. Section A provides a definition of teaching quality but does not provide a standard, which was Lea Vaughn’s concern during the last meeting on the lack of either minimum or maximum standards. Standards are within Section 24-32, Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles. Unlike the Faculty Code, Executive Order 45 “Documentation for Recommendations for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases”⁴ specifically addresses this service requirement.

The linkage between these qualifications and definitions in these documents is visible within the Procedure for Promotions section of the Faculty Code (Section 24-54), where Executive Order 45 is footnoted. Section 4 of this Executive Order actually provides the standards, whereas elements of the Faculty Code are focused on how they are measured. Faculty Code on Promotion and Tenure does not actually contain the standards which are mentioned to be present in Section 24, which makes the document inconsistent. Ricker suggested that the subjectivity is helpful, due to the heterogeneity across departments and Landis also agreed, noting importance of shifting contexts for different faculty members and tenure. Christie emphasized his interest was in having the standards described in Executive Order 45 linked to where standards are mentioned in the Faculty Code, and not just in the process-specific sections. Cameron agreed that Executive Order 45 did provide definitions for evaluations, providing a range of understandings in order to be applicable to multiple disciplines. Christie cited the example given by Vaughn during the last meeting that the Law School has publication requirements, but the ability to establish such standards are absent from the Faculty Code. Definitions are defined within the Faculty Code in section 24-34.

Christie is interested in addressing the issue by adding language to state that candidates could “meet or exceed” minimums but that colleges could have more specific or more stringent standards or in areas not addressed within the Faculty Code. It was clarified that there is delegation of power to Schools and Colleges to set their standards, addressed within Faculty Code Section 23-43, “Except for the graduate faculty, the faculty of each campus, college, or school:”

³ Found at: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#Sec2432>

⁴ Found at: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO45.html>

“B. Shall, with respect to personnel matters, make recommendations to its chancellor or dean in accord with the provisions of [Chapter 24](#) and of Chapter 25, [Section 25–41](#);”

Because personnel policy is listed under actions that a faculty can take, Christie concluded that this implies that school specific regulations are permitted, and can vary across schools or colleges. The council explored when conflict could arise between school or college rules and qualifications within Faculty Code. Service requirements are mentioned but not defined within “Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members (Faculty Code Section 24-32), however Executive Order 45 defines service and provides the inclusion of consideration of service under “...; and substantial contribution in other phases.” (Executive Order 45, Section 4). Due to this wording, Christie is satisfied that service is addressed appropriately, but the question remains whether indirect structure of qualifications was worth preserving or whether requirements on service needed to be added with Section 24. There were suggestions to use the language in Executive Order 45 in Section 24-34, or discussion of whether it was unnecessary to make the effort to pass Class A Legislation to change such language as the language in the Faculty Code is already sufficient.

Christie would recommend a change in title of Executive Order 45, to indicate that this contains requirements and procedures for documentation. It is also important that faculty looking promotion and tenure guidelines be able to find the additional qualifications in Executive Order 45. Christie will draft a footnote for Section 24-32 to highlight Executive Order 45. Cameron was asked to consider a title change for Executive Order 45.

5. Adjournment

Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:24 a.m.

Minutes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. jayf@u.washington.edu

Present: **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Ricker, Bryant-Bertail, Huber
 President’s Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: David (ASUW)
 Guests: Landis (Waiting to be appointed)

Absent: **Faculty:** O’Brien, Vaughn
 Ex Officio Rep: Sukol, Anderson