

University Of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., December 6, 2011  
26 Gerberding

**Meeting Synopsis:**

- 1) Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
  - 2) Review and Approval of Minutes
  - 3) Update of HR Web Site
  - 4) Continued discussion of Promotion and Tenure
  - 5) Adjournment
- 

**1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda**

No quorum was achieved. Discussion started at 9:11 a.m.

**2. Review and Approval of minutes**

Approval of minutes from the November 22, 2011 meeting remains pending.

**3. Update of HR Web Site**

Following the discussion on November 8, 2011, FCFA requested that Cheryl Cameron revise language on the Academic Human Resources (AHR) website<sup>1</sup> in order to improve consistency between the Promotion and Tenure process in the Faculty Code and on the AHR website. Cameron presented a draft of the changed language, as follows:

I. Academic Human Resources (AHR) website currently states:

‘No names of reviewers or vote counts should be included in that summary.’

Proposed revision:

‘For purposes of confidentiality, the summary shall not include the names of the reviewers and may exclude the vote counts at the discretion of the department chair/ program director (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college).’

II. Academic Human Resources (AHR) website currently states:

‘Again, names and vote counts should be omitted from that summary report.’

Proposed Revision:

‘Again, for purposes of confidentiality, the summary report shall not include the names of the voting faculty and may exclude the vote counts at the discretion of the department chair/ program director (or dean in an undepartmentalized school or college).’

The council debated the language of excluding vote counts at the “discretion of department chair or program director,” and whether the AHR website serves as policy as it is not part of the UW Policy Directory. Secretary of Faculty Marcia Killien noted that some departments list that vote counts should be shared. Christie was concerned that the AHR website might be taken as policy by the various units. To

---

<sup>1</sup> See AHR website, [http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/admin/promotion\\_tenure.html](http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/admin/promotion_tenure.html)

clarify this point, the AHR website “provides guidance on policies and procedures,”<sup>2</sup> and it was suggested that wording could be added to note in conflicting cases to refer to University Policies and Procedures.

Killien expressed concern that this revised language may contradict statements within academic units, and that she believes the wording of the “discretion” goes further than the code implies. Cameron noted her concern that departmental rules may not directly address the issue of confidentiality. Christie emphasized that differences between the AHR guidelines and the Faculty Code will need to be addressed. He suggested that in cases of conflicts, it was necessary to use the Faculty Code as it is voted on by Faculty and approved by the President. Christie clarified that these recommendations are from three faculty members, rather than from the Council itself and this topic will need to be revisited.

#### **4. Continued discussion of openness in the Promotion and Tenure process**

Killien was concerned in the cases within the Promotion and Tenure process when a Dean makes a decision which differs from faculty input, or the Provost makes a recommendation which differs from college input, and whether sufficient feedback is given to justify such a decision. The Council debated whether it has jurisdiction on such procedures. It was suggested that FCFA either draft clarifying legislation or recommend such clarification to the provost.

Further questions arose as to whether the promotion and tenure candidate has the right to know the recommendation of the Dean or the elected faculty council, the rationale for disclosing such information and communication of concerns between the Office of the Provost and the department. Cameron commented that such concerns from the Provost Office are provided to the candidate’s department via the Dean, and denials are communicated to candidates in writing by the AHR office. Debate continued on the Dean’s responsibility to communicate the Provost’s justifications, and whether it would be valuable to clarify this process.

#### **5. Adjournment**

Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:20 a.m.

---

*Notes by Jay Freistadt, Faculty Council Support Analyst. [jayf@u.washington.edu](mailto:jayf@u.washington.edu)*

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Ricker, O’Brien,  
                          **President’s Designee:** Cameron  
                          **Ex-Officio Reps:** David, Sukol, Anderson  
                          **Guests:** Killien

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Bryant-Bertail, Huber, Vaughn, Landis

---

<sup>2</sup> “The Academic Human Resources website is designed to provide administrators, current and prospective faculty, librarians, and academic staff with a wide range of information and guidance on University policies and procedures.” <http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/>