

University Of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., November 8, 2011  
142 Gerberding

**Meeting Synopsis:**

- 1) Call to Order
- 2) Approval of Agenda
- 3) Review of Minutes
- 4) Future FCFA topics
- 5) Collegiality in Promotion and Tenure
- 6) Adjournment

---

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Council Chair Rich Christie at 9:16 a.m.

**1. Approval of the minutes from the October 24, 2011**

Minutes from the October 24, 2011 meeting were edited and approved, with one abstention.

**2. Future FCFA Topics**

Chair Christie requested input on potential topics for the Council to focus on during the 2011 – 2012 academic school year. Prior items mentioned were as follows:

- **Counseling process for non-meritorious faculty members**  
Vandra Huber has raised the issue of counseling for non-meritorious faculty members after evaluation. She would like the counseling committee to go a step further and create a plan for the faculty member's success.
- **Modification of the statement of Faculty Rights**  
Jim Gregory, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate has raised the issue of modification of the Faculty Rights section in the Faculty Code, particularly within Rights and Responsibilities and language regarding academic freedom, to language modeled on the University of Utah's code, which may be appealing to President Young.
- **Transparency in Promotion and Tenure process**  
Secretary of Faculty Marcia Killien is compiling College promotion and tenure processes, which have a wide variation in procedures among different units. She briefly described the current procedure for Promotion and Tenure in the Faculty Code. The process includes discussion during voting by department faculty, which is attended by the chair, who summarizes the discussion and makes an independent recommendation. After this, the case goes to the school, college or campus level, where an elected faculty council makes an advisory vote that is given to dean as a recommendation. The dean in turn makes a recommendation that is then confirmed by the provost. Killien requested that the Council consider three different elements of this process:

- a) Lack of clarity as to whether the faculty vote may, must or must not be shared with the faculty member: There is a discrepancy between the Academic Human Resources (AHR) website and the Faculty Code. The Faculty Code states that, at the department level, “[f]or purposes of confidentiality, all names shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate's summary.”<sup>1</sup> The AHR website differs, stating of faculty votes “[n]o names of reviewers or vote counts should be included in that summary.”<sup>2</sup> This discrepancy may result in confusion for departments and department chairs regarding the transparency of the vote.
- b) Deans and Chairs’ “rolling voting”: At a department level, a chair may sometimes vote as a faculty member, but then must also make an independent recommendation. Similarly, some faculty may be voting at both department and college levels. Questions arise regarding fairness in these cases, especially in small departments.
- c) Transparency of chair or dean’s rationale to candidates: There is currently no requirement that department chair or dean provide rationales for their decisions to candidates.

Killien requested that the FCFA investigate whether the Faculty Code is sufficient, or whether language should be added to promote more transparent decision-making within the Promotion and Tenure process. She noted that a common request for conciliations is to determine at which level a case was recommended; currently the only requirement is that the department faculty discussion must be summarized for the candidate.

- **Appointment Related Code Clarification**  
Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, found the Council’s work clarifying lecturer and instructor issues ([http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/legislation/class\\_a/class\\_a124.pdf](http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/legislation/class_a/class_a124.pdf)) helpful. She noted that other appointment related issues have arisen. She was requested to bring some alternative language for the council’s consideration.
- **Librarian Faculty Status**  
Serin Anderson, ALUW representative, noted that the Librarians continued to consider faculty status. Christie described the previous discussion over this subject, and that the Council had decided to support any decision by Librarians to seek faculty status should the Librarians so decide.

Christie requested members’ opinion regarding the prioritization of these potential topics. He mentioned that the Transparency of Promotion and Tenure process would be a natural transition due to the previous discussion on Collegiality in Promotion and Tenure.

### 3. Collegiality in Promotion and Tenure

Christie discussed that during the last session, the Council had tentatively reached a consensus that there is no need to add a specific collegiality clause regarding conduct of behavior in Promotion and Tenure standards for four reasons. 1) The Faculty Code successfully operated without the clause for years; 2) the article circulated during the October 25<sup>th</sup> FCFA meeting illustrated upheld dismissals for conduct despite absence of any explicit conduct clause in promotion and tenure guidelines; 3) implicit

<sup>1</sup> See Faculty Code, Chapter 24-54, <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>

<sup>2</sup> See AHR website, [http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/faculty/promotion\\_tenure.html](http://www.washington.edu/admin/acadpers/faculty/promotion_tenure.html)

expectation that faculty would take collegiality into account for promotion and tenure even if not in Faculty Code; and 4) an explicit conduct clause could be abused to deny tenure for a faculty member, in retaliation for criticism of scholarly positions or work of senior faculty.

Christie pointed out parenthetically that Executive Order No. 45, found as a footnote to section 24-54, Procedure For Promotions and entitled “Documentation for Recommendations for Promotion, Tenure, and Merit Increases” in fact contains standards for promotion and tenure, rather than just a list of expected documentation. For example, “To warrant recommendation for the granting of tenure or for promotion in the professorial ranks, a candidate must have shown outstanding ability in teaching or research, an ability of such an order as to command obvious respect from colleagues and from professionals at other universities;...”. Christie suggested that the title of E.O. 45 could be amended to better reflect its contents and it could be prominently referenced in Section 24–32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members. Cheryl Cameron indicated a willingness to consider any proposed title change.

The council discussed whether having unwritten criteria or subjectivity within the promotion and tenure process was beneficial or detrimental. Killien noted that the reason she brought this issue to the council was to determine if collegiality could be used as the sole reason for denial of promotion or tenure. An upcoming adjudication decision may hold that collegiality cannot be used as sole reason for such denial, but there is nothing in the code which suggests otherwise.

Lea Vaughn stated that the Faculty Code is unclear about whether promotion and tenure requirements are either minimum or maximum requirements and that this may contribute to the need to address collegiality. She also suggested that if adjudication decisions were made public, removing individually identifiable data, that would serve to create a greater understanding of the Faculty Code. It is not clear whether departments could have higher promotion and tenure standards than Faculty Code without being in conflict with it, and if so whether such interpretation conflicts with the intentions behind the Faculty Code. If units have higher standards, such as taking account of service within promotion and tenure, members of the council agreed this was fine, as long as these were not implicit and were clearly articulated by academic units.

There was disagreement as to whether or not there were sufficient reviews after professors had tenure. Vaughn noted that the only two inappropriate behaviors directly discussed by the Code are discrimination / sexual harassment and scholarly misconduct. Despite this, the Code notes that “[i]n all other kinds of cases the dean shall appoint a special investigating committee of three faculty members who are not directly involved in the matter being considered.”<sup>3</sup> Vaughn thought it would be beneficial to have some language here directed at abusive or annoying faculty members, to support Deans in dealing with these individuals and thus dissuade such behavior. Christie requested that council members come to the next meeting with example language to specify behavior that does not classify within sexual harassment or scholarly misconduct and delineate abusive or aggressive behavior.

#### **4. Adjournment**

Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:19 a.m.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Faculty Code, Chapter 24-71 Section D3,  
<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html>

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

**Present:**       **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Ricker, Vaughn, Bryant-Bertail  
                  **President's Designee:** Cameron  
                  **Ex-Officio Reps:** Anderson, Sukol,  
                  **Guests:** Killien

**Absent:**       **Faculty:** Huber, O'Brien  
                  **Ex Officio Rep:**