

University Of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., January 10, 2012  
142 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) Updates / New Items
  - 6) Adjournment
- 

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

Discussion started at 9:01 a.m.

**2. Review and Approval of minutes**

Minutes from the November 22, 2011 meeting were approved.

**3. Update of HR Web Site**

Concerns about language regarding the visibility of votes during the Promotion and Tenure process on the Academic Human Resources website have been addressed by Academic Human Resources updating the Web Site, which now reads 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).’

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

Christie reviewed the discussion on Collegiality in Promotion and Tenure process, which earlier had concluded that no changes should be made within the Faculty Code because denial of tenure due to reasons of lack of collegiality has been commonplace elsewhere and successfully defended in lawsuits despite the absence of collegiality in promotion and tenure guidelines in these universities.

Two members mentioned they thought this item warranted additional discussion. Christie provided example language from the College of Engineering, discussed the bar on behavior for promotion and distinguished between Collegiality of Service and Collegiality of Behavior. The issue remained unresolved as the topic of discussion shifted towards transparency within the Promotion and Tenure Process.

Christie gave the background on the information provided to promotion and tenure candidates during the process. The candidate is informed of any subcommittee report, and can respond, and then of the faculty discussion, and can respond, but not of the College discussion, Dean's recommendation or Provost's justification. Cheryl Cameron mentioned that if the Provost's decision is different than the Dean's recommendation, this information is provided to the Dean; if they agree with the Dean's recommendation, no further information is necessary. It was noted that whether the Provost receives the college council's recommendation varies with academic units. Huber suggested that this process be standardized across schools, and asked whether full packet of voting results is provided to the Provost. Christie read through Faculty Code Chapter 24-54 Section C:<sup>1</sup>

“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. 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.”

Vaughn noted when this language was drafted it was believed to be politically unviable to require openness in this process by Deans, and this was left to be dealt with in the future.

The issue was clarified to be whether the candidate is provided the opportunity to respond to the decision at each stage of the promotion and tenure process. Debate occurred whether or not adjudications arose due to lack information about the Provost's decision on candidates. It was noted that the Promotion and Tenure process in the code does not mention the Provost, though present in [Executive Order 12](#). The rationale for secrecy in the process was questioned, and it was suggested that at the departmental level, such secrecy served to protect against animosity within the department, if voting against tenure, but this reason would not apply to higher levels in the decision making process.

Christie offered to draft a letter to the Board of Deans and ask for their opinion on this issue, and send to the Chair of the Board of Deans, Kellye Testy. Discussion followed on whether more openness would increase or decrease adjudication cases, and whether more openness would improve the honesty and rigor of annual reviews, since these would now have to be consistent with the decision justification. (There is some belief that, for some faculty, annual reviews are softened to avoid confrontation, while “true” concerns are conveyed to the college council and Dean during the promotion process.)

---

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

The Council discussed at what level such transparency was necessary, at the Department Committee, Chairs and Deans or Provost level. Concerns were voiced on the difficulty of justifying negative decisions in smaller departments due to the risk of grudges. Cameron suggested that Susan Neff, University Ombudsman, could attend a meeting to discuss the cases. It was noted that a clear, transparent and fair performance appraisal process can help unsuccessful candidates come to terms with the results. Christie also raised the question of justifying promotions given against faculty recommendation to the faculty, and asked whether this was worth considering. Consensus was that this did not require attention.

Discussion ended due to the time.

## **5. Updates / New Items**

Christie noted that the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA) had brought Class A Legislation forward to the Senate Executive Committee, which had placed it on the agenda for the next Senate meeting. The legislation would modify the Promotion and Tenure standards to require that contributions to diversity be considered. Christie distributed the draft legislation from the SEC agenda.

Cameron commented that though the legislature mentioned alteration within Faculty Code Section 24-31, there were no revisions proposed.

Council members expressed concerns about singling out a particular element (diversity), the possibility of recommendations being interpreted as a requirement, or potentially throwing off the tripartite balance between service, teaching and research. The council also was unanimously of the opinion that the requirement to consider contributions if any were made would become a defacto requirement to make such contributions, despite the language as written.

Christie will communicate the Council's concerns to FCMA's Chair David Takeuchi, and invite him to the next FCFA meeting, which will be before the next Senate meeting.

## **6. Duration of Lecturer Appointments**

This topic was left for a later meeting.

## **7. Adjournment**

Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:06.

---

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

**Present:**           **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Vaughn, Huber, O'Brien, Landis, Bryant-Bertail  
**President's Designee:** Cameron  
**Ex-Officio Reps:** Anderson, David  
**Guests:** Steve Buck (awaiting confirmation)

**Absent:**           **Faculty:** Ricker