

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., Feb. 21, 2012
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approval of agenda
 2. Review and approval of minutes
 3. Qualification for Appointments at Specific Ranks and Titles - Language Review
 4. Contributions to Diversity Language – Update
 5. Duration of part time lecturer appointments
 6. Openness in P&T – Proposals
 7. Adjournment
-

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

Discussion started at 9:03 a.m.

2. Review and Approval of minutes

Minutes from the February 7, 2012 were approved as written.

3. Qualification for Appointments at Specific Ranks and Titles - Language Review

Draft language for delegating authority to recommend renewals and new appointments of part time lecturers, affiliate faculty, research associates and clinical faculty was reviewed. A final version was agreed. The language was slightly modified to ensure that authority for multi-year part time lecturer appointments could not be delegated. The Council will consider permitting such appointments shortly.

Draft language to provide two three year terms as an alternative to one three year term for “without tenure” (WOT) faculty was reviewed and approved.

The Council agreed that the two issues should be brought to the Senate Executive Committee separately. Christie agreed to write a draft justification and circulate to the Council.

4. Contributions to Diversity Language – Update

Carol Landis provided a brief update on the revisions of the Class A Legislature to add Diversity Language into the Faculty Code. She noted a broad spectrum of opinion within the Special Committee revising the legislature. The language has been kept consistent with the intent of the proposition.

Landis noted the principal work was concentrated on the introductory paragraph of the legislation. Changes were consolidating the first two sentences, and adding this language to the preamble section rather than being a separate paragraph. Concerns were raised that the Faculty Code, in Sections 24-54 and 24-57 already include language requesting candidates submit all research, teaching and service for their tenure review, and thus all research relating to diversity would already be taken into account.

Procedural sections in the Faculty Code were not reviewed, rather focusing on the qualifications section. The politicization of this topic was noted, should it be voted down by the Faculty, and other alternatives such as addition of language as a Statement of Principal and Footnote were not supported. Killien suggested that Council members attend the Faculty Senate meeting to voice such concerns.

5. Duration of part time lecturer appointments

Christie mentioned that the historical rationale for having one year restrictions on part-time lecturers was not known. The Council supported the crafting of new language to permit multi-year part time lecturer appointments. Distinctions between competitive and non-competitive recruitment were discussed. Many departments which do quarterly or annual appointments lack the time to do competitive recruitments, and national searches for part time lecturers are uncommon. Steve Buck also noted tension between designating Chairs with the power to make appointments (through agenda item 3), who could then make a three year appointment, resulting in some adjustment in that language to prevent delegation for multi-year appointments.

Discussion followed on whether there is increasing flexibility with practitioners filling faculty roles. The Council deliberated the distinction between competitively recruited and non-competitively recruited lecturers. Potential changes were explored for addition of annual or quarterly appointments within the Faculty Code Section 24-52, but concerns were raised. Christie noted that if FCFA comes to agreement on this item, then legislation may still be a possibility within this academic year.

6. Openness in P&T – Proposals

Continuing on the Openness in Promotion and Tenure subject from earlier meetings, Christie created a table tracking the different stages of the Promotion and Tenure process and the information flow to and from the candidate, to assist discussion on whether there should be more points where candidates are notified of the status of their case and more points to allow candidates response to negative recommendations. He discussed each particular step, noting which steps do not have an informational requirement and response from candidates.

Discussion followed on the role of the subcommittee within the faculty vote, and the timing of responses. There is no opportunity in the Code for candidate input after the recommendation by the Chair, or at any point later in the process. Discussion followed regarding disclosure to candidates of the Elected Faculty Council decision.

The Council has been informed that Deans routinely meet with candidates after the Elected Faculty Council decision but prior to making a decision in difficult cases. Christie noted Kellye Testy, Chair of the Board of Deans, would not oppose making this process formal, but was concerned about additional time or labor within this portion. There is no requirement to notify candidate of the decision by the Dean, and questions arose on whether this should be changed, and if there is a procedure within Academic Human Resources requiring notification. Killien noted 9 cases of faculty members complaining about not being notified of the outcome or rationale for the outcome since 2007, and will gather more data.

7. Adjournment

Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:30 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Vaughn, Buck, Landis, Huber
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: David

Absent: **Faculty:** Bryant-Bertail, O'Brien, Ricker
 Ex-Officio Reps: Anderson, Sukol