

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., May 29, 2012
142 Gerberding Hall

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda
2. Review and Approval of minutes from last meeting
3. Continued discussion of openness in promotion and tenure
4. Without Tenure legislation reconsideration
5. Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chair Rich Christie.

2. Review and Approval of minutes from last meeting

Minutes from the May 15th FCFA meetings were approved with revisions.

3. Continued discussion of openness in promotion and tenure

Christie briefly reviewed the results of the survey he had conducted with small department chairs, which indicated their general support for increased openness in promotion and tenure process. He also reviewed the decision taken at the previous meeting to defer double-voting issues and focus on procedural changes in the *Faculty Code*. Discussion then focused on proposed language.

24-54 B:

- The Council considered potentially changing language from “shall omit names” to “may omit names” at the level of the subcommittee’s report or recommendation. Discussion followed on the possibility of different wording here, noting that it is not unusual for the subcommittee to be known to the candidate. Curiosity was expressed whether this would violate the *Faculty Code* by having such openness, and a potential compromise was suggested to allow the committee to decide whether the names or votes will be released.
- Additional language was proposed to add a meeting for the candidate to discuss this report with the department chair (or the chair's designee or the dean of an undepartmentalized school or college or the dean's designee) who will write a formal report of proceedings.
- The candidate’s response was suggested to be changed from prior to when the Chair’s analysis and recommendation is provided to candidates to afterwards, to provide an opportunity for the candidate to respond to the recommendation. The department chair would summarize proceedings and meet with candidate to discuss the report.

The change would not add to the chair's writing task. The current process already has two documents being drafted by chair, an analysis and a recommendation, and the change would be in making the second document drafted by the chair available to the candidate. Discussion followed on the rationale for the timing of the two documents drafted by the chair and whether these two documents could be integrated into one document. The candidate's response would be provided to the College Council, giving a redacted perspective of discussion, and placing burden on the candidate to respond to discussion to the College. Past concerns had been voiced that with a lack of a department chair's recommendation or summary, the chair could exercise an informal influence on the Dean's decision.

Currently, the process is as follows: the chair provides a report to the candidate after the faculty vote, and the candidate has 7 days to respond to the Chair's report, prior to the Chair's recommendation to the College. The new process would require the Chair to send a report on the faculty vote to the candidate, have a discussion with the candidate, draft a recommendation, and the candidate would have 7 days to provide a written response to the college which would arrive together with the Chair's recommendation. Should the Chair only draft one written report, this would not be drafted until after discussion with the candidate, as this would provide the candidate with the opportunity to respond verbally to concerns expressed by the Chair at their meeting.

Council members considered the tradeoffs of requiring verbal or written reports, and concluded that the visibility from both sides of the process was important. Other considerations were how this should work in an undepartmentalized school or college, as Deans summarize the faculty report, but there is no recommendation from Chair to Dean. A suggestion was made to draft a flow-chart to visualize the process.

4. Without Tenure legislation reconsideration

Christie introduced Matt O'Donnell, Dean of the College of Engineering, to the Council for reconsideration of the Without Tenure legislation. This legislation would have provided possibility of an additional 3 year appointment for this category. Though it passed at the Senate Executive Committee, the legislation was returned to the Council during the April 2012 Senate meeting.¹ FCFA had questions regarding the choice of the length of terms, and at what point extension would need to be decided, and was referred to Matt O'Donnell for further background on the ideas behind these changes.

O'Donnell explained two different usages for this category: one for faculty coming from industry as full professors, and another for newly hired very junior associate professors. He characterized benefits as ensuring quality of faculty, being cost-effective for the University and flexibility for both the candidate and UW.

Further discussion followed on the specifics of the proposed policy. The need for a longer evaluation period for faculty coming industry compare to faculty coming from other institutions was considered. Questions were posed whether such appointments could exacerbate a declining tenured/tenure track

¹ http://www.washington.edu/faculty/facsen/senate_minutes/11-12/senate_041912.pdf

faculty ratio. O'Donnell did not believe that this mechanism could be used for such purposes. There is a definite path to tenure for the faculty being considered.

The Council considered one four-year appointment rather than two three years appointments, when the possibility of renewal would be offered, and when the terminal year would occur for non-renewed WOT faculty. O'Donnell emphasized the need of additional time for candidates transferring from industry to adjust to UW, expressed support for a 3 year appointment with potential for renewal and the tenure decision occurring during the 5th year. For consistency with other associate professor policies, candidates' terminal year would be their 6th year if not gaining tenure. O'Donnell suggested that the second term be contingent on a positive first review by the Dean, and require approval by colleagues. He added that neither positive nor negative opinions on this legislation were expressed from Deans of other schools, though it was mentioned that Tacoma and Bothell may desire such a category.

Christie presented revised language, with a slightly altered justification clarifying the few incidences of such positions in this category. The Council agreed to make three-year appointments, with a potential renewal for a second three year term for consistency with other models, and for the tenure decision to be made during the fifth year, with the terminal year in the sixth year should tenure not be gained. Family planning events for "stopping the tenure clock" would still be applicable. Renewal decisions would be made during candidates' second year, with annual reviews in addition to this. A potential conflict was noted as associate professors presently have annual reviews every two years, but associate professors without tenure would be on the tenure clock and would need annual reviews. Council members expressed support for annual reviews, which would need to be addressed within other portions of the *Faculty Code*. Quorum was lost and discussion was halted. Christie will send the revised language to Gail Stygall for further revisions next year.

Council members thanked Chair Christie for his leadership, noting much work has been done, and Christie noted satisfaction with the Council's work. The June 12th meeting was cancelled.

5. Adjournment

Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:16 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Christie (Chair), Landis, O'Brien, Buck
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: Sukol, David
 Guests: Marcia Killien, Matt O'Donnell, Gail Stygall

Absent: **Faculty:** Vaughn, Huber, Ricker, Bryant-Bertail
 Ex-Officio Reps: Anderson