

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

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of minutes from May 29th, 2012
3. Continuation of last years' items:
 - a. Next steps for Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process
 - b. Remaining revisions for Without Tenure legislation
4. Discussion regarding Executive Order 45
5. Discussion of other items to addressed during this year
6. Adjourn

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chair Gail Stygall. Members introduced themselves.

2. Approval of minutes from May 29th, 2012

Minutes from the May 29th FCFA meeting was approved as written.

3. Continuation of last years' items:

Stygall introduced multiple items from last year for continued discussion.

- a. Next steps for Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process

FCFA had been working on revising the Promotion and Tenure Process to allow for additional openness. Stygall described the potential changes which had been outlined by Rich Christie last year. Council members broadly considered whether names of the subcommittee of faculty senior in rank “may” or “shall” be disclosed to candidates which would require revision of the *Faculty Code* section 24-54 B. It was reiterated that many times, candidates do know the identities of committee members, and the *Faculty Code* would need to be updated to reflect this.

Discussion on disclosure followed, noting such instances rise in two situations: a) with names of subcommittee members, and b) the Chair’s summary of faculty discussion regarding the candidate. To address Provost Ana Mari Cauce’s concern of revealing such names in small departments, Christie surveyed small department chairs last year on their opinion of whether their decision should be disclosed to candidates. Despite some concern being expressed, the majority favored additional openness. The Council expressed different perspectives, noting different policies in different departments, and however the need for consistency to assure that procedures are not perceived as arbitrary. This could be accomplished by requiring consistency within academic units in their policy.

Members considered the need of frank discussion, but also prevention of abuse through attributing critical comments from specific faculty members. Redacting names or not attributing personal opinions while preserving rationale was suggested to prevent such abuse; these are protected unless litigation

proceeds to a discovery session. Changes in policy on disclosure of names would not impact annual reviews as this section is only applicable to internal discussion during the promotion and tenure decision. Suggestions were that using “may disclose” allowed for cultural differences within departments. After a quick informal vote on how many members supported a “may” clause, concerns were still expressed on how such language could ensure such consistency within departments. Stygall would work with Secretary of Faculty Marcia Killien to draft potential language, capturing the idea that “disclosure must be consistent across candidates and years.” Cheryl Cameron and Lea Vaughn were tasked with investigating the viability of insertion of “consistency” across all promotion and tenure processes in the *Faculty Code*.

Other questions followed on the policy of electronic voting within academic units within the section:

“The voting faculty of the candidate’s department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate’s record and to vote on the promotion question.”

Many academic units conduct electronic votes of this rather than during a meeting. Some units have codified such procedures however creating a centralized policy may be problematic. Council members questioned whether faculty not attending meetings had the right to vote, and whether a majority was constituted by a majority of the whole voting faculty within the department or simply those who attend the meeting. The School of Medicine was given as an example, voting within divisions, but later having a larger discussion with the entire school. Advantages to update this within bylaws were considered, allowing policy to be directed by faculty within academic units. Within the *Faculty Code*, revised language was suggested as follows: “The voting faculty of the candidate’s department (or college/school if undepartmentalized) superior in rank and title to the candidate shall then meet to discuss the candidate’s record. A vote will be then held on the promotion question.” This would allow for the mandatory meeting, however leave openness on the manner of voting.

The following paragraph was discussed, shifting the candidate’s response to after the Chair’s summary of the faculty proceedings. This is the candidate’s second chance of a response, and the following paragraph added the Chair’s report to be divulged to the candidate. Much discussion within FCFA had occurred on both whether the Chair’s recommendation should be provided to candidates, and when this would take place in discussion with the candidate. This was noted to be a significant change from the past practices, and required discussion to be postponed for the next FCFA meeting. Stygall emphasized cautious consideration due to risk within small departments.

b. Remaining revisions for Without Tenure legislation

The Council then discussed the Without Tenure Legislation, which returned to the Council following the April 2012 Faculty Senate meeting. Motive for changing this policy primarily comes from the College of Engineering, providing additional time for faculty coming from industry to gain grants or improve their teaching skills. Concern was expressed on the ability of without tenure faculty to vote on without tenure faculty coming up for tenure. Cheryl Cameron suggested language in C.4 of Faculty Code §25-32 to “as distinguished from without tenure due to funding.”

Without tenure by reason of funding or tenure track faculty were differentiated, noting that the need for additional time was either to determine teaching effectiveness or gaining grants. Issue was due to

timing, as a tenure decision could be made within one year; the new timeframe was to be similar to that of the assistant professor. Additional concerns were also expressed on additional 7th terminal year. Confusion followed between different drafts of revised language. This would be addressed during the next FCFA meeting.

4. Discussion regarding Executive Order 45

Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel had proposed to discuss, in light of last year's discussion on collegiality, possible changes to Executive Order 45. This will be added to a future meeting's agenda.¹

5. Discussion of other items to addressed during this year

Stygall itemized current items to develop Class A Legislation:

- Without Tenure Legislation
- Openness in Promotion and Tenure
- Inclusion of language regarding interdisciplinary work in the promotion and tenure guidelines
- Potential consideration of the Faculty Salary Policy
- Academic Freedom language: Potentially the largest of future issues. The Garcetti court case² has raised concerns from the American Association of University Professors that employees may have their opinions silenced on what is going on in their jobs. Worry is this may be applicable to academic freedom and shared governance, and language change in the *Faculty Code* may be necessary.
- SEC nomination process may require some changes
- Librarians as Faculty: FCFA expressed support for moving forward on this, pending legislation.
- Revision to RCEP process (simplify, make it more approachable, change the name) to assure that departments will not be hesitant to initiate the process.

Faculty Senate is currently discussing an Online Undergraduate Degree Completion Initiative, the proposed student diversity requirement and strengthening faculty governance at UW Bothell and Tacoma.

6. Adjournment

Chair Stygall adjourned the meeting at 10:26 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Stygall, Buck, O'Brien, Ricker, Vaughn, Landis, Watts
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: Sukol, Henchy
 Guests: Marcia Killien, Jack Lee

Absent: **Faculty:** Huber, Johnson

¹<http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO45.html>

² http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=12246082893907445304&hl=en&as_sdt=2&as_vis=1&oi=scholarr