

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., October 23, 2012
142 Gerberding Hall

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of the Agenda
 2. Approval of minutes from October 9th, 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. Adjourn
-

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. by Chair Gail Stygall.

2. Approval of minutes from October 9th, 2012

Minutes from the October 9th FCFA meeting were approved with revisions.

3. Continuation of last years' items:

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

The Council resumed discussion of steps to improve Openness within the Promotion and Tenure Process. Concerns were expressed at the last meeting regarding requiring names to be disclosed at the Subcommittee level promotion decision. Council members considered the balance between two potentially conflicting values: consistency and flexibility for departments. FCFA recognized the need to allow for variations within units, but not case by case decisions, which may cause legal issues. Departments should develop consistent guidelines on their promotion and tenure decisions.

Option: Mandated disclosure of Subcommittee names

Members deliberated either mandating or allowing for the department to choose its policy on divulging names, as long as this is consistent within Faculty Code §25-54 . Discussion followed whether there would be any benefits to omitting subcommittee names.

Mandating disclosure of a list of subcommittees members was considered and two options were discussed: allowing academic units to include this mandate in their promotion and tenure guidelines, and thus not revising the *Faculty Code*, or presenting such a statement to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) for it to make such a decision. The Council chose not to pursue such language, after concerns were expressed on lack of time for the SEC to review this. Also mentioned was the lack of affirmative statements in the *Faculty Code*, which raised the potential of legal action against the University if non-compliant, should affirmative statements be added.

Option: Potential omission of attributions, and specification of names

The Council considered other ways to maintain a balance between consistency and flexibility through redacting names from attribution within subcommittee reports. While it is important to describe opinions of the subcommittee, it was noted to not be ideal to attribute personal opinions, though subcommittee membership should not be secretive. The vote count could also be omitted within units, though some units do not have a formal vote, but a recommendation or concerns expressed.

The Council voted to allow names of the subcommittee to be listed, while not allowing for attribution to be made within reports. Drafted language was proposed as follows in the *Faculty Code* §25-54 B:

“For purposes of confidentiality, ~~all names~~ specific attributions shall be omitted and vote counts may be omitted from the candidate’s summary.”

The Council voted to include this language within the changed language on Promotion and Tenure Language, which was approved with a majority.

Consistency within Units

Discussion followed on the consistency of practices within units, allowing for culture and practices for units, without allowing for differential treatment of individual candidates. Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien drafted language prior to section A in the *Faculty Code* §25-54 to cover all subsequent sections in this process, to reduce repeated language. The statement is as follows:

“Procedures within units shall be consistent for all candidates being considered for promotion.”

Council members provided feedback. Such a statement would need to address different types of promotions (i.e. mandatory and affiliate promotions), and concerns were expressed on the word choices of “procedures” and “units.” Broader concerns were whether such language was necessary after revising the language within rather than other cross departments and campuses. Other concerns were the addition of a potential requirement which could open up legal cases; why not simply propose this to the guidelines within the *Faculty Code* §25-54 B, or if this could be addressed within the guidelines of the candidate’s college and unit. The Council held off making a decision for this addition, pending further revisions.

Flowchart for Promotion and Tenure Process

Killien also had developed a visual representation of the Promotion and Tenure process, in the hope that this will help the Council discuss issues before changing the language. Two processes were illustrated: one for departmentalized units, and another for undepartmentalized units. She discussed changes being considered by FCFA, which would add notifications at the Department Chair and Dean levels, and add recommendation of the timing of candidates’ responses.

One remaining decision is to determine when the candidates’ responses should be given, to allow them adequate time for response. Council members were uncertain if the presented version of this language

had all notes, and Steve Buck informed that he would compare versions and make a list of changes to review in its entirety.

b. Remaining revisions for Without Tenure legislation

Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Human Resources, described the two categories for without tenure appointments. One category provides additional time for faculty coming from industry to ready their skills prior to applying for tenure. After discussion with Matt O'Donnell, Dean of the School of Engineering, last year's Council had changed a proposed legislation to revise the *Faculty Code* §25-32 and §25-41 language to reflect a potential for two three year appointments. Decisions would be made on a renewal during the second year. Though the Council had decided to require that the promotion review occur during the second year of the second year appointment, with the terminal year being their sixth year, this had yet to be added to the proposed legislation, in §25-41 A. Confusion with drafts arose, and discussion would continue during FCFA's next meeting.

4. Adjournment

Chair Stygall adjourned the meeting at 10:29 a.m.

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

Present: **Faculty:** Stygall (Chair), Watts, Vaughn, Ricker, Buck, Johnson, O'Brien
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio Reps: Sukol, Henchy
 Guests: Marcia Killien

Absent: **Faculty:** Huber, Landis