

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., December 4, 2012
Guthrie Annex 3

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of minutes from November 20th 2012
3. Discussion regarding Executive Order 45
4. Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process
5. Adjourn

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:13 a.m. by Chair Gail Stygall, and the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of minutes from November 20th 2012

Minutes from the November 20th Meeting were approved with revisions.

3. Discussion regarding Executive Order 45

The potential to revise Executive Order 45¹ had arisen during the Council's consideration of collegiality during 2011-12, from questions of whether to include language on collegiality within the *Faculty Code*. Cheryl Cameron, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, brought these revisions for the Council's considerations, as an informal review. While the Council had decided that collegiality was important to be addressed, it did not recommend that the *Faculty Code* be revised, and this revision provides an alternative way to do so. Executive Orders proposed by the President do not require approval of the Faculty, however the Secretary of the Faculty and Faculty leadership are consulted for comments.

Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien expressed concern of having differing language on promotion and tenure in different parts of the Policy Manual. Faculty or academic units may not consider consulting Executive Orders for policy on promotion and tenure cases. Beyond inconsistencies in guidelines between the *Faculty Code* and Executive Orders, there is also a need for "linkages" between pertinent policies between such documents in the Policy Manual. Council members provided feedback on sections of the revised Executive Order:

- 2. Research

Council members suggested to clarify language on external support as "success, **as appropriate**, in securing external support" to avoid confusion that all faculty may be judged on their external support, as different appointments. Members also considered the balance between external support and intellectual merit for faculty, and how to emphasize the importance of publication quality. Council members considered this language to be consistent with criteria in *Faculty Code* § 24.32.

¹ Current form found online at: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/PO/EO45.html>

- 3. Service

Council members deliberated the separation of language regarding service within both the “Service” and “Other Considerations” sections. This separation was justified as the “Other Considerations” section emphasizes such a fit within academic units, rather than across the University as a whole.

- 4. Other Considerations

Discussion on the “Other Considerations” section followed on whether the new language “high standards of professional integrity and conduct” would impact academic freedom. The *Faculty Code* currently lacks centralized standards of conduct beyond § 25-71.² Council members emphasized the need to ensure respectful interactions, without limiting academic freedom. A suggestion was made to separate the conduct language within the “Service” section, and leave integrity within “Other Considerations,” but this section was deemed to address broader goals than service. Cameron suggested language of “Does a given candidate demonstrate high standards of academic citizenship and professional conduct...” to clarify the intention of such broader goals. Other sections of the *Faculty Code* also provide language on respectful behavior, such as § 24-33 which deals with academic freedom, but exist outside of the promotion and tenure criteria.

Consistency

The Council considered the benefits of potential inconsistencies between the *Faculty Code* and Executive Order 45, noting compliance issues could arise if the *Faculty Code* is not changed to be consistent. Items which would need to be added to the *Faculty Code* for consistency were the following:

- Potential for continued success in scholarly attainments
- Achieving appropriate levels of independence and/or collaboration. FCFA will later consider interdisciplinary appointments, which could provide an opportunity to revise such language.

Killien suggested making “housekeeping” changes to reference Executive Order 45 in portions of the Faculty Code addressing promotion and tenure, as done in §24-55 A-1 and §24-32. Such revisions do not require legislation, and identify the importance of Executive Order 45 in promotion and tenure. Cameron cautioned potential risk of not highlighting other equally important sections.

The Council agreed to inform Cameron to proceed with this revision, which will be revisited by the Senate Executive Committee or the Faculty Senate, as this will have a high impact on faculty.

4. Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process

This will be discussed at the next meeting, in addition to proposal on academic freedom.

5. Adjournment

Chair Stygall adjourned the meeting at 10:17 a.m.

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

² Found online: <http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH25.html#2571>

Present: **Faculty:** Stygall (Chair), Landis, Buck, Watts, O'Brien
 President's Designee: Cameron
 Guests: Killien

Absent: **Faculty:** Huber, Johnson, Vaughn, Ricker,
 Ex-Officio Reps: Sukol, Henchy