

University Of Washington
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., January 22, 2013
Gerberding 142

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order and Approval of the agenda
2. Approval of minutes from January 8th 2013
3. Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process
4. Class A Legislation - Academic Freedom
5. Adjourn

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m. by Chair Gail Stygall, and the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of minutes from January 8th 2013

Minutes from the January 8th meeting were approved with revisions.

3. Openness in the Promotion and Tenure Process

Faculty Code § 24-54 Section B:

During the last meeting, it had been suggested to align processes in departmentalized and undepartmentalized units. This was suggested to be accomplished by changing “departmental” to “faculty” within “The candidate may send a written response to the departmental recommendation to the advisory group . . .” The Council agreed to this change.

Faculty Code § 24-54 Section D:

Concern was raised on the use of “favorable” in drafted language: “If the recommendation of the committee or council of Subsection C is not favorable...” The question was raised how “favorable” could be interpreted? Council members found that the phrase emphasizes the candidate’s point of view. Scenarios were described for postponement, and it was asked whether the faculty’s request is documented in this process. Legal decisions would use precedent, and it was suggested that the meaning would be understood. This language was not changed.

It was suggested that language was confusing that mandated the dean to provide the committee’s recommendation to the candidate, without direct mention of the Dean’s recommendation. It was suggested to strike “therefor provided by the committee or council” from “shall provide the candidate with the recommendation and reasons therefor provided by the committee or council.” Additionally, language was changed to “Subsection C is not favorable, and/or prior to the issuance of a decision or ...” to distinguish between the Dean and committee’s recommendations. These changes were approved.

Within the language “In such cases the dean shall then meet with the candidate to discuss the case,” there was lack of clarity on if a designate would be allowed to serve instead of the Dean or when such a meeting occurred. Face-to-face meetings may not be possible, with remote campuses. “In such cases the dean or designate shall then discuss the case with the candidate.” This was approved.

Discussion followed on the inclusion of mandatory reviews within this process. Language was suggested: “If the decision is favorable or mandatory.” This was approved.

The Council considered the difference between using “decision” or “recommendation.” One is dean’s recommendation and the other is the decision on the case. Concerns were expressed on the logistics of including the President’s office or falsely expressed “support.” The Council also debated whether Deans should their recommendations to the candidate, to achieve transparency, or if this would be too taxing of a process. It was suggested that having feedback at all points in the process is optimal. Questions were raised whether the Board of Deans would accept an additional requirement to present their recommendation to candidates.

The language in this section as written leads candidates to assume a positive decision if they hear nothing. Other questions were raised on how a discussion could be mandated between a dean or their designate and the candidate, and the sending of their letters due to additional time and lack of flexibility on mandatory promotions. Questions were posed whether this should account for “mixed reviews,” rather than either positive or negative. Lea Vaughn and Vandra Huber offered to investigate this part.

Potential redundancy may occur with *Faculty Code* Section 25-41, and Stygall suggested linking Section 25-41 to this language in 24-54. Next steps were discussed, and Cheryl Cameron suggested seeking input on this language from the Board of Deans on the 6th of February, prior to FCFA bringing this to the SEC on the 11th of February.

4. Class A Legislation - Academic Freedom

This item will be discussed during the next meeting. Members were uncertain if the first paragraph was necessary.

5. Adjournment

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

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

Present: **Faculty:** Stygall (Chair), Landis, Buck, Vaughn, Johnson, Huber
 President’s Designee: Cameron
 Ex-Officio: Sukol, McNerney (ASUW), Henchy, Rees (GPSS)

Absent: **Faculty:** Ricker (on-leave), Watts, O’Brien