University Of Washington  
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs  
9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m., January 24, 2012  
142 Gerberding

Meeting Synopsis:

1) Approval of agenda  
2) Review and approval of minutes from the January 10, 2011 meeting  
3) FCMA Proposed Legislation on advancement of diversity in P&T  
4) Qualifications for Appointments at Specific Ranks and Titles  
5) Adjournment

1. Call to Order and Approval of Agenda  
The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Council Chair Rich Christie.

2. Review and approval of minutes from the January 10, 2011 meeting  
Approval of the minutes from the January 10, 2011 was postponed to the next meeting.

3. FCMA Proposed Legislation on advancement of diversity in P&T  
Christie introduced David Takeuchi, Chair of the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA), and Luis Fraga, Vice Provost of Faculty Advancement and Presidential Designee for FCMA. Christie noted that they were present so FCFA could discuss with them its concerns about FCMA’s proposed Class A Legislation (attached as Appendix 1), concerns which had been communicated via memo to FCMA and Faculty Senate Chair, Susan Astley (attached as Appendix 2). Christie discussed proposed changes and rationale, and provided the critiques expressed during FCFA’s last meeting.

Takeuchi described the timeline of the development of the legislation and Fraga provided background on the proposed legislation, based on language adopted by the Faculty Senate at the University of California, Berkeley. Fraga emphasized that contributions to diversity would not be a requirement but could be included in promotion and tenure material, should candidates so decide. He said that “diversity” is not specifically defined in order to provide flexibility for departments and Deans doing assessments. The proposed language was reviewed by the Attorney General’s office, which concluded that this language would likely be legally defensible against allegations of violation of Washington Initiative 200, as the language considers a faculty member’s work rather than the faculty member, and such work is optional rather than a requirement.

FCFA Concerns Regarding the Class A Legislature  
Discussion followed on FCFA concerns. Councilmembers considered the wording “… faculty contributions in scholarship, research and teaching that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged, and given recognition within the evaluation,” to cause confusion about whether such
contributions were mandatory, proposing “may be considered, and given recognition...” instead. Questions were posed as to whether promoting diversity in research and teaching is best way to promote diversity within faculty. FCFA Council members noted their support for such work on diversity, but their concern that adding this language could lead to the requests of inclusion of other language in the promotion and tenure standards. Also mentioned was the lack of a specific definition of “diversity,” which Councilmembers noted may erode the intention of such changes.

FCFA members also commented that they felt that this legislation should have been brought to their attention prior to being brought to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting. Christie and the Secretary of the Faculty both apologized (the latter by email) to the Council for failing to catch the need to route the language through FCFA before the SEC meeting.

Vaughn asked if Board of Deans and Provost’s Office had been consulted, to determine impact on Human Resources or within different schools. Fraga noted that he had discussed this item with specific Deans and the Provosts.

The necessity for inclusion of such language within the Promotion and Tenure language was questioned by Council members. In particular, it was asked if the University of Washington would suffer legal action if faculty members feel that tenure was denied due to lack of doing work with diversity.

Suggestion of Alternatives
Christie opened discussion for alternative options to add language on diversity into the Faculty Code. One suggestion was to draft a Statement of Principle, and an example was provided in Faculty Code Section 24-33,¹ as a compromise. This compromise was noted to resonate with the spirit of FCMA’s motion and Takeuchi and Fraga indicated that FCMA would consider this option in their meeting Wednesday afternoon.

Another compromise suggested was to add language in a footnote (such as an example given in Section 24-33, regarding Faculty/Student Relationships and Conflicts of Interest), either within the Academic Freedom section, or on its own, and it was noted that such a revision would require a less intensive process (Class B Legislature) and may have a greater possibility of passing the Faculty vote.

Options to deal with the issue in the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting were discussed, such as the ability withdraw the Legislation, or changing the action into an informational item to assess faculty support and have a debate rather than a vote.

FCFA suggested that FCMA discuss such proposed changes with the President, Deans, and Administration. Fraga noted that this is a faculty issue and had not been taken to the Board of Deans however that he had discussed the legislature with two Deans, who responded positively. Additionally, he commented that he had yet to discuss this with President Young. FCMA will discuss its options tomorrow, and make a decision. Christie will draft a statement to be presented at the Faculty Senate,

¹ Available at http://www.washington.edu/admin/rules/policies/FCG/FCCH24.html#Sec2433
and Vandra Huber offered to speak on behalf of FCFA at the Faculty Senate meeting and to help in drafting a Statement of Principal, should FCMA wish.

4. Qualifications for Appointments at Specific Ranks and Titles
Cheryl Cameron handed out a proposal for minor changes to the Faculty Code regarding the decision-making process on part-time lecturer appointments and renewals of appointments. Some units have delegated this decision to department chairs however the Faculty Code does not allow this as it requires the decision to be made by the faculty as a whole. Cameron emphasized the need to quickly decide such temporary part-time, affiliate, and clinical appointments and the administrative burden on the staff of preparing hundreds of affiliate and clinical appointment cases.

Cameron summarized the proposed language, which allows for the majority of an academic unit to delegate such voting abilities to the department chair or departmental committee, the dean or a college or school committee without the vote of the faculty. Questions arose on the length of time that the delegation decision would hold, and Cameron noted that this ability could be withdrawn. Suggestions were given how to allow for withdraw such ability, such as annual approval at the beginning of the academic year, and discussion on whether an annual vote would be appropriate followed. Consensus was that the authority of the chair would have to be renewed annually by majority faculty vote.

Cameron noted the second issue in the proposed changes is “without tenure” appointments, as only three years are presently allowed, and the promotion process effectively limits the evaluated performance to one year. She mentioned specifically that people brought in from industry had difficulty establishing a teaching and research record in only one year of work. She proposed language to include the potential of an appointment with the option to renew for a second three year term. Council members debated whether extending appointments to one four-year term rather than two three-year terms would be sufficient. Two three year terms prevailed. Further discussion followed on the Dean’s role with on appointment extensions. The Council supported these recommendations, and requested Cameron to add the provision for an annual review policy on the delegation of such decision-making, and the Council would add this to the next SEC agenda.

5. Terms of Appointment of Part Time Lecturers
FCFA was asked to investigate the possible extension of part-time lecturers to multi-year appointments. They are currently limited to one year terms. The purpose of multi-year appointments is to attract nationally prominent part time lecturers. Christie asked Cameron if she could report on current appointment lengths for full and part-time lecturer appointments.

5. Adjournment
Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

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

Present: Faculty: Christie (Chair), Vaughn, Bertail-Bryant, Landis, Huber
President’s Designee: Cameron
Ex-Officio Reps: Sukol
Guests: Steve Buck (awaiting confirmation), Fraga, Takeuchi

Absent: Faculty: O’Brien, Ricker
Ex-Officio Reps: Anderson, David
Appendix 1: Class A Legislation, Proposed by Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Class A Legislation, Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Revisions to Chapters 24-31 and 24-32: Code revisions related to appointment and promotion of faculty members

Rationale: Proposed changes to make accomplishments related to enriching diversity in teaching, research and service considered, but not required, in faculty, appointments and promotions decisions. [Faculty Code Chapter 24.31 and 24.32]

For several decades, the University of Washington has committed itself to increasing the diversity of its students, faculty, and staff. On the University’s main website at www.washington.edu/diversity, it states, “At the University of Washington, diversity is integral to excellence. The University values and honors diverse experiences and perspectives, strives to create welcoming and respectful learning environments, and promotes access, opportunity, and justice for all. Valuing and honoring diversity. It’s the Washington way.”

The proposed changes in the Faculty Code in Section 24-32, unanimously endorsed by the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs, are designed to allow that the work done by faculty in research, teaching, and service that enriches diversity at the UW be recognized in the processes of appointment and promotion. We recommend that language be added to the existing Faculty Code that will allow departments, review committees, chairs, deans, and the provost to consider this work in reviewing faculty. At least one set of peer institutions, the University of California system, adopted language similar to the one contained in this proposal.

Nothing in this proposed language requires that any member of the faculty demonstrate accomplishments in this area to be appointed or promoted. However, it does formally allow a faculty member’s success in this area to be part of the file that is reviewed at all appropriate levels of the University. As the University continues to build excellence for the 21st century, a continued focus on diversity integrates the changing demographics of the country with the expansion of intellectual boundaries in many disciplines. A faculty with more of its members committed to diversity in research, teaching, and service will make the University of Washington better positioned to meet its stated goals in the 21st century.

In reviewing Chapter 24 of the Faculty Code, it was determined that Sections 24-31, General Appointment Policy, and 24-32, Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members, each can be amended to include language that allows faculty work that promotes diversity and equal opportunity to be recognized in appointments and promotion. All proposed language appears in the attachment to this statement.
Appendix 1: Class A Legislation, Proposed by Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs

Faculty Code
Chapter 24

Appointment and Promotion of Faculty Members

Section 24–31 General Appointment Policy

The principal functions of a university are to preserve, to increase, and to transmit knowledge. Its chief instrument for performing these functions is its faculty, and its success in doing so depends largely on the quality of its faculty. The policy of this University should be to enlist and retain distinguished faculty members with outstanding qualifications.

Section 13–31, April 16, 1956 with Presidential approval.

Section 24–32 Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members

The University faculty is committed to the full range of academic responsibilities: scholarship and research, teaching, and service. Individual faculty will, in the ordinary course of their development, determine the weight of these various commitments, and adjust them from time to time during their careers, in response to their individual, professional development and the changing needs of their profession, of their programs, departments, schools and colleges, and the University. Such versatility and flexibility are hallmarks of respected institutions of higher education because they are conducive to establishing and maintaining the excellence of a university and to fulfilling the educational and social role of the institution.

In conjunction with the University's expressed commitment to excellence and equity, faculty contributions in scholarship and research, teaching, and service that promote diversity and equal opportunity are to be encouraged and given recognition in the evaluation of the faculty member's qualifications. These contributions to diversity and equal opportunity can take a variety of forms including research in a scholar's area of expertise that highlights inequalities, efforts to advance equitable access to education, or public service that addresses the needs of diverse populations.

A. Scholarship, the essence of effective teaching and research, is the obligation of all members of the faculty. The scholarship of faculty members may be judged by the character of their advanced degrees and by their contribution to knowledge in the form of publication and instruction; it is reflected not only in their reputation among other scholars and professionals but in the performance of their students.

B. The creative function of a university requires faculty devoted to inquiry and research, whose attainment may be in the realm of scholarly investigation, in constructive contributions in professional fields, or in the creative arts, such as musical composition, creative writing, or original design in engineering or architecture. For each of these, contributions to the advancement of equitable access and diversity in education can be included. While numbers (publications, grant dollars, students) provide some measure of such accomplishment, more important is the quality of the faculty member's published or other creative work.

Important elements in evaluating the scholarly ability and attainments of faculty members include the range and variety of their intellectual interests; the receipt of grants, awards, and fellowships; the professional and/or public impact of their work; and their success in directing productive work by advanced students and in training graduate and professional students in scholarly methods. Other important elements of scholarly achievement include involvement in and contributions to
interdisciplinary research and teaching; participation and leadership in professional associations and in the editing of professional journals; the judgment of professional colleagues; and membership on boards and committees.

C. The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students, and special training or educational outreach. The educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively. Instruction must be judged according to its essential purposes and the conditions which they impose. Some elements in assessing effective teaching include the ability to organize and conduct a course of study appropriate to the level of instruction and the nature of the subject matter; the consistency with which the teacher brings to the students the latest research findings and professional debates within the discipline; the ability to stimulate intellectual inquiry so that students develop the skills to examine and evaluate ideas and arguments; the extent to which the teacher encourages discussion and debate which enables the students to articulate the ideas they are exploring; the degree to which teaching strategies that encourage the educational advancement of students from all backgrounds and life experiences are utilized; the availability of the teacher to the student beyond the classroom environment; and the regularity with which the teacher examines or reexamines the organization and readings for a course of study and explores new approaches to effective educational methods. A major activity related to teaching is the instructor's participation in academic advising and counseling, whether this takes the form of assisting students to select courses or discussing the students' long-range goals. The assessment of teaching effectiveness shall include student and faculty evaluation. Where possible, measures of student achievements in terms of their academic and professional careers, life skills, and citizenship should be considered.

D. Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field.

E. The University encourages faculty participation in public service. Such professional and scholarly service to schools, business and industry, and local, state, national, and international organizations is an integral part of the University's mission. Of similar importance to the University is faculty participation in University committee work and other administrative tasks and clinical duties, including the faculty member's involvement in the recruitment, retention, and mentoring of scholars and students in an effort to promote diversity and equal opportunity. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile.

F. Competence in professional service to the University and the public should be considered in judging a faculty member's qualifications, but except in unusual circumstances skill in instruction and research should be deemed of greater importance.


Submitted by:
Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
01-09-12

Approved by:
Senate Executive Committee
01-09-12
Appendix 2: Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs’ Memo to Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs
Regarding Class A Legislation

From: richc@uw.edu [mailto:richc@uw.edu] On Behalf Of Rich Christie
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 10:54 AM
To: Susan Astley; David Takeuchi
Cc: N. L. Ricker; Sarah A. Bryant-Bertail; Kevin D. O'Brien; Lea B. Vaughn; Vandra L. Huber; Carol A. Landis; Cheryl A. Cameron; Shanna T. Sukol; Serin M. Anderson; Marcia G. Killien; James N. Gregory; Jim Fridley; christinedavid007@gmail.com; sbuck@u.washington.edu
Subject: Diversity Legislation - FCFA Concerns

Dear Susan and David,

The Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) met this morning, January 10. Among other work, we reviewed the Class A legislation proposed by the Faculty Council on Multicultural Affairs (FCMA), which adds consideration of diversity to the promotion and tenure guidelines in the Faculty Code. This legislation was approved by the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) at its meeting yesterday and placed on the agenda for the Faculty Senate for its meeting on Thursday January 26, 2012. I, as FCFA chair, first was made aware of the proposed legislation on January 4, so FCFA was unable to review it prior to the SEC meeting or to provide input to that meeting. Today FCFA reviewed the language submitted to the SEC.

All FCFA members present at our meeting (we had a quorum) expressed significant concerns about this legislation. Our first concern is that promotion and tenure guidelines are the direct responsibility of FCFA, and we have not had adequate opportunity to review the proposed changes.

Our second concern is that, while diversity is an important value of the university that should be supported, our initial reaction is that we feel the proposed legislation is overkill. It elevates diversity from among the many other important values that the university supports. It disturbs the traditional factors of research, teaching and service used for assessing faculty performance. Although both the justification and the language are intended not to require contributions to diversity, our experience leads us to believe that this is exactly what will happen in practice if the legislation is adopted. That is, even though the language makes contributions to diversity optional, its mere presence in the promotion and tenure guidelines will result in candidates and evaluators treating contributions to diversity as mandatory.

We believe that the goal of advancing diversity can be better served by a more modest revision to the code.

I ask the Senate Leadership to defer the Senate agenda item until FCFA has had sufficient time to consider this legislation and issue a report and recommendation. While FCFA will meet on January 24, it will come as no surprise to those familiar with the pace of FCFA work that more than one meeting is likely to be needed to consider all ramifications of the proposal.

I also invite FCMA to send a representative to attend the next FCFA meeting, 9:00-10:30 AM January 24 in Gerberding 142, to start a dialog between the councils on this proposal.

I attach the SEC agenda, which contains the proposed language on pages 12-14, for the benefit of FCFA members who could not attend today's meeting.

Regards,
Rich Christie
FCFA Chair