Meeting Synopsis:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Minutes from March 5, 2013
3. Chair closes meeting due to lack of quorum
4. Adjourn

1) Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Stygall at 9:09 a.m.

2) Approval of the Minutes from March 5, 2013
Minutes from March 5, 2013 were not approved due to lack of quorum. Minutes will be approved at the next meeting on April 2nd.

3) Chair Closes Meeting Due to Lack of Quorum
Due to lack of quorum it was decided to conclude the meeting and wait until April 2nd to address agenda items.

Dean Lisa Graumlich delivered a letter to the Council that addresses the Board of Deans and Chancellors’ (BODC) position on Class A Legislation on Openness in Promotion and Tenure. This letter will be distributed to members at a later time in order to discuss the issue in more detail at the next Council meeting. In response to an inquiry whether Graumlich was present to provide her individual perspective or that of the BODC, she clarified that she was serving as the representative of the BODC.

Killien clarified that since the legislation is now at SEC, the Council has already approved it and the only action that can be taken by the Council is to provide suggestions and input to the SEC in response to its referral of the legislation back to the Council. The next meeting of the SEC is April 8th. The Council will work to make recommendations and send a report to the SEC before that meeting.

A report will be distributed to members summarizing a recent meeting with the Provost. The discussion about the recommendations will be deferred to the next meeting when there are more members to discuss the issue. An effort will be made to ensure quorum will be met at the next Council meeting. A draft copy of modified legislation will also be distributed to members to review and discuss during the next Council meeting. This draft legislation is another version which the Council may decide to present SEC in addition to the already-approved legislation.

It was confirmed that the Class A Legislation on Academic Freedom will also be an agenda item for the next Council meeting on April 2nd.

4) Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned by Chair Stygall at 9:17 a.m.
Present:  Faculty: Stygall (Chair), Buck, Johnson  
President’s Designee: Cameron  
Ex-Officio Reps: Sukol, Henchy, Rees  
Guests: Lisa Graumlich, Marcia Killien  

Absent:  Faculty: Ricker, O’Brien, Vaughn, Huber, Landis, Watts  
Ex-Officio Reps: McNerney, Tyl
March 19, 2013

James Gregory, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

Gail Stygall, Chair,
Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs
36 Gerberding Hall
Box 351271

Dear Jim and Gail,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Board of Deans and Chancellors (BODC) to provide our collective perspective on the changes proposed by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs to Section 24-54 of the Faculty Code, “Openness in Promotion & Tenure.” We discussed the proposed changes during BODC meetings on March 6, 2013.

There is a broad consensus among BODC members that we share the goal of the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs (FCFA) to encourage best practices in promotion and tenure communication. As deans, we strive to create a positive environment for all faculty while preserving the rights of individuals. We recognize that faculty govern P&T policies and, as such, we are writing to state our concerns and preferences on two aspects of the current proposal.

First, we urge you not to formalize a requirement that chairs reveal their own vote and recommendation to the dean when it differs from the faculty. The current revision requires that the written chair’s report, with its own independent chair’s recommendation on the promotion and/or tenure case, be provided to the promotion candidate, and that the candidate then be given seven days in which to respond to the chair’s written report by writing directly to the College Council. As deans, we share the multiple concerns set forth in Dean Stacey’s letter of March 4, 2013 and, concur with Dean Stacey’s conclusion that the proposed changes would reduce the quality of the decision-making process.

Second, we urge you not to create a formal requirement that deans reveal the faculty council vote and recommendation to the candidate. As deans, we are not opposed in principle to the changes proposed to Section 24-54D of the Code with respect to the role of the dean. It is our collective best practice in cases in which a dean is recommending to the Provost against a promotion and/or tenure recommendation to be forthright in discussing that negative recommendation, and the reasons for it, with the candidate. We respectfully suggest, however, that Section 24-54 be amended so as to not require the dean to report to the candidate a negative recommendation on the part of the College Council unless the Dean is also recommending against promotion and/or tenure.
In closing, the BODC believes that the current UW P&T procedures and policies strike an appropriate balance between transparency and anonymity that by design protects the integrity of the process from internal politics. We urge you to take care in considering changes to current policies.

Sincerely,

Lisa J. Graumlich
Dean, College of the Environment