Meeting Synopsis:

1. **Call to Order and Approval of Agenda**
   The meeting was called to order at 9:12 a.m. by Chair Rich Christie.

2. **Review and Approval of Minutes**
   Minutes from the April 17th FCFA meeting were deferred for the next meeting to provide further time for review.

3. **Legislation Update**
   Christie described word changes by the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations to clarify the makeup of the “elected departmental committee” in the Delegation of Authority Legislation. This was to address cases where students participate with vote on some department committees. Both the Delegation of Authority and Multi-Year Part Time Lecturer Appointment Legislation will go to the Faculty Senate’s next meeting for a second approval before being sent for a faculty vote.

   The Without Tenure Class A Legislation was referred back to the Council, possibly due to one Faculty Senate member’s complaints of junior faculty voting on tenure, however substantial critiques were not provided. Revision for this legislation was deferred to the next meeting so Cheryl Cameron can be present.

   Secretary of the Faculty Marcia Killien briefly discussed Without Tenure appointments. Current *Faculty Code* language was considered as a good baseline, allowing units to determine any additional desired criteria at a local level. Though Council members noted unease that extensions of “temporary” Without Tenure roles could cause these to become permanent, it was emphasized such appointments are not attractive offers for faculty. Should the Senate be truly concerned about this subject, they could impose a ratio of Without Tenure and Tenured faculty, however this would probably not be enforceable. Further discussion followed on national searches, noting that all appointments technically must be advertised nationally to meet equal opportunity requirements.
The Contributions to Diversity Legislation had wording and editorial changes applied by the Office of the President and the Advisory Committee on Faculty Code and Regulations. Luis Fraga, the Presidential Designee for FCMA, has assented to the changes and said that FCMA Chair David Takeuchi had seen the changes and they were acceptable. One line was removed, which had been added by the Special Committee in order to avoid the differentiation of diversity from other relevant qualifications.

4. Joint Appointments and Promotion and Tenure
Gerry Baldasty from the Graduate School requested for FCFA to review a document regarding considerations for joint appointments. Joint appointments were noted to be a common practice, but such appointments may cause issues for consideration of promotion and tenure of such faculty. Christie considered this to be the second special interest to seek specific mention in the Promotion and Tenure guidelines, following the inclusion of Diversity. FCFA will discuss this issue during fall 2012.

5. Continued discussion of openness in promotion and tenure
Christie summarized the past discussion and asked the Council to continue resolving principles related to double voting and department size in preparation for drafting specific language.

Principles established at the last council meeting were reviewed:

1) Department Chairs cannot serve on the 1st level small committee for Promotion and Tenure, as they have an independent recommendation.

Debate proceeded on whether department members on the committee should be able to vote in the departmental vote. The Provost’s office has stopped or held up promotions if excuses or abstentions are high. The Council concluded that the committee members should vote in the department vote if they are voting members of the department.

2) Chair cannot embed their vote within the faculty vote, but will have to make their recommendation be visible to the candidate, in order to avoid double-voting, as voting with the faculty and additionally providing a recommendation give the Chair too much power.

The question was raised of what happens in the case of a tie, or if the Chair can refuse to provide a recommendation and vote along with the faculty. A tie is essentially a negative outcome, as a strong positive department vote is expected. Thus there is not a need to break a tie. The Council members expressed concern about of allowing a chair to refuse to provide a recommendation, as Chairs could informally influence the process, and it seems likely that a Dean who did not get a formal recommendation from a Chair would in many cases obtain an informal one. Different cultures within academic units were discussed.

3) Chair must provide an independent recommendation which goes to the candidate.
In order to address Provost Ana Mari Cauce’s concerns regarding Chairs in small departments, Christie agreed to survey such Chairs to determine possible reactions for proposed policy. Steve Buck provided a suggestion to remove the role of recommendation from the Chair completely, rather to have the Chair synthesize the discussion. He noted that requiring a Chair’s independent decision would continue the role of a “strong chair”, rather than a more democratic system. Christie had earlier considered to make the Chair’s recommendation optional, but was persuaded by Council members that this would leave room for a Chair to informally influence the process nonetheless, which would be inappropriate.

Through consulting small department Chairs, the Council would be addressing Provost Cauce’s expressed concerns. It was suggested to ask what current practices take place, whether such Chairs vote with faculty and do not make a recommendation, vote and make recommendation, or otherwise.

4) One faculty member has one vote in any Promotion and Tenure Case, with the exception of the small pre-committee and department vote.

On review of this principle Buck noted did not agree with inconsistency of exempting the departmental promotion and tenure decision, and that he would favor a double vote, if between the initial committee and the departmental vote. It was observed that a committee’s recommendation may not include a vote within the committee, according to the Faculty Code. Council members discussed their personal experiences within such processes in their academic units. Christie noted that the Council did not come to a consensus on this topic.

Christie noted that the current draft language continued the existing option to redact names and votes from the chair’s analysis and recommendation. In practice, votes can be specified as “slightly positive” or “overwhelmingly negative” and so forth, without specific vote numbers provided.

Christie lamented the expansion of the scope of the proposed changes. He considered that the broader the proposed changes became, the more difficult it will be for this legislation to pass the Faculty Senate. The initial goal of the process was to open the recommendations of the Chair and Dean, and the justifications for the Provost’s decision to the candidate. Resolving the double voting issue appears to be difficult in the Council. Christie suggested deferring the double voting and small department issues to a later time (possibly even ten years from now, which was the interval since the last openness change to P&T) and concentrating on openness. Killien discussed cases of Chairs and Deans double voting.

A compromise was proposed. The Chair cannot vote with faculty, but provide an independent recommendation to be disclosed to the candidate. A Dean would not be allowed to vote in a department or college faculty vote. This would not alter college promotion and tenure committee and department P&T committee voting, and would address most major double-voting issues. It was suggested that once faculty is used to the openness, the topic of double voting could be reopened. The rationale for such a decision was suggested as Chairs and Deans are not one vote among many, but are weighted because of their role. Associate deans and the faculty vote would be also not changed.
Christie will continue with the survey for small department Chairs, and was suggested to survey the Board of Deans as well. He will provide a summary of responses during the next meeting.

Killien requested to know how Deans would inform the candidate if they were not approved. The draft legislation allows Deans to delegate the job of informing the candidate and does not require a written report.

6. Adjournment
Chair Christie adjourned the meeting at 10:28 a.m.
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