Meeting Synopsis:

1) Call to Order
2) Approval of Minutes (for both 5-31-2011 and 10-11-2011)
3) FCFA Voting Rights
4) Continued discussion of collegiality in Promotion and Tenure
5) Adjournment

Agenda

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Chair Christie at 9:31 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes (for both 5-31-2011 and 10-11-2011)
Minutes for the meeting on May 31, 2011 approved as written. No need to approve minutes for 10-11-2011, as they are meeting notes, lacking a quorum.

3. FCFA Voting Rights
Christie discussed the ability of FCFA to request additional voting rights for non-faculty members through the Senate Executive Committee. Traditionally FCFA only has allowed faculty to have voting rights as the affairs of the council directly address faculty. Christie requested to know if there were any requests to change this policy, and there were none. FCFA will continue with voting rights solely given to the faculty.

4. Continued discussion of collegiality in Promotion & Tenure
Discussion of article
Christie referred to an article submitted by Lea Vaughn, which he felt provided important distinction between two forms of collegiality: service and conduct. He distinguished service roughly as non-external service that a colleague performs if another faculty member is unable to do so. Christie argued that this is what makes this “collegial,” which infers cooperation, but had concerns about this perspective. He found both service and conduct referenced within the Faculty Code, discussed in Chapters 24 and 25. Faculty Code Section 24-32 parts E¹ and F² both relate to service; E cites that service is important to the university however F describes research and teaching as of greater importance to the university.

In regards to "conduct" issue, Christie saw the main focus of the article targeting when problems arise when collegiality of "conduct" is perceived to be the reason for denying tenure and lawsuits. The question is whether promotion and tenure standards support denial of tenure due to collegiality. This would cover the case if one professor was denied tenure because they annoyed colleagues while another with similar...

¹ "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. Both types of service make an important contribution and should be included in the individual faculty profile."

² “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.”
research, teaching and service records would be promoted. Christie’s impression is that the Secretary of Faculty Marcia Killien would like to have language that would support having these decisions embedded within Faculty Code.

Is Faculty Code modification necessary? Christie posed the question of whether the Faculty Code should be modified in some way in order to not conflict. He provided his perspective that collegiality was not sufficient for defining promotions, but that a minimal level was necessary for all faculty and it was unclear whether this language embraces this concept. Huber and Ricker stated that they believed in a minimum amount of service, but the challenge is in defining this minimum level. Huber suggested some mode of operationalizing this, such as a “scorecard” technique, and providing weights in regards to how much of one’s time was expected for teaching versus service, and differentiating by position. Different parts of the university deal with collegial service in different ways. Discussion followed whether behavior between faculty members may be used within evaluation of tenure, either formal or not. Huber termed this as “pro-social” behavior, to describe implicit expectations of an individual’s behavior. Christie requested Huber to provide the language that the Business school uses for this. Huber will investigate this.

Members discussed the potential to use the term “fit,” to address promotion and tenure, not only fit in capacity, but in terms of the culture of the workplace. Executive Order 45 contains the wording: “Consideration must also be given to the way in which the candidate will fit into the present and foreseeable future of the department.” Questions arose on the ability interpret “fit” as the department changing directions rather than the “fit” of the individual within the culture of the department. Christie noted that there was further language regarding “service” within this section.

Debate then occurred between “necessary” and “sufficient” levels of collegiality, and that flexibility within different departments to determine their own; Christie would like a counter-balance for faculty who do good teaching and research however do not provide an appropriate level of service should be grounds for denial of tenure. Faculty Code section 25-51 G 3 discusses grounds for removal of persons with tenure. Christie gave example of professor at University of California who urinated on his colleague’s door; if negative conduct is noted, can it be taken account when considering tenure? Christie argued that such behavior could not be taken into account within the tenure process at the University of Washington, as there is no violation of “in a substantial way adversely affect the faculty member or the victim’s academic, scholarly or professional ability.” There was brief discussion to whether a “hostile working environment” would serve to harm one’s professional behavior, or serve as harassment. Christie explained that his reason for bringing up such a case was that there is a spectrum within acceptable behavior of professors when seeking promotion and tenure.

There was discussion and differing views on whether the faculty code was appropriate to not explicitly discuss collegiality. Gregory expressed the thought that absence of language on collegiality in the Faculty Code was seen as good, and formalizing criteria on collegiality may unwittingly promote discriminatory behavior. Christie noted that this was the downside of focusing on collegiality, but there was a balance between compromising with colleagues and punishing them. He also noted that the wisdom of the Faculty Code, due to its longevity, and suggested a way to side-step the concerns of providing an exact measurement would be to utilize “an appropriate level service is expected of all faculty,” which provides local interpretation. Sukol commented that she felt the division between appropriate behavior and mistreating colleagues. Huber said she was comfortable with the objective evaluation of service, but not comfortable with subjective elements of collegiality, and suggested measuring appropriate service levels could be differentiated by different teaching positions. Christie pointed out that measurement of appropriate service levels could be differentiated by research activity.

3 “Intentional and malicious interference with the scientific, scholarly, and academic activities of others. To warrant a removal for cause or reduction of salary, conduct falling within these categories must in a substantial way adversely affect the faculty member’s or the victim’s academic, scholarly, or professional ability to carry out his or her University responsibilities.”
Christie encouraged council to read through the article, and not all cases discussed were as controversial as one may think, such as a music professor denied tenure at the University of Pittsburgh because he did not get along with his department. Huber agreed with Gregory that collegiality should not be discussed within promotion and tenure standards, but believes that there’s a minimal level of collegiality which is needed in meritorious increases and promotion and tenure that you should not be able to achieve tenure without. Ricker also agrees, but thinks this is already being addressed. Bryant-Bertail also agrees with this, that there are other ways to address when there are concerns about a faculty member’s conduct. Christie announced the tentative conclusion that there should be a minimal level of collegiality, and next meeting will confirm consensus and determine language regarding faculty service.

Additional Topics
Gregory brought up discussion by President Young that the Utah Faculty Senate is stronger, especially within Rights and Responsibilities, and language regarding academic freedom. Now may be an opportunity to work with the President to make changes to rights and responsibilities. Huber brought up non-meritorious faculty member, being evaluated by a committee of peers; she is interested in providing the faculty member a voice, mandating the committee to work with the faculty member to set up a plan.

5. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22am.
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