FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
April 7, 2017
Room 630 (Haaren Hall)

Open Meeting Minutes
NOT YET APPROVED – will be voted on at the 5/5/17 FPC Meeting

OPEN MEETING CALLED TO ORDER 9:37 AM

Non-FPC members in attendance: Ned Benton (PAD), Allison Pease (ENG)

I) Approval of Minutes:

a. Motion to approve called and seconded
b. Unanimously approved

II) Faculty Personnel Process Outcomes (Provost Bowers):

a. Provost's report reviewed, Provost JB confirmed the following:
- outcomes for 2016-2017 are consistent with prior years
- Reports will continue to be generated, shared with faculty and posted to Faculty Services website
- Low rate of appeal suggests evidence of good hiring and nurturing.

III) Adjunct Professor Emeritus Policy (Provost Bowers)

a. Revisiting discussion from previous meeting, CUNY indicates this is allowable. Does the committee want to proceed with this distinction? What are the requirements?
b. Discussion, question, concerns and clarifications:
- Question: How many faculty would meet the criteria (LK)? Nationwide this seems to be an exception.
- Question: What is done at other CUNY schools? What is done outside of CUNY at other schools? What are the current standards in process for full-time? More information needed (JC).
- Clarification: FPPG does not state "full time"; if adjunct emeritus policy is adopted, revision to FPPG is required. Suggestion: "Exception" list expanded to list "adjuncts" (JB).
- Adjunct Faculty should submit letter to department P&B explaining the reason for their request (AM).
- Concerns: We must be mindful of the creditability of the title associated (EM/JB). FPC does address the adjunct personnel review process and that is a concern with bestowing the title of Emeritus (JT).

c. Proposal to gather more information withdrawn (JC).Committee unanimously agreed to keep process and policy the same.

IV) Distinguished Professor Nomination Process (Provost Bowers):

a. Continuation of 4/07/17 meeting agenda item. How do nomination/cases come before the FPC? Provost Bowers summarized current JJ DP nomination process. Provost and President review the candidate's CV, speak with the candidate; both are required to write the nomination letters. Provost also described the CUNY review process and what materials are provided for CUNY review. There was concern that an external body does not review nominations before the case is brought to FPC – e.g., a committee comprised of current DPs to advise the FPC (Advisory Review Committee of DP or a subcommittee of the FPC.

b. Discussion:

- As a matter of practice the President and Provost informally prescreen interested candidates and find it has been helpful to candidates. Inclination to leave things where they are (JT).
- Clarification: Total number of DPs appointed allocated across CUNY; numbers are not allocated by campus (JB, JT).
- DP distinction is not as clear as other ranks. Reviewer should combine the expertise of the discipline and an individual who has a clear understanding of the DP distinction. Not in favor of a new committee to advise on DP recommendations (AM).
- Advisory committee composed of DPs can play a role in the screening process, can improve the quality of the process, advise re trajectory of one who wants to ascend to DP (EM).
- Clarification: FPC sees the case after the Dept. P&B and Provost/President reviews and with the nomination letters (JB).
- Concern: BOT upset with gender and ethnic representation. Current pool of DPs tend to represent specific demographic; calling upon them to serve as advisory/review committee would perpetuate lack of diversity in DP candidates – a deep concern (JB, DB)
- Clarification: DP reviews must occur every 5 years and information about the reviews are forthcoming (communication from KB).
- Restatement of Options: Draft a policy statement for insertion in FPPG to reflect DP advisory committee review prior to Presidential support of nomination (II.J.4) OR keep things the way they are (JT).
    - Suggestion: Insert in II.J.1Initial conversation – >DP Advisory Committee reviews with exception to DP upon hire (EM).
- Concern: DP committee is appearing to be both mentoring and advisory – problematic. They should be separate (AL)
- Clarification: DP criteria calls for productivity and impact on the field, which is why the external evaluator letters are important (JB).
    - Perhaps a nomination process by with faculty receives a nomination letter from a tenured full professor (AM).
    - No external evaluation before department reviews. Perhaps it should start with an external evaluation/assessment first (DS).

- Perhaps a pre-assessment process for those who are not self-nominating is needed? The current process lends itself to those who are the most active and pursuer "self-promoters" (JT).
    - The current process is fine, but an advisory committee to review files and identify certain markers could serve as a good screening group (HP).
- Recommendation: Draft policy proposal to establish a "committee of…,"position the committee as a step before formal nomination, discuss committee composition (DP only? A mixed group of DPs, disciplinary members and race /gender diversity?)(JT).
    - Consider inclusion of external person in that field for feedback (DB). Examine the external letter solicitation process; who selects the 10 evaluators? (LP) Advisory Committee could comprise DPs, Deans and another administrator or faculty (EM). AP to Provost as an appointed person to the advisory committee (BD)
- Full Professor mentoring suggested (L)
- There should be a separate group that solicits or nominate; no self-nomination (JC).

c. Committee is advisory. Revisit at 5/05/2017 meeting. EM will assist in creating draft policy document for discussion (JT).

V. Faculty Senate Statement on Faculty Personnel Process: (Ned Benton, representing Faculty Senate)

a. NB provided background re the generation of the Statement. Statement addresses concerns identify by the concerns by members of the Senate. Acknowledges FPC is working on some of the concerns.

- Could FPC make information available via the Faculty Senate Chronicle (JT)? NB agreed that would be fine. Those who are affected by the decision should have opportunity to participate either via sending comments or some other mechanism. Some schools have a governance website/page.
- The two- reading rule used by UCASC could be applied; clarification of the rule required (JB).
    - The two-reading rule would necessitate more meetings (LP).
- Progress has been made because FPC is now open when it was initially always a closed meeting. The open meeting segments was a major step in transparency (EM)
- Agendas posted well in advance of meeting; FPPG guidelines revisions were published well before the next FPC action review process; publishing outcomes; we can do the cohort analysis; the gender and race report is not information available to this; CUNY has indicated we cannot create department/discipline-specific criteria with exception of Library, Journalism and Counseling. Revising service and teaching balance and will be carried on with next Provost (JB).
- Item 6 requires a holistic discussion about the role of service in faculty (EM,AC, JT)
    - Item 6 will be more about changing habits versus formulating criteria (JJ). Item 6 Teaching and Service balance. Progress made on teaching but not much has been made on defining/recognizing/balancing and fine tuning service requirements. Holistic discussion required to continue this work (JT).

b. Invitation to draft a response to the Faculty Senate; anyone on the committee is welcomed to work with President and Provost. To be presented at the May 5th meeting

VI. Appeals Process:

a. Unresolved question from fall 2016 and Faculty Senate Statement, item 5 re the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee composition. Subcommittee assigned to review (Evan Mandery, Jim Cauthen, Jane Bowers, Marjorie Singer) determined appeals process was not in violation of College Charter or Bylaws (JB

- History of how FPC got to current process. Best practice would be to adjust JJC Bylaws of the Charter, to maintain current appeals process as we go through that process (EM).
- Provost reads summary statement sent by EM in October 2016 JB

b. To be revisited at next and last meeting (5/5/17). Obtain legal view and determine if an item should be written to add the bylaws (JT).

OPEN MEETING ADJOURNED 11:52 AM