



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Friday, September 21, 2018

Room L.61, New Building

9:30 am-1:00 pm

**APPROVED – 12/14/18 FPC Meeting**

*Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 11:30 am\**

### I. Welcome

*Meeting convened: 9:38am*

- Round table introduction of each committee member and guest present
- President Mason discussed the purpose of the committee
- All were reminded by Jennifer D. that they will receive a Memo of Guidance regarding their roles in the committee
- President Mason discussed her order for reviewing documents related to actions so as to familiarize the committee with the process
- Alisson P. took the floor to briefly discuss the Faculty Personnel Guidelines. She reminded all present to become familiar with the guidelines before making votes on personnel actions

### II. Approval of Minutes, 5/04/18 meeting

First Order of Business:

- Vote on minutes of last meeting - Jay G. moved for motion to accept and Warren E. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

President Mason proceeded with the following discussion items:

### III. Service Committee proposal for guideline revision

Allison P. took the floor to discuss the proposal of revising the Faculty Personnel Guidelines and the Form C. This was proposed in order to clarify and simplify what is expected from candidates in terms of service.

Purpose for changes in wording of Form C:

Line 21 of Form C states “list service activities” – it was suggested that it may be more helpful for candidates to go into more detail about the types of services they’ve accomplished, as opposed to only providing a list. It was explained that a list may not provide enough information as to what the service specifically entailed. It should be more descriptive in the types of services the candidate was or is involved in (such as department, college, or university level).

Purpose for changes in wording of Guidelines:

There should be a question added to find out how many people are in any given department

or program. This would help assess the balance in size of department and the amount of service a candidate should be involved in. For example, small departments often have faculty doing an enormous amount of work (one example would be serving in multiple committees). There is also a desire to increase levels of service for those in senior positions (such as those in the roles of Full Professor).

Discussion opened for the floor:

Topics broached upon:

- How different departments interpret some sections of the Form C and how much of a candidate's promotion is based on their level of research or publications.
- How the culture of the college and its guidelines seem rigid in terms of what it counts as scholarship.
- How the guidelines could be more quantitative and making it into a 33 point system covering scholarship, service, and teaching.
- How service needs to be redefined to showcase what we value the most in higher education from our faculty.
- How does one account for those that don't have enough faculty, doing enough of the work in the college, yet their faculty are huge in their particular field. Does their work still count for service, if it isn't exactly related to the campus, but rather to the field as a whole? It was debated that the answer to this would depend on the department and its specific needs which can range for various reasons. Each department also has different expectations.
- There is concern on extending the questions of the Form C into long narratives when there is already a long narrative in the end as the 'Self-Reflection' portion. The questions should give way to short sentence answers as appose to paragraph answers.
- Provost Li cautioned on the need to increase transparency.
- There was discussion about adding new language and tables to help with transparency, such as lines detailing the need for providing service in the field at the college level.
- Questions arose when deciding which service is actually considered 'service', when you are being compensated?
- The need for clarity in what to do when there is one piece of writing listed in multiple sections of someone's Form C (such as services and publications) also arose.

Outcome:

-Ned B., Benjamin L., and Warren E., Angela C. and Bob D. will work with Allison P., Carmen S., and Demi to review this further and bring back revised proposal to the committee.

**IV. Faculty Personnel Appeals process, subcommittee report** – Tabled for discussion at the next meeting

**V. New Business and Announcements**

- Shelly E. was introduced as President Mason's mentee from the CUNY Diversity Leadership Program, to learn how the President's Office and John Jay College function on day to day operations.
- President Mason shared news of a lecture addressing the ethics of social mobility posted on the College's YouTube channel, discussing the narrative of the college experience for those who are the first in their families to attend college.
- President Mason discussed her attendance at the Tao Foundation event, celebrating their 30 years of philanthropy

*Open session adjourned: 11:25am*



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Friday, December 14, 2018

Room 630, Haaren Hall

11:00 am-2:00 pm

**APPROVED –4/5/2019 FPC Meeting**

*Meeting Open to the Public 11:00 am – 12:45 pm*

*Meeting convened: 11:20am*

### **I. Approval of Minutes, 9/21/18 meeting**

First Order of Business:

- Vote on minutes of last meeting - Allison K. moved for motion to accept and Avram B. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

President Mason proceeded with the following discussion items:

### **II. Faculty Personnel Review – PSC Discussion**

- President Mason expressed that the PSC had inquired about the file viewing process and wanted to discuss with the committee the importance of reading a faculty member's entire file. She emphasized that both the electronic version (FIDO) and the hardcopy version (Personnel File), make up the candidates entire file. Both should always be reviewed in their entirety upon a candidate's upcoming action.

- Ned B. explained that reviewers may opt to review one type of file over the other because they're looking for specific things that they know will be only in a particular file. President Mason responded, that while that may be so, there is still a responsibility to read both files. If a reviewer comes across something in a file that they have already read from the previous file, they are expected to move past that item and continue reviewing the rest of the file, not just dismiss one file over the other.

- Jessica G.-N. brought up a suggestion to ensure easier reading of files, she explained that a more rigorous outline of what needs to be in each file should be implemented, especially when it comes to the FIDO files. She elaborated that specifically for FIDO, there also needs to be a way to ensure that files uploaded by Chairs cannot be removed by candidates.

**\*All times are approximate**

12/03/2018

President Mason responded, that they have been looking into FIDO concerns regarding ability to remove files, and are trying to figure out ways to improve the system.

- Members suggested that someone needs to go through all the faculty files (FIDO and Personnel) to review all the documentation inside to verify that appropriate forms are inside. Allison P. explained that Faculty Services does not have the resources to go through the multitude of electronic FIDO files and hardcopy Personnel files, to cross check all the materials inside. She also reminded members that the guidelines dictated that it is the faculty's responsibility to make sure their files are in order. Ned B. agreed and elaborated that the candidate bears the responsibility of being satisfied with the layout of their own files.

- Jennifer D. also reminded members that both files are considered one, thus what is in one file does not have to be on the other and there are only certain items that actually need to be in both: Form C (uploaded to FIDO and added to Personnel file by candidate), current CV (uploaded to FIDO and added to Personnel file by candidate), Chair's Annual Evaluation (uploaded to FIDO by Chair and added to Personnel file by Faculty Services), Pre-Tenure Review (when appropriate - uploaded to FIDO and added to Personnel file by Faculty Services), and Teaching Observations (uploaded to FIDO by Chair - and added to Personnel file by Faculty Services).

- Jim C. followed Jennifer D.'s explanation by requesting that there be a clear written statement describing what materials should certainly go into FIDO/Personnel Files. He also wanted to review the student evaluation reports and what to do with them, some members do not have them in their files, some incorporate it into the Chair's letter or in their Form C, it varies and it should be uniform. He also explained that they should not have to go online to look for a candidate's evaluation reports. Robert D. agreed that there needs to be more diplomacy and there is some confusion as to what should go in each file. Allison P. explained that the guidelines describe where to write about student evaluations and if that needs to change there should be a discussion on adding that to the guidelines. Anthony C. added on that Review Committee members should also be well informed on what is needed in candidate's files, so they know what to look for during their review process.

- Provost Li reflected that members should always try to emphasize to their departments that both electronic and hardcopy files are always expressed as composing a candidate's entire file. He suggested to create a table to help faculty visualize what is mandated to be in both files and what is needed overall as a fully completed file. This will help make expectations clear to both candidates and Chairs. He also shared that they are forming a small task group to look at the modernization of FIDO to upload and update files.

- President Mason concluded by stating that she would convey all this information to the PSC.

### III. Service Committee proposal for guideline revision

- Ned B. started by reviewing the current service requirements in the guidelines. He then explained what areas they were hoping to revise and how by reviewing the university bylaws regarding service, they were able to decide what should and shouldn't be a part of the revision. He explained that university policy never refers to compensation as being an issue against service. Thus any compensated service should not be disqualified. He gave examples of how he was awarded grants for professional service/research and it had not been disqualified because of grant compensation.

*-President Mason was excused at 11:40am; Provost Li took lead-*

- Jim C. suggested that service requirements should be more balanced in small departments and taken into consideration as part of revising the guidelines.

- Katie G. expressed that there should be a way to be transparent about compensated service vs. non-compensated service in a way that will not take away from the actual service done by faculty.

- Anthony C. suggested that there should be a way to list on the Form C what kind of works are compensated vs. non-compensated and also explain which is within the college and which is external to the college. Angela C. seconded what Anthony C. said and elaborated that this would help reviewer's weigh their decisions better on how to evaluate a candidate's type of service. Jessica G.-N. also agreed with Anthony C.'s suggestion to find a way to label the type of services as compensated vs. uncompensated so that it can be evaluated properly by each department. Bettina C. expanded on these points by agreeing that transparency is very important and adding that we should also look at the external compensation of service and how that is weighted differently across different disciplines and departments.

- Dara B. stated that it may still be difficult to lay out the type of services in itself as services can be interwoven and cannot be so easily categorized even with or without compensation.

- Ned B. expressed that they might be able to list compensated vs. non-compensated services on the Form C, but it needs to be developed as a separate proposal so that the process could be vetted properly. He hoped that they could pass this initial revised version for now, with this specific language about balance (3a) and without the categorizing of the type of service.

- Allison P. proposed that they should strike the word uncompensated from page 4 and on page 2 add ", indicating whether compensated or uncompensated" to the guidelines as a way to solve the problem. Members of the committee voted in favor of the current version needing to be revised. Following this vote, members then voted in favor of moving the proposal, with revisions discussed, to the College Council as well.

- Provost Li summarized that the initial request to change the language in the guidelines was to provide transparency on the type of service that is compensated or not compensated. It was not to devalue a type of service over the other. He also expressed concern that it needs to be clear on what amount of services someone should do in their early years as faculty versus those later years in their careers.

#### **IV. Faculty Personnel Appeals process, subcommittee report**

- Jim C. wanted to make the appeals process a bit more clear in regards to what is done in other campuses. The areas they looked at were: who hears appeals, what is the size of the appeals committee, how long members have served, and what types of actions are heard in the appeals process. Different institutions had different requirements for who serves on the appeals committee such as ranks. Some institutions allowed for appellants to submit a rebuttal of the appeals committee result. He has concerns on the size of our appeals committee as it is much larger than a normal review group, but mentioned that the nice thing about it, was that all members could come together to speak on the standards of what is expected from candidate files. He suggested that there also needs to be a process where the review committee should be informed of how a decision is made in the appeals committee, because that can help them in knowing what to look for in future reviews or how to better serve during their portion of the review process.

#### **V. New Business and Announcements**

- Provost Li, on the heels of what Jim C. said, agreed that the outcomes of review committees should also be shared with the P&B committees to improve service there as well. He also asked Jim C. what the next step for the appeals process report would be, Jim suggested that we can use his information to think about what we may want to change, if anything, for the next cycle of appeals.

- Ned B. and Marjorie S. discussed the notion that they should only have FPC members on the appeals committee as FPC members are charged with having to vote on the appeals process.

- Provost Li closed the meeting by reminding everyone of the importance of quorum for all future meetings

*Open session adjourned: 1:00pm*

## **FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Friday, April 5, 2019**

Room L.61 New Building

**9:30 AM – 1:00 PM**

**APPROVED – 5/3/2019 FPC Meeting**

***Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 11:30 am***

*Meeting convened: 9:40am*

### **I. Approval of Minutes, 12/14/18 meeting**

- Seth B. motioned to accept and Peter M. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

### **II. Faculty Personnel Appeals – Discussion for Policy and Process Change**

- President Mason addressed scheduling and time management issues during the 2019 appeals meetings; laid out need to reexamine appeals process; provided overview of Cauthen's memo; explained her rationale/process and perspective for considering appeals.
- Alisse W. expressed a sense that the process was not fair and inquired about the decision making process regarding appeal case outcomes.
- Angela C. suggested starting the appeals process earlier, i.e. the Fall semester (October or November).
- Bettina C. recommended one committee for appeals. The process is working but the composition needs updating.
- David M. stated process should be kept in its current way, because all of the effort and personnel required to make any changes at all, will not produce a significant outcome.
- President Mason identified two items to address/discuss: (1) Do we reexamine the process and (2) Do we adopt Jim Cauthen's recommendation (sent via email to many members of the FPC).

*(in response to Alisse W's earlier statement)* The standards are articulated in the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines (FPPG), how we interpret them is what varies, which can be helpful. Mason provided brief overview of the process and her role in the process.

- Mason/Benton exchange– NB brings up historical cohort overview report; KM suggested that Title IX officer certification should address the request. NB views process as illegal, KM does not view it as illegal.

- Ned B supports Jim's proposed process and is willing to bring forth the Faculty Senate. Introduced an update to "Senate Draft Recommendations for Amendments to the FPC Guidelines" shared at Council of Chairs meetings and subsequently with Provost Office.
- President Mason responded that Jim's model does not require review of outside members; recommended we use Jim's model for next year.

Responded to item H (Reporting) of *Senate* document; commitment to deliver report of FPAC process, the difficulty in this is due to the small number of actions. President Mason read the following data:

**During 2012 - 2016 Academic Year Actions; 12 were denied through the appeals process. Of the 12: 7 were promotion, 4 were tenure and 1 was reappointment. The total numbers of appeal denials per academic year were as follows: 2012 (2); 2013 (4); 2014 (3); 2015 (2); and 2016 (1).**

The Title IX officer reviews this information annually. Proposed that the Officer make a certification to the committee regarding if there are any disparities or not, each year.

- Bob T. stated FPAC recusal equates to lost expertise
- 
- Warren E. would want to see distribution of vote history if possible; dept. standards for personnel actions would be helpful.
- 
- Avi B responded that department chairs should articulate the expectations in the annual evaluations. Deans also address in pre-tenure evaluation/letters.
- 
- Bob D. expressed support of Jim's recommendation; overall believes the process was fair; must improve notification to candidate re outcome. (*President Mason addressed the issues related to March 1<sup>st</sup> meetings and post meeting notifications*)
- Jon J. expressed support of Cauthen's proposal; could use Review Committee as model. Recommended the elimination of the personal appearance by candidate, focus more on the file and less on the personal chemistry or disposition of the room.
- David M. suggested pre-prepared questions and a two minute time clock for candidate and chair to respond. We should go back to the old way of doing appeals.
- Michael P. stated that Alt and At large folks did not get Cauthen's e-mailed proposal. The current process works best, from his experience on the committee, but revisions are needed. Personal appearances by candidates skew deliberations.
- Larry S. votes for "old way"; current process is too complex, too many committees. FPAC recusal equates to lost expertise
- Jessica G-N. also expressed that FPAC recusals equates to lost expertise. Suggested smaller FPAC, no personal appearance by candidate, more time for deliberation. How can we give more to weigh P&B decisions?
- Monika S. suggested more time dedicated to appeals review. Requested background/history of the process and changes.



- Ben L. expressed that smaller committee will limit the number of perspectives; larger committee has breadth and fresh perspectives.
- Brian L. expressed mixed feelings; sees benefits of Cauthen's proposal, but also drawn toward DM, LS "old way". Likes the breadth of big P.
- Elise C stated that dept. standards should be required
- Yi L. emphasized importance of thoughtful annual evaluations
- Nicholas P. is not in favor a standing appeal committee, wants to see experts or adjacent experts in appeals meetings; no personal appearance by candidate, written statements only.
- Aftab A. recommended documentation of department's decision (reasons, etc.).
- President Mason responded that CUNY's process does not provide for written documentation or record of justification of personnel committee decisions.
- Jay G. expressed the there's a lack of communication from one step to another, particularly for candidates; the current committee size is not effective for deliberations; expertise should be included in the appeals meetings; and there should be two rounds of appeals.
- Bob G. expressed there's wide variance in dept. standards (even within departments); suggested creation of three 12- person disciplinary committees. Implications for morale when Rev C/FPC/FPAC recommendations are "overturned".
- Seth B agreed with Cauthen's proposal basically; keep candidate personal appearance.
- Brian L. expressed that expertise is in the process at the department level and adjacent expertise is in the process at the review committee level.
- Peter M. stated the FPAC is too large. Candidates' personal appearance essential. FPAC's role is to contain chair bias. We talk too much ~ timekeeping
- Anthony C. posed the following: What's the intent of the appeal? To second guess P&B, Rev Committees? Or is there a mistake to be rectified? What is the purpose of the appeal?
- Geert D. expressed the FPAC was too large. Recusal equals loss of knowledge as well as expertise. Dept. P&B should have more weight. Cauthen's proposal looks good.
- Demi C. recommended focusing on the effectiveness and fairness of the process; supports Jim's proposal
- Angela C. expressed that the Dept P&B should have more weight. FPAC too large. Loves Cauthen's proposal.
- Rosemary B. discussed experiences with the old and current process; appealed under old process... this is better. Expertise is in the room after recusals. Current mode for candidate's personal appearance is so much better. Would like clarification and/or record keeping regarding who actually reads the files (FIDO, hard copy. Wants better/more detailed feedback regarding President's decisions.

President Mason wrap up: No action to be taken today. For 5/04 mtg:

- Decide how to proceed for upcoming year regarding appeals panel composition
  - Committee to consider appeals process revamp for 2020 implementation – report will be due September 2019
  - Regarding what she decides and why: transparency vs. confidentiality – balancing committees desire to know vs candidates right to share/not share outcomes. The PSC contract outlines when reasons are provided to candidate. The letters are private. President will continue to be transparent about her process of review and decision making.
    - Yi L: Emphasized it's a consultative process by KM and YL
- Ned B.: emphasized request for reporting regarding appeals committee; Faculty Senate report is just recommendations, just points for discussion; pushback regarding disclosing personnel info, expressed the committee has the right to know.

### **III. Standards for Early Tenure**

Yi L. reviewed Jane Bowers' position paper. He was scheduled to meet with all early tenure candidates to ensure they understand the memo from CUNY. The meetings are not a mechanism for screening candidacy. After one year in tenure-track line, faculty may apply for early tenure. Candidates must articulate and provide a substantial narrative that supports the exceptional nature of their early tenure case. Chair must articulate exceptionality as well; Provost must provide a letter of support to CUNY.

Benton stated that JJC has been aligned with the high bar that has been outlined.

**Open session adjourned: 1:00 PM**

**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
MINUTES**

**Friday, May 3, 2019**  
Room L.61, New Building  
**9:30am – 1:00 pm**

**APPROVED – 9/13/2019 FPC Meeting**

***Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 11:30 am***

*Meeting convened: 9:40am*

**I. Approval of Minutes, 4/5/19 meeting**

Discussion of previous meeting required a motion for approval with amendment to the following:

- David M. requested to change his section on page 1 from “...process does not need to change...” to “...process should be kept in its current way, because all of the effort and personnel required to make any changes at all, will not produce a significant outcome.”
- It was also requested the last sentence on page 4 be clarified (add “been” before “outline”)?
- Warren motioned and Geert D. seconded the motion. All were in favor.

**II. Faculty Personnel Appeals – Discussion for Policy and Process Change**

- Jim C. gave a short explanation of his proposal on how to establish an appeals committee separate from the FPC. He also described his concern about pulling any faculty members from a department or review committee that is already short on members.
- Kyeanna B. explained the process of the At-Large/Alternate elections regarding how the office identifies where there are seats to be filled and how to handle filling them.
- Ned B. broke down the chart he submitted for today’s meeting. He explained that it is a first draft based on what Jim developed for his statement. He outlined two options: (a) have a separate appeals committee independent of the review committee (so as not to have eligibility issues) or (b) have members who serve on both review committees and appeals committees.
- Allison P. was concerned about possible changes to the guidelines to match the new appeals process and was also concerned with quorum if members are pulled from one committee to now only be on the appeals committee.

Some concerns/suggestions:

- Some faculty were concerned over which members should be on the appeals committee, as they would want to have a diverse panel that would be qualified enough to understand the

materials from various disciplines. They do not want to end up with a committee of people that won't know anything about the candidate's field.

- Jim explained that in his research he has found that an appeal committee with a broad disciplinary span is beneficial to the candidate). Thus at the very least, we could minimize the number of members on our appeals panel/committee.
- Warren suggested that the appeals committee could be outside members, such as senior faculty, instead of the same FPC members just rearranged to a new appeals configuration. Similarly, Geert D. suggested that the Provost's Office could gather eight faculty members that had previously served as Chair's to now serve under the appeals committee.
- Some faculty members shared that regardless of the process chosen, they would like to see members give weight to the department P&B votes as the departmental P&B would know the members and the discipline the best. However, there were others that felt that P&B votes could sometimes be influenced by personality issues within the department and actually the votes of every committee should hold equal weight to provide a more rounded review.
- Provost Li expressed his support for trying to compose a new appeals committee. He believed that having a smaller body of members would be beneficial to the decision making process, so long as there is a way to properly and fairly represent each discipline in the committee. He expressed that having proper representation will aid to properly evaluate candidates' actions.
- Some faculty shared their concerns about changing the process every year. They wanted to be clear that while the current process is a draft, it should still be looked at as a permanent change. If the FPC moves to have a new appeals process next year, faculty must be made aware of how their actions will be reviewed if they go through the appeals process.
- Kyeanna B. described the logistics of what goes on behind the scenes of the FPC meeting. She expressed support of a separate and smaller appeals committee because it would mean appeals meetings could be scheduled during the Fall semester. It would also allow quicker notification to faculty members regarding their personnel action decisions, decreasing anxiety for those awaiting results.
- President M. asked for a focus group to change this draft into a narrative form so that the FPC could have a more in-depth discussion. The group will consist of Monica S., Ned B., Jonathan J., Jim C., Bob T., and Katie G.

### **III. New Business**

#### Tracking Action Outcomes

- President M. requested that data sheets be presented to the FPC in two formats one as a 10-year analysis and another as a breakdown of the latest year.
- The committee discussed that this information can be shared and posted online on our "Inside Portal" page.

**Open session adjourned: 11:10 am**