



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

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

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

- I. Approval of Minutes, 04/05/19 meeting**
- II. Faculty Personnel Appeals –Discussion for Policy and Process Change**
- III. New Business and Announcements**

Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 11:30 am– 11:45 am
Initial Appointment

Notes:

***All times are approximate**

4/30/2019

FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Friday, April 5, 2019
Room L.61 New Building
9:30 AM – 1:00 PM

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 1st 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