



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

### AGENDA

**Friday, May 7, 2021  
9:30 am – 12:30 pm**

**Zoom link:** <https://jjay-cuny.zoom.us/j/82827665009?pwd=UnFiWVZackNlVXNTVER2ZytoSzdBdz09>

**Meeting ID:** 828 2766 5009 **Passcode:** 2021123

***Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 12:00 pm (times are approximate)***

- I. Welcome
- II. Approval of Minutes (April 9, 2021)
- III. Fellowship Leave Proposal
- IV. Proposals Submitted by Ned Benton/Council of Chairs
- V. Proposal Submitted by Paul Narkunas
- VI. Announcements

***Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 12:00 pm – 12:15 pm (times are approximate)***

- I. Fellowship Leaves – Spring 2022
- 

**Materials for Open Meeting Items II – V are available here**



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

**PENDING APPROVAL**

### AGENDA

**Friday, April 9, 2021**

**10:00 am – 1:30 pm**

**Zoom link:** <https://jjay-cuny.zoom.us/j/82827665009?pwd=UnFiWVZackNlVXNTVER2ZytoSzdBdz09>

**Meeting ID:** 828 2766 5009 **Passcode:** 2021123

***Meeting commenced: 10:11am***

I. Welcome

President Mason tabled two FPC items submitted from Paul N. and Ned B. for the next FPC agenda in May.

II. Discussion of Guidelines for Listing Foreign Language Publications on Form C (Proposal submitted by Gail Garfield in 3/2021)

Gail started her discussion by clarifying that she did not seek to change the current personnel review standards, rather she's looking to develop guidance for reviewers to evaluate the merits of scholarly material that are written in foreign languages. She asked the committee their thoughts on what would be the best course of action for reading these materials: "do we ask candidates for a transcript of the translation of the publications or seek outside resources for assistance?" Overall, she felt it was important to give a fair review of applicants form Cs and publications.

President Mason asked Gail to share how the Sociology committee addressed this issue in their current voting. Gail shared that they reached out to librarians at John Jay and other CUNY colleges for guidance.

Lucia T. spoke about reaching out to other CUNY librarians and finding out that some colleges had written policies in place for reviewing foreign materials.

Rosemary B. spoke about asking Angela C. for guidance on how to interpret a candidate's file. Angela C. agreed that reaching out to other librarians for support was a good idea. Through this process, they found someone at Harvard that was able to speak to the quality of the publications of these candidates.

Ned B. wanted to know if there is any flexibility in the personnel process for an earlier external review in the third or fourth year to put in the file as a resource.

Provost Li agreed that having support from expert librarians is helpful in determining the quality of materials from candidates. He also liked what Ned B. said regarding getting an expert on a candidates'

language to evaluate materials. However, he expressed that there should still be a separate guideline for foreign reviews in general.

Paul N. asked if the Sociology committee could explain what they found other colleges were doing in these situations. Lucia T. answered that some colleges had a written policy making it the college's responsibility to find a qualified reviewer to comment and evaluate on the foreign language materials. Colleges also noted that these materials were just as valid as any other English language materials.

President Mason asked for volunteers to research this topic further. Volunteers included: Rosemary B., Elsa-Sofia M., Maki H., Angela C., Chevy A., Katarzyna C., Lucia T., Gail G.

Elsa-Sofia M. shared that reviewers should focus on the peer-reviewed quality of the publications and get assistance from librarians too rather than looking at outside resources.

Vicente L. asked to change the term "foreign language" to "other than English". President Mason agreed.

Warren shared concerns about where all this would lead the committee. He explained that not everyone is an expert in everyone's field. Committees mainly refer to the expertise of external reviewers or peer-reviewed journals to evaluate the merits of publications. He argue that if committees start to need outside resources to read publications, then what is stopping them from then using outside resources to read all the things in a general file that committees are not experts in as well.

Rosemary B. added that not all different language materials are peer-reviewed, such as books or specially funded projects.

Alisse W. added that she thinks this is critically important if we are serious about decolonizing our universities. She also suggested that since we are at the end of the semester with some faculty leaving Chair positions, maybe Gail G.'s committee could revisit the volunteer list in the Fall. President Mason agreed that this was a good point. She suggested Gail use the summer to figure out the lay of the land while herself and Provost Li figure out what they can on the CUNY side and then Gail can revisit this in the Fall to solicit more participation.

Paul said we are supposed to read a candidates entire file and if we cannot literally read materials, we are not completing our part. He also understood Warren's point, but thinks we should walk away from impact factors because it may not take into consideration books and various ways in which certain journals may rate disciplines.

### III. Adjunct Promotions (Proposal submitted by Ned Benton in 2/2021)

Ned B. gave a brief overview of the proposal, explaining that the plan involves integrating the adjunct promotion process into the current faculty personnel committee process.

Ned B. moved for the Motion of adopting this proposal. David M. seconded. All members agreed unanimously.

Ned B. will find out if this proposal needs to go to the college counsel.

*Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 11:00 am – 11:45 am (times are approximate)*

- I. Fellowship Leaves – Spring 2022 (tabled for May FPC)
- II. Recap of Fall 2020 & Spring 2021 Appeals

*Meeting adjourned: 11:03am*

---

**Upcoming FPC Meetings**

**Friday, May 7, 2021                      9:30 am – 1:30 pm**

April 28, 2021

Proposal to Adjust the Vote of Fellowship Leaves Faculty Personnel Committee

**Request:** Fellowship leaves are reviewed by three committees (Department P&B, Review Committee and Full Faculty Personnel Committee) before the recommendations are submitted to the President for review. The Office of the Provost proposes revision of the voting procedure to align with the current procedure for reappointment, tenure and promotion. Below you will find the current FPP guidelines, *Section II.G. Sabbatical Leave (Also Known As Fellowship Leave)*.

Current FPP Guidelines	Proposed Revision	Rationale
<p>II.G.4. Before consideration and vote by the FPC, sabbatical proposals shall be reviewed by an FPC review committee, as assigned by the Provost. The review committee will forward its recommendations to the FPC for vote.</p>	<p>II.G.4. <del>Before consideration and vote by the FPC,</del> Sabbatical proposals shall be reviewed by an FPC review committee, <del>as assigned by the Provost</del> <b>(sections II.D.2. II.D.3),</b> the review committee will forward its recommendations to the <del>FPC</del> <b>for vote. [President]. [The President then makes an independent determination that is forwarded to the Board of Trustees.]</b></p>	<p>Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion are reviewed by the Departmental P&amp;B and forwarded to a designated Review Committee for review and vote. Both committees' recommendations are submitted to the President who makes an independent determination. This change would align the review of fellowship (sabbatical) leaves with other personnel reviews.</p>
<p>II.G.5. The recommendations of the FPC are forwarded to the President who makes an independent determination that is forwarded to the Board of Trustees.</p>	<p><del>II.G.5. The recommendations of the FPC are forwarded to the President who makes an independent determination that is forwarded to the Board of Trustees.</del></p>	
<p>II.G.6. Within 30 days following the completion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a report to the chair and the Provost documenting how activities during the leave advanced the plan as proposed in the application.</p>	<p><del>II.G.6.</del> <b>[II.G.5.]</b> Within 30 days following the completion of the leave, the faculty member shall submit a report to the chair and the Provost documenting how activities during the leave advanced the plan as proposed in the application.</p>	

## Amendment to the Faculty Personnel Committee Appeal Process

Purpose of Amendment	Add Delete Version of Amendment	Resulting Version of the FPC Guidelines
<p>Establish a fifth review committee to conduct appeals of FPC Review Committee recommendations. Clarify that the actions of the four review committees constituted the official recommendations of the FPC to the President, unless appealed to the Appeals Committee in which case the Appeal Committee action supersedes the action of the Review Committee.</p>	<p>II.D.1. The Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) shall be divided into four review committees: A, B, C and D, <del>and an Appeal Committee.</del> <u>Actions of the four review committees shall constitute recommendations to the President pursuant to Section 9.e of the College Charter, unless appealed to the Appeal Committee in which case the action of the Appeal Committee shall constitute the FPC recommendation to the President.</u></p>	<p>II.D.1. The Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) shall be divided into four review committees: A, B, C and D, and an Appeal Committee. Actions of the four review committees shall constitute recommendations to the President pursuant to Section 9.e of the College Charter, unless appealed to the Appeal Committee in which case the action of the Appeal Committee shall constitute the FPC recommendation to the President.</p>
<p>Add II.D.4 establishing the qualifications and election process for the membership of the Appeals Committee. Renummer the sections that follow.</p>	<p><u>II.D.4. The Appeal Review Committee shall consist of 2 FPC faculty members elected by each of the four FPC Review Committees, and the President and Provost. The elected members shall not be members of the same department and shall have served on the FPC for at least one of the past two years. Once elected, the Appeal Committee members shall no longer serve on their respective Review Committees.</u></p>	<p>II.D.4. The Appeal Review Committee shall consist of 2 FPC faculty members elected by each of the four FPC Review Committees, and the President and Provost. The elected members shall not be members of the same department and shall have served on the FPC for at least one of the past two years. Once elected, the Appeal Committee members shall no longer serve on their respective Review Committees.</p>
<p>Clarify that the review committee quorum rule also applies to the appeal committee.</p>	<p>II.D.6. Quorum. At least 80% of the eligible voting members of a review <del>or appeal</del> committee must be present to consider a personnel action.</p>	<p>II.D.6. Quorum. At least 80% of the eligible voting members of a review or appeal committee must be present to consider a personnel action.</p>
<p>Amend existing language to reflect that appeals are heard by the Appeals Committee.</p>	<p>II.E.4. The appeal shall be considered by <del>the entire membership of the FPC with the exceptions noted below in II.E.5 and II.E.6.</del> <u>the Appeal Review Committee.</u> The appeal shall be chaired by the President or, in his or her absence, the Provost.</p>	<p>II.E.4. The appeal shall be considered by the Appeal Review Committee. The appeal shall be chaired by the President or, in his or her absence, the Provost.</p>
<p>Amend the appeal language so that a candidate's department chair or any member of the candidate's department, if a member of the Appeals Committee, may not attend or vote on the candidate's appeal. This is the same rule that applies for the four Review Committees.</p> <p>Based on how the Appeal Committee is constituted there can only be one exclusion, either the chair or a member of the candidate's department, because two members of the same department cannot be elected to the Appeal Committee.</p>	<p>II.E.6. The chairperson of a candidate's department, <u>if a member of the Appeal Committee,</u> will neither make a presentation to the committee, nor be present for discussion of the candidate, nor be eligible to <u>attend or vote</u> on the appeal. <del>A candidate's chairperson will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of his or her department's candidate, and shall not vote on the candidate.</del> In the case of candidates with dual departmental affiliations, this will apply to both chairpersons.</p> <p><del>Any FPC Appeal Committee member who is affiliated with the same department as the candidate will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of the candidate, and he or she will not attend or</del> vote on the candidate. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The candidate's department chairperson</li> </ul>	<p>II.E.6. The chairperson of a candidate's department, if a member of the Appeal Committee, will neither make a presentation to the committee, nor be present for discussion of the candidate, nor be eligible to attend or vote on the appeal. In the case of candidates with dual departmental affiliations, this will apply to both chairpersons.</p> <p>Any Appeal Committee member who is affiliated with the same department as the candidate will not attend or vote on the candidate. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The candidate's department chairperson</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All members of the candidate's Departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (inclusive of externally appointed members).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All members of the candidate's Departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (inclusive of externally appointed members).</li> <li>• Any at-large and alternate members who are affiliated with the candidate's department.</li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Any at-large and alternate members who are affiliated with the candidate's department.
Eliminate the Appeal Panel members.	<p>II.E.7. The members of the review committee that decided a candidate's action shall not participate in the appeal, except for a presentation by the Primary Reporter, as provided in II.E.8 below. <del>These members shall be replaced by an equivalent number of members of the Appeals Panel selected by the President. The Appeals Panel shall be comprised of twelve faculty members who are not current members of the FPC. The Appeals Panel members shall be elected by the faculty to staggered three-year terms. (One-third of the panel shall be up for re-election each year.) Appeals Panel members selected for a given appeal will not include those from the appealing candidate's department.</del></p>	<p>II.E.7. The members of the review committee that decided a candidate's action shall not participate in the appeal, except for a presentation by the Primary Reporter, as provided in II.E.8 below.</p>
Clarify reference to the Appeals Panel. Eliminate unnecessary language about candidate department members because they are already excluded.	<p>II.E.8. The Provost shall appoint a Primary Reporter and Secondary Reporter from among the FPC and Appeals Panel <u>Committee</u> members participating in the appeal. The Primary and Secondary Reporters will present independent evaluations of the candidate to the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee at the outset of the consideration of an appeal. These presentations shall be based solely on the File and without consultation or discussion with anyone else on or off the committee. <del>Neither the Primary Reporter nor Secondary Reporter shall come from the candidate's department.</del> Everyone on the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee is required to read the entire File of the appellant.</p>	<p>II.E.8. The Provost shall appoint a Primary Reporter and Secondary Reporter from among the Appeals Committee members participating in the appeal. The Primary and Secondary Reporters will present independent evaluations of the candidate to the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee at the outset of the consideration of an appeal. These presentations shall be based solely on the File and without consultation or discussion with anyone else on or off the committee. Everyone on the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee is required to read the entire File of the appellant.</p>
Clarify that the recommendation of the Appeals Committee constitutes the recommendation of the FPC as required by the Charter.	<p>II.E.11. The decision of the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee on a candidate's appeal <u>constitutes the FPC's recommendation to the President and</u> is advisory to the President.</p>	<p>II.E.11. The decision of the Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee on a candidate's appeal constitutes the FPC's recommendation to the President and is advisory to the President.</p>

## Amendments to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines Relating to Faculty Compensation

Purpose of Amendment	Add/Delete Version of Amendment	Resulting Version of FPC Guidelines
<p>When the FPC formally votes on all initial appointments, the salaries shall be reported to the FPC along with the rationales for any appointment salaries above the official range.</p>	<p>II.F.1. The FPC formally votes on all initial appointments during the first meeting of the subsequent fall semester. <u>Salaries shall be reported to the FPC along with the rationales for any appointment salaries above the official range.</u></p>	<p>II.F.1. The FPC formally votes on all initial appointments during the first meeting of the subsequent fall semester. Salaries shall be reported to the FPC along with the rationales for any appointment salaries above the official range.</p>
<p>This new section implements responsibilities of the FPC relating to compensation as specified in the College Charter and the CUNY Bylaws.</p>	<p><u>II.M. Compensation Equity</u>  <u>II.M.1 There shall be a Review Committee on Compensation Equity. The membership of the Committee shall consist of one member elected from each Review Committee and one full professor elected by the Faculty Senate. The Committee shall elect the chair from among its members.</u>  <u>II.M.2 The committee shall receive, by February 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, a study of faculty salaries by rank and department, including averages and ranges. The Committee shall review and forward this report to the FPC with recommendations.</u>  <u>II.M.L.3 The Committee shall receive and consider petitions and appeals from members of the full-time faculty with respect to matters of individual compensation, and shall present its recommendations to the Provost and President.</u></p>	<p>II.M. Compensation Equity            II.M.1 There shall be a Review Committee on Compensation Equity. The membership of the Committee shall consist of one member elected from each Review Committee and one full professor elected by the Faculty Senate. The Committee shall elect the chair from among its members.            II.M.2 The committee shall receive, by February 1<sup>st</sup> of each year, a study of faculty salaries by rank and department, including averages and ranges. The Committee shall review and forward this report to the FPC with recommendations.            II.M.L.3 The Committee shall receive and consider petitions and appeals from members of the full-time faculty with respect to matters of individual compensation, and shall present its recommendations to the Provost and President.</p>

### A. Charter Issues

#### e. Committee on Faculty Personnel:

There shall be a Committee on Faculty Personnel which shall review from the departments and other appropriate units of the College all recommendations for appointments to the instructional staff in the following ranks: Distinguished Professor, Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Distinguished Lecturer, Lecturer, Chief College Laboratory Technician, Senior College Laboratory Technician, and College Laboratory Technician, and make recommendations to the President. It shall also receive recommendations for promotions and reappointments with or without tenure, together with compensation, in the aforementioned ranks of the instructional staff and shall recommend to the President actions on these matters. It may also recommend to the President special salary increments. The President shall consider such recommendations in making his or her recommendations on such matters to the CUNY Board of Trustees.

Policy recommendations of the committee shall be made to the College Council for action. Recommendations with respect to appointments, promotions, and other matters specified in the paragraph above, shall be reported to the President and shall not be considered by the College Council except at the discretion of the President. The Committee shall receive and consider petitions and appeals from appropriate members of the instructional staff with respect to matters of status and compensation, and shall present its recommendations to the President. Further appeals shall follow CUNY procedures.

**B. CUNY Bylaws Issues**

ARTICLE VIII ORGANIZATION AND DUTIES OF THE FACULTY

SECTION 8.7. COMMITTEE ON FACULTY PERSONNEL AND BUDGET

a. There shall be in each college a committee on faculty personnel and budget or equivalent committee. The chairperson of this committee shall be the president. The members of the committee may include the department chairs, the vice president of academic affairs and one or more deans designated by the president.

b. This committee shall receive from the several departments all recommendations for annual appointments to full-time faculty titles, including annual appointments to the titles distinguished lecturer, clinical professor, lecturer and instructor as well as titles in the college laboratory technician series, reappointments thereto, with or without tenure, and promotions therein, together with compensation; it shall recommend action thereon to the president. The committee may also recommend to the president special salary increments. The president shall consider such recommendations in making his/her recommendations on such matters to the chancellor.

c. Within the period prescribed by the chancellor, the president shall prepare the annual tentative budget and submit it to the committee for its recommendations. The committee shall make its recommendations within the period prescribed by the chancellor and submit them to the president. The president shall submit to the chancellor, within the period prescribed by the chancellor, such tentative annual budget, together with his/her comments and recommendations and any comments and recommendations of the committee.

**C. Questions:**

- What is the role of the FPC with respect to compensation and special salary increments?
- What is the role of the FPC with respect to compensation for new faculty appointments?
- What should the FPC Guidelines say about this?
- How does the FPC consider petitions and appeals from faculty members relating to their compensation?

## Amendment Relating to Department/Discipline Criteria for Scholarship

Purpose of Amendment	Add/Delete Version of Amendment	Resulting Version of FPC Guidelines
<p>Require that departmental and or discipline guidance about criteria for the assessment of scholarship and service be written, approved by vote of the faculty of the department, and approved by the FPC. When approved guidance exists, satisfaction of the guidance must be assessed by the chair in the annual evaluation and by the candidate in the Form C.</p> <p>The amendment assures that the candidate, the chair, the department P&amp;B and the FPC and its committees are aware of the criteria and the application of the criteria to the scholarship of the candidate. When a department includes faculty from several disciplines, separate guidance documents can be developed for the disciplines involved.</p> <p>Because the revised section concerns both scholarship and service, it is moved to section III.A which refers to criteria generally. All paragraphs should be numbers and this becomes III.A.6.</p>	<p><u>III.A.6 It is recognized that different disciplines have different criteria by which to assess scholarship and service excellence, such as the role of multiple authorship and the length of articles, or the value and nature of the candidate's artistic or journalistic works or the candidate's service. Department and/or discipline guidance must be written, approved by vote of the department faculty, and approved by vote of the FPC. When approved departmental and/or discipline guidance exists, it is the responsibility of the candidate's chair, in developing the annual evaluation, to assess how the candidate's scholarship and service satisfies criteria of the candidate's department and discipline and how it demonstrates progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the college. The candidate must also address these matters in the Form C.</u></p>	<p>III.A.6 It is recognized that different disciplines have different criteria by which to assess scholarship and service excellence, such as the role of multiple authorship and the length of articles, or the value and nature of the candidate's artistic or journalistic works or the candidate's service. Department and/or discipline guidance must be written, approved by vote of the department faculty, and approved by vote of the FPC. When approved departmental and/or discipline guidance exists, it is the responsibility of the candidate's chair, in developing the annual evaluation, to assess how the candidate's scholarship and service satisfies criteria of the candidate's department and discipline and how it demonstrates progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the college. The candidate must also address these matters in the Form C.</p>
<p>Section III.C.1.c is deleted because it only addressed scholarship.</p>	<p><del>III.C.1.c. It is recognized that different disciplines have different criteria by which to assess excellence, such as the role of multiple authorship and the length of articles, or the value and nature of the candidate's artistic or journalistic works. It is the responsibility of the candidate's chair, in developing the annual evaluation, to assess how the candidate's scholarship satisfies criteria of the candidate's department and discipline and how it demonstrates progress toward meeting the requirements for tenure relative to their time of service at the college. The candidate must also address these matters in the Form C.</del></p>	

## **Proposed Revisions of the FPC Guidelines**

**GOAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:** Restore Chairs and their disciplinary expertise to the personnel process. Foster faculty governance.

### **Current Language:**

“II.D.10. The chairperson of a candidate’s department will not make a presentation to the committee except in tenure cases, when the chairperson shall introduce the candidate’s File to the Review Committee. The chairperson will then be excused from the committee since the chairperson of the candidate’s department shall not be present for discussion of the candidate. In the case of candidates with dual departmental affiliations, this will apply to both chairpersons. If any member of the review committee needs questions answered or points clarified, however, the chairperson of the candidate’s department will be invited to appear before the committee. When the candidate him/herself is the chairperson, the department P&B shall elect one of its members to appear in lieu of the chairperson” (12).

### **Suggested Changes:**

II.D.10. The chairperson of a candidate’s department will not make a presentation to the committee except in tenure cases, when the chairperson shall introduce the candidate’s File to the Review Committee. ~~The chairperson will then be excused from the committee since the chairperson of the candidate’s department shall not be present for discussion of the candidate. In the case of candidates with dual departmental affiliations, this will apply to both chairpersons. If any member of the review committee needs questions answered or points clarified, however, the chairperson of the candidate’s department will be invited to appear before the committee.~~ When the candidate him/herself is the chairperson, the department P&B shall elect one of its members to appear in lieu of the chairperson (12).

### **Context and Rationale for the Change:**

Chairs were removed from the FPC Committee deliberations to preclude their advocacy for faculty within their department during the FPC decision-making process. Similarly, these changes arose due to concerns that chairs had derailed their departmental candidates, either for interpersonal or political reasons. To remedy this possibility, chairs were replaced by the file, which was supposed to be more objective and speak the truth of the candidate. Chairs would be invited in to the deliberations only to clarify the file’s truths within limited parameters.

Without denying the real concerns of chair advocacy or chair hostility, the current system assumes that the file is a transparent entity without its own context and history. Without the chair or other disciplinary expertise, context about disciplinary standards can be lost, even when considering the annual evaluation letters. By restoring chairs to the deliberation process while weighing the file, important context can be learned, allowing for more complex and robust discussion on the candidates’ record.

Furthermore, for candidates who are unsuccessful in their reappointment, tenure, or promotion, the advantage of having the chair present during the discussion may facilitate their due process to mount an appeal. Currently, candidates who go up for appeal must receive the information only on the result of the action, if they receive any information at all. How is a candidate supposed to launch an appeal if s/he has no insight into the rationale for the denial?

**GOAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:** Restore disciplinary expertise and faculty governance to the FPC deliberations.

The following shall also be cut from p. 12 of the current FPC Guidelines:

~~Any FPC member who is affiliated with the same department as the candidate will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of the candidate, and he or she will not vote on the candidate. This includes, as indicated above, the candidate's department chairperson and the following:~~

- ~~All members of the candidate's departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (inclusive of externally appointed members).  
Any at-large and alternate members who are affiliated with the candidate's department.~~

Instead, the following shall replace it:

“All members of the candidate's department or departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (inclusive of externally appointed members) are precluded from voting on the candidate.”

### **Context and Rationale for the Change:**

In our current FPC structure, every individual who has expertise on the respective discipline or department is required to be absent during the deliberation of the candidate. As a result, specific disciplinary standards, knowledge, and contexts are often not shared during the considerations of a candidate because those who can speak to it are not allowed in the room.

By restoring those with specific disciplinary knowledge to the deliberations on a candidate, we can restore the decision-making of the department to the FPC deliberations. Many chairs have commented on how they want to respect the decision-making process of the departments. This small gesture would allow that possibility. However, to be fair and provide a check, we can remove the chair's right to vote on the candidate, especially for members who may have also served on the departmental personnel committees.

### **PROPOSED APPEALS PROCESS CHANGES:**

**GOAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:** Restore Chairs and their disciplinary expertise to the appeal process.

### **Current Language:**

“II.E.6. The chairperson of a candidate's department will neither make a presentation to the committee, nor be present for discussion of the candidate, nor be eligible to vote on the appeal. A candidate's chairperson will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of his or her department's candidate, and shall not vote on the candidate. In the case of candidates with dual departmental affiliations, this will apply to both chairpersons” (13).

### **Proposed Revisions:**

II.E.6. The chairperson of a candidate's department will not make a presentation to the committee, but will be present for discussion of the candidate. However, the chair is not eligible to vote on the appeal. In the case of candidates with dual departmental affiliations, the aforementioned policies will apply to both chairpersons.

### **Context and Rationale for the Change:**

As with above, we restore Chairs to the deliberation process on appeals for the same reasons as stated above. To place a check on the chair's power, we continue to deny chair's the right to vote on their own candidates at FPC Appeals.

**GOAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:** Restore disciplinary expertise and faculty governance to the FPC Appeals Process.

### **Current Language:**

"Any FPC member who is affiliated with the same department as the candidate will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of the candidate, and he or she will not vote on the candidate. This includes:

- The candidate's department chairperson
- All members of the candidate's Departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (inclusive of externally appointed members).
- Any at-large and alternate members who are affiliated with the candidate's department" (13).

### **Proposed Revisions:**

Any FPC member who is affiliated with the same department as the candidate ~~will be asked to leave the room during the discussion of the candidate, and he or she will not vote on the candidate.~~ This includes:

- The candidate's department chairperson
- All members of the candidate's Departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (inclusive of externally appointed members).
- Any at-large and alternate members who are affiliated with the candidate's department.

### **Context and Rationale for the Change:**

In our current FPC Appeals Committee structure, every individual who has expertise on the respective discipline or department is required to be absent during deliberation on the candidate. As a result, specific disciplinary standards, knowledge, and contexts are lost during the deliberation because those who can speak to it are not allowed in the room.

By restoring those with specific disciplinary knowledge to the deliberations on a candidate, we can restore the important context and knowledge of disciplinary and departmental decision-making to the FPC Appeals Committee considerations. Many chairs have

commented on how they want to respect the decision-making process of the departments. This small gesture would allow that possibility. However, to be fair and provide a check, we can remove the chair's right to vote on the candidate, especially for members who may have also served on the departmental personnel committees.

**GOAL OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:** To allow appeals candidates adequate time to prepare their appeal letter during the winter break, instead of during the most demanding time of the semester.

**Current Language:**

“II.E.3. Within 14 days following notice of the intention to appeal, the candidate may submit a written statement in support of his or her appeal. The written statement shall be restricted to information contained within the File, but may include any updates to the status of scholarly contributions referenced in the File with supporting documentation. For example, a candidate may offer evidence that a paper already referenced in the File as in progress has been accepted for publication, but a candidate may not include a newly published paper that was not referenced in the File as in progress” (14).

**Proposed Revisions:**

II.E.3. Within **30** days following notice of the intention to appeal, the candidate may submit a written statement in support of his or her appeal. The written statement shall be restricted to information contained within the File, but may include any updates to the status of scholarly contributions referenced in the File with supporting documentation. For example, a candidate may offer evidence that a paper already referenced in the File as in progress has been accepted for publication, but a candidate may not include a newly published paper that was not referenced in the File as in progress.

**Context and Rationale for the Change:**

Currently, the candidate has 14 days to signal his/her intention to appeal to the provost's office, and then another 14 days to complete the appeal letter. This may seem like considerable time. However, given the timelines of the FPC decision-making process (right around Thanksgiving), most appeal letters must be filed during the third week of December during the busiest time of the semester for faculty. Faculty members frequently have to rush their letters, and/or may end up cheating their students at this crucial time of the semester because their livelihoods may depend on the letter. Meanwhile, the letters are filed, and basically sit around for the entire month of January. In the interests of student success and allowing candidates sufficient time to critically reflect on their appeals letter, while also giving the Provost's office adequate time to post the letters on FIDO or place them in the physical folder, we suggest 30 days.