



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

Friday, April 7, 2017
Room 630T, Haaren Hall
9:30 am-1:00 pm

Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 12:30 pm

- I. Welcome**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
- III. Faculty Personnel Process Outcomes**
- IV. Adjunct Professor Emeritus Policy**
- V. Distinguished Professor Nomination Process**
- VI. Faculty Senate Statement on Faculty Personnel Process**
- VII. Appeals Process**

Spring 2017 FPC Meeting

Full FPC

Friday, May 5, 2017

Notes:



FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

February 10, 2017

Room L.61 (New Building)

Open Meeting Minutes

NOT YET APPROVED – will be voted on at the 4/7/17 FPC Meeting

Open Meeting called to order at 9:39 AM

Non-FPC Members in attendance: Allison Pease (ENG)

- I. **Approval of Meetings**
 - a. Motion called and seconded
 - b. Unanimously approved
- II. **Proposal to change timeline to pre-tenure review**
 - a. Provost Bowers summarized discussion for the last FPC meeting, 12/9/16.
 - b. Two revisions: (1) reviews begin in fall, after the file has closed and (2) dean does not review a faculty assigned to their review committee.
 - c. Motioned called and seconded
 - d. Unanimously approved
- III. **Form C Update - Allison Pease**
 - a. Summarized initial proposal and proposed revision to items 15 and 16.
 - b. Discussion: (JC) Evidence of teaching item 15 should end at "teaching effectiveness". (JB) suggesting extending and including "efforts to improve teaching". (AM) In favor to have mentoring emphasized to highlight/underscore the work of faculty. (AK) request to add "assist with internships" (referencing the FPP Guidelines). AP clarifies this proposal is about the Form C not the guidelines. (AC) what do we want to see emphasize? Cutting sentence at "teaching effectiveness" because it will give faculty opportunity to share what is applicable. (AP) Keep item15 as is, edit to end at "teaching effectiveness" and eliminate item 16 or keep item 15 as is and keep item16. (JB) emphasize need to demonstrate assessment and activities faculty participate in, shared information about middle states concern/discussion. (JT) editing suggestion "...teaching effectiveness AND efforts to improve teaching.", there should be an ongoing process of efforts to improve teaching.
 - c. Proposed Amendment
 - i. Item 15 – Amended - "...teaching effectiveness AND efforts to improve teaching." Item 16 remains as proposed
- IV. **Statement Regarding Librarianship Librarian statement – Larry Sullivan**
 - a. Form C items 15 and 16 do not provide library faculty to demonstrate their qualifications. The proposed revision is consistent with CUNY Bylaws.

- b. Motioned called and seconded
- c. Unanimously approved

Open meeting adorned at 10:09am

Faculty Personnel Process
Analysis of Outcomes
Eight Year Look-Back

Year	Negative Outcomes as a Percentage of Total Cases prior to Appeal	Appeals as a Percentage of Negative Outcomes	Types of Actions Represented in Negative Outcomes and Appeals (those who chose to appeal)	Successful Appeals as a Percentage of All Appeals	*Overall Negative Outcomes of All Cases - Post Appeal
2009-2010	5/142=3.5%	5/5=100%	<u>Appealed:</u> 1 CCE 3 Promotions 1 Tenure	4/5=80%	1/142 = 0.7%
2010-2011	8/162=4.9%	7/8=88%	<u>Appealed:</u> 1 CCE 1 Promotion 4 Reappointments 1 Tenure <u>Not appealed:</u> 1 Promotion	5/7=71% 1 Negative Outcome Overturned by President	2/162 = 1.2%
2011-2012	17/166=10.24%	12/17=71%	<u>Appealed:</u> 2 CCE 4 Promotions 6 Reappointments <u>Not appealed:</u> 2 Promotions 1 Reappointment 2 Tenure (early)	11/12=92%	1/166 = 0.6%
2012-2013	10/167=5.99%	8/10=80%	<u>Appealed:</u> 2 Promotion 5 Reappointments 1 Tenure <u>Not appealed:</u> 1 Reappointment 1 Tenure (early)	6/8=75% 1 Positive Rec. Overturned: Non-reappointment by President	2/167 = 1.2%
2013-2014	12/245=4.9%	8/12= 66.7%	<u>Appealed:</u> 1 CCE 5 Promotions 1 Reappointment 1 Tenure <u>Not appealed:</u> 2 Promotions 1 Reappointment 1 Tenure (early)	5/8= 62.5%	3/245 = 1.2%

2014 -2015	6/198 = 3.03%	5/6 = 83.3%	<u>Appealed:</u> 2 Promotions 1 Reappointment 2 Tenure <u>Not Appealed:</u> 1 Promotion	3/5 = 60%	2/198 = 1%
2015-2016	9/152 = 5.9%	8/9 = 88.9%	<u>Appealed:</u> 3 Promotions 2 Reappointments 3 Tenure <u>Not Appealed:</u> 1 Distinguished Professor (President recommends promotion and forwards case to CUNY, thereby reversing negative recommendation)	4/8 = 50% 2 negative outcomes were 2 cases of tenure and promotion, where tenure was granted but promotion was denied.	4/152 = 2.6%
2016-2017	8/128 = 6.25	6/8 = 75%	<u>Appealed:</u> 1 Reappointment 1 Early Tenure 4 Promotions <u>Not Appealed:</u> 2 Promotions	5/6 = 83.3% 2 Negative Outcomes Overturned by President.	1/128 = 0.8%

Summary

1. The vast majority of faculty members who apply for tenure or promotion in any given year are successful in their initial application. In the past seven years, the rate of unsuccessful outcomes only once reached double digits (10.24% in 2011).
2. From 2009 to 2017, the rate of unsuccessful outcomes, prior to appeal, has risen by three percentage points, but has not increased steadily over the eight years. Three of the eight years saw a decline from the previous year.
3. The vast majority (from 66.7% to 100%) of candidates appeal their negative outcomes.
4. The vast majority of appeals are successful, ranging from a 50% to a 92% rate of success.
5. The vast majority of annual personnel actions have positive outcomes, including successful appeals. In the final analysis, the annual failure rate for tenure and promotion at John Jay College is in the very low single digits. With one exception (2015 at 2.6%) the final negative outcomes as a percentage of all personnel actions initiated in a given year has been at around 1.2% or lower. On average, 1.16% of personnel actions had negative outcomes from 2009 to 2017.

Overview: Professor Emeritus/Emerita

CUNY MANUAL OF GENERAL POLICY

Policy 5.17 Professor Emeritus

The title of Professor Emeritus shall be automatically conferred upon all full professors who have honorably retired after a period of service in the institution of more than ten years.

In addition, individuals holding professorial titles who have honorably retired may also be **designated as “emeritus” in their professional title, regardless of the period of service, if the college president agrees with the affirmative recommendation of the relevant department personnel and budget committee and the college personnel and budget committee.**

FACULTY PERSONNEL PROCESS GUIDELINES, effective FALL 2015

II.L. Policy on Professor Emeritus/Emerita Status

II.L.1. At all CUNY colleges, the title of Professor Emeritus/Emerita is automatically conferred on full professors who honorably retire after more than 10 years of service. Retired full professors who have served 10 or more years and who wish to formalize their Emeritus/Emerita rank should apply in writing to the President, who is responsible for confirming their Emeritus/Emerita status.

II.L.2. In exceptional cases the title of Emeritus/Emerita may be conferred on associate or assistant professors who retire or on full professors who retire with fewer than 10 years of service.

II.L.3. Criteria for Awarding Emeritus/Emerita Rank in Exceptional Cases include

- Evidence of outstanding teaching or service to the college community over a period of at least 10 years, or
- Record of meritorious research and publication.

II.L.4. Process for Awarding Emeritus/Emerita Rank in Exceptional Cases:

- Candidates apply to their department P&Bs for Emeritus/Emerita rank.
- Chairpersons refer departmental votes on these applications to the FPC for review.
- The FPC reviews each case and makes a recommendation to the President for final approval.

II.L.5. Privileges for Emeritus/Emerita faculty may include:

- Access to space for research and writing, if available
- Inclusion of name on list of faculty in the college catalogue and other relevant publications
- Inclusion in campus events open to college employees (e.g. lectures, receptions)
- Invitations to participate in college ceremonies, commencement processions, and convocations
- College email account and intranet access
- College library access
- College mailbox, if space is available

Overview: Professor Emeritus/Emerita

- Opportunity to serve in a volunteer capacity (e.g. as tutor, events facilitator, consultant to grant-writers or report-writers, research mentor to junior faculty)
- Opportunity to teach independent study courses in a volunteer capacity
- Use of college recreational and social facilities on the same basis as other faculty
- Listing as faculty on college website
- John Jay ID card

Overview: Distinguished Professor Nomination

CUNY NOMINATION GUIDELINES, REVISED AUGUST 7, 2014

College Process and Nomination Procedure

Nominees need the support of and recommendation from the college president and highest ranking academic administrator, the Distinguished Professor Selection Committee, the Chancellor, and the Board of Trustees Committee on Faculty, Staff, and Administration to be conferred with the title of Distinguished Professor by the CUNY Board of Trustees.

The college will forward the following to the Executive Vice Chancellor and University Provost:

1. A current curriculum vitae checked for accuracy and completeness;
2. **Letters of recommendations from the college's president and from the chief academic officer;**
3. External evaluations, accompanied by vitas (not bios) for each evaluator*;
4. Documentation of the nomination process, including an account of the process by which the external evaluations were solicited;
5. **Representative samples of the candidate's scholarly and/or creative work, as appropriate** and any additional evidence of exceptional performance by national and international standards of excellence.

*Campuses should seek at least ten (10) external letters of evaluation from full professors or people of comparable standing outside the academy who are widely recognized authorities in the **nominee's field and can provide objective analyses of the nominee's qualifications.** As part of the nomination materials sent to the University, the campuses should provide the evaluating committee with each reviewer's vita. The review letters should include a comparison of the nominee to a specific list of other distinguished scholars in the field and provide a clearly articulated rationale for the assessment. Reviewers must be objective, without reasons for bias; for example, they should not ordinarily be coauthors with the candidate, and they cannot be from any CUNY college. Reviewers should acknowledge any prior contact with the nominee.

<http://www2.cuny.edu/about/alumni-students-faculty/faculty/distinguished-professors/nomination-guidelines/>

FACULTY PERSONNEL PROCESS GUIDELINES, EFFECTIVE 2015

II.J. Nomination of Distinguished Professors

II.J.1. Nominations for the position of Distinguished Professor may be proposed by members of the faculty or members of the administration. Nominees may either be external candidates or current members of the John Jay College faculty. Regardless of how nominations originate, they must be vetted and approved by the P&B of the department to which the Distinguished Professor is to be appointed or in which the nominee currently has an appointment. In reviewing the nomination, the P&B must apply the rigorous scholarly criteria required by CUNY

Bylaws. Nominators, chairs, and candidates are encouraged to review the CUNY Bylaws and related documents posted on the CUNY website.

II.J.2. In the case of an external candidate, the nominee must have all of the qualifications necessary for appointment to the position of full Professor. The Board of Trustees may act to confirm the appointment as a full Professor concurrently with the approval of the designation as a Distinguished Professor.

II.J.3. If the departmental P&B votes in favor, the nomination is forwarded to the Provost who independently makes a judgment about the merit of the nomination and determines whether CUNY will make a Distinguished Professor position available. (The number of Distinguished Professorships **across the university is capped at 175.**) **If the Provost's assessment is positive** and if CUNY advises the Provost that an additional distinguished professorship can be assigned to the college, the Provost will forward a recommendation to the President who will decide whether to bring the nomination to the FPC for its review and vote.

II.J.4. If the President supports the nomination; the department chair shall solicit at least ten **letters of evaluation from widely recognized authorities in the nominee's field**, as required by **CUNY procedures. The FPC shall review the nomination letter and the candidate's external** letters of evaluation, and vote on the nomination.

II.J.5. Should the FPC vote in favor of the nomination, the next stage of the CUNY review process is put into effect. The application is sent to the Office of the Executive Vice-Chancellor **and University Provost, including the candidate's current curriculum vitae, external letters of evaluation, letters of recommendation from the John Jay College President and Provost, and documentation of the college's review processes, to enable the university to make an** independent determination of the merits of the appointment.

Statement on the Faculty Personnel Process

John Jay College of Criminal Justice

Faculty Senate

Draft 2.1 as approved by Senate March 7, 2017

Based on the 2015 COACHE survey results, the COACHE Working Group¹ made recommendations to “Improve the Transparency of the Personnel Process.” The 2012 COACHE survey results also reflected problems with the faculty personnel process.² The percent of positive rating by faculty members completing the Chronicle of Higher Education “Great Colleges to Work For” have consistently declined each year for the past four years, including ratings in survey areas concerning job satisfaction, professional development, policies, communication and fairness.³

There is a broad consensus in support of the COACHE Working Group recommendations concerning the need for improved transparency in the Faculty Personnel Process. The Faculty Senate shares in that consensus, and has made recommendations as the Provost and the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC) formulated measures to implement the recommendations of the COACHE Working Group.

The Faculty Senate periodically adopts statements on important issues affecting the status of the faculty at John Jay College. In this statement, the Senate summarizes recommendations to improve the faculty personnel process.

1. Structure the Process to Develop and Adopt Changes in the Faculty Personnel Process

The faculty personnel process is an essential and critically important feature of the college as an academic institution. It determines the employment status and academic rank of every faculty member, and the decisions made affect the performance of every academic program, department, service and project. Therefore, it is essential that faculty personnel policies and procedures, and the processes for development and change of those policies and procedures, are transparent, clear, consistent and fair.

These recommendations are designed to promote the values stated above, and are consistent with the following COACHE Working Group recommendations:⁴

- *The FPC (or Provost’s office) should hold open consultation with faculty prior to any changes to the personnel guidelines.*
- *The FPC (or Provost’s office) should publish and disseminate personnel guidelines prior to candidates submitting materials for a particular year’s personnel actions – particularly if any changes occurred.*

An improved process would be more structured and open, with the following features:

- a. **A predictable schedule:** For example, topics and ideas for changes might be identified in November/December, changes drafted in February/March and changes adopted in April/May.

¹ COACHE Working Group Report, June 8, 2016, pp.9-11

² John Jay 2012 COACHE Data Summary Report, OIR, August 2012

³ <https://johnjaysenate.commons.gc.cuny.edu/2016/09/15/four-year-comparison-of-our-great-colleges-to-work-survey/>

⁴ COACHE Working Group report, June 8, 2016, p. 10

- b. **Written Proposals:** Proposed changes should be presented in writing before they are adopted. Subsequent substantial changes, including changes made based on comments, should also be circulated in writing.
- c. **Comment Periods:** There should be reasonable and predictable periods of time for submission of comments concerning proposals and other changes. In order to afford department faculties and college governance bodies time to meet, comment periods should provide for at least 30 days within the Fall and Spring semesters.
- d. **Notice:** It should be possible for any faculty member or governance body to request to receive email notice of pending actions and comment periods, with open access to the documents involved.
- e. **Prospective Application:** Revised policies should not take effect during the academic year and personnel action cycle during which the change is adopted. Exceptional circumstances may arise, such as externally mandated changes, and situations where the comments confirm a general consensus that the proposed change benefits the faculty members whose cases are under consideration, and delay adversely affects them.

2. Improve Reporting on the Faculty Personnel Process

Valid and informative statistical reporting is essential to assessment of the faculty personnel process, and also essential to promote understanding and awareness for all stakeholders in the faculty personnel process. This recommendation is consistent with the following COACHE Working Group recommendation:⁵

- *The FPC (or Provost's office) should publish annual statistical reports of FPC actions. Information should not be detailed enough to identify individuals, but should communicate to candidates the tendency over time of candidates to be tenured and/or promoted.*

The Provost's COACHE Implementation Action Plan⁶ proposes to develop such a report.

- *In September 2016, a comprehensive, seven-year historical view of FPC statistics was sent by email to all FT faculty and was published on Inside John Jay, with plans to update and disseminate annually.*
- *Faculty Services will undertake a cohort analysis, breaking down for race and gender and share the findings similarly.*

The Faculty Senate supports the Provost's plan. However, the cohort analysis has not yet been developed and circulated.

3. Encourage and Support Transparency in Providing Specialized Departmental Guidance

Section III.C.1.c of the Faculty Personnel Guidelines states *"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*

⁵ COACHE Working Group report, June 8, 2016, p. 10

⁶ Provost's Plan to Achieve the Objectives Put Forth by the COACHE Working Group on the Faculty and to Implement the Strategies of the Faculty Diversity Strategic Plan, Fall 2013-2018, pp. 6-7

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."

The Faculty Senate agrees that departments and disciplines should have the opportunity to develop and achieve official recognition of special criteria, reflecting the norms, standards and modes of academic, intellectual and creative expression of their academic disciplines for teaching, scholarship and service. However, the FPC Guidelines do not define how these different criteria would be developed, adopted, documented and communicated.

For example, consistent with the general idea in the FPC Guidelines that special criteria should be recognized, at the February 10, 2017 meeting, the FPC approved a "Statement for Guidelines regarding Librarianship."

For faculty members in the Library Department, "teaching" is to be interpreted as "librarianship" to reflect the overall goals of the library including developing, organizing, preserving, maintaining, making accessible, and interpreting informational resources for teaching, learning, and research. This section addresses information literacy, collection development, reference and instruction, user services, information technology and application, library administration and management, special collections, and print and digital archives.

The rationale for the new language to be added to the Faculty Personnel Guidelines change was: *"Because library faculty do not teach three-credit courses, the current Teaching Section of Form C does not apply easily to library faculty. In order to effectively evaluate the work done by librarians and to clarify for review committees assigned to librarians' Form C, the following additions to the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines are proposed."*

Independent of consideration of this proposal by the FPC, the Faculty Senator representing the Library provided this proposal to the Senate on February 8, 2017 and there was strong support that the exceptional language was needed. Senators recognized that this statement provided an example of the need for departmental guidance in the interpretation of reappointment, promotion and tenure requirements.

The same opportunity should be extended to other departments and disciplines.

While the FPC guidelines, in Section III.C.1.c (quoted above) encourages each candidate and candidate's chair to demonstrate in the annual evaluation and the Form C how the candidate satisfies special departmental criteria, the section refers only to scholarship and not teaching or service.⁷ The guidelines 1) do not define how these criteria are formulated and formally approved, 2) do not define how they are to be made consistently available to faculty members, and 3) do not define how the members of the FPC can access these criteria to apply them in individual cases.

The Guidelines language suggests that this can all be worked out in the Chair's annual evaluation memorandum and the candidate's Form C. But, since there is no requirement that the special criteria be documented or approved or posted, there are many opportunities for 1) variable understandings, such as annual evaluations approving different interpretations of the criteria; 2) misunderstandings, such as

⁷ See also article 18 of the PSC-CUNY contract which also states elements of total academic performance relevant to professional evaluation.

where the candidate does not accurately understand what the department intends because it is not written and available; 3) changing understandings, such as if a new chair applies a new and different understanding of the departmental criteria, since the prior version was not formally written or adopted, and 4) outright errors, such as if an FPC review committee fails to apply a criteria because it is not aware of it because it is not written, adopted, documented or approved by the FPC.

The Senate recommends that the FPC Guidelines be amended to explain 1) that special department and discipline criteria might apply for scholarship, teaching and service; 2) how these criteria are formulated and formally approved at the department and FPC level, 3) how they are to be made consistently available to faculty members, and 4) how the members of the FPC can access these criteria to apply them in individual cases. Items 3 and 4 could be resolved by including the special criteria in the FPC guidelines, as was done for the special librarian requirements.

4. Submit Substantive Changes to the College Council for Approval

The 2013 Middle States Self Study (p.70) described how the FPC Guidelines document was formally approved in 2009, and the role of the Senate, Chairs and College Council in the development and approval process. *“In December 2009, the College Council approved Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines, developed at the initiative of the Faculty Senate and the Council of Chairs, which for the first time described expectations for a faculty member’s advancement through the personnel process and clarified the reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. The existence of written guidelines has had the seemingly unanticipated effect of making the faculty review process more rigorous, even though the guidelines articulate already existing standards. Having these standards in writing has meant that faculty members are more consistently held to them.”*

The approval process included the College Council because this was required by the College Charter. Article I Section 1 of the College Charter provides that *“The College Council shall be the primary governing body of John Jay College of Criminal Justice. It shall have authority to establish College policy on all matters except those specifically reserved by the Education Law or by the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of The City University of New York to the President or to other officials of John Jay College or of The City University of New York, or to the CUNY Board of Trustees.”*

Article I section 9 Of the College Charter states *“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”.*

In 2013, changes were being considered that involved reorganization of the review committees so that rather than having committees for different categories of actions, the committees would consist of members from groups of departments considering all actions for their candidates. CUNY legal counsel was asked whether these changes had to be approved by the College Council. CUNY legal counsel replied as follows:

Dear President Travis:

This will confirm my advice to you in our telephone conversation today that the procedures for the work of the College’s Committee on Faculty Personnel, like the procedures for the conduct of business of other committees of the College Council, do not constitute “College policy” within the

meaning of Article I, Section 1 of the College's Charter of Governance. Accordingly, the Committee may establish its own procedures, and they do not require review and approval by the College Council.

By contrast, any guidelines concerning the standards for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure are clearly substantive, rather than procedural, and would require approval by the College Council. In this regard, however, I would point out that any such guidelines should be reviewed by my office prior to action by the College Council to ensure that they are consistent with the policies of the Board of Trustees.

*Very truly yours,
Frederick P. Schaffer
General Counsel and Senior Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs*

CUNY legal counsel considered the review committee reorganizations to be “procedures for the conduct of business” and not “College policy” and advised that FPC Guidelines changes involving “procedures for the conduct of business” did not have to be approved by the College Council.

However, this exemption from the Charter requirement for College Council approval was a limited one. The letter also provided that “guidelines concerning the standards for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure are clearly substantive, rather than procedural, and would require approval by the College Council.”

Since October 2013 many changes have been made to the FPC Guidelines, and apparently the FPC considered all of the changes to be procedures for the conduct of business. The Senate recommends that the FPC seek legal guidance as to what kinds of changes are procedures for the conduct of business” and what kinds of changes “concern standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure.”

For example, the recent approval of additional language stating that for library faculty, “teaching” is to be interpreted as “librarianship” clearly concerns standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure. Without the new language in the guidelines, the literal expectation of the Guidelines would be that library faculty would be evaluated for reappointment, tenure and promotion based on their teaching as otherwise defined in the guidelines. As a result of the new language, librarians will be entitled to be held to a different standard.

Therefore, the new language relating to librarians should also be approved by the College Council. Based on the review of the proposal at the Faculty Senate, faculty support at the College Council would be strong.

Much of the content of the FPC Guidelines consists of procedure for the conduct of FPC business by the FPC. However, Section III, titled Guidance for Candidates and Personnel Committees, is substantive. Section III.A basically announces this: “The purpose of this section is to provide guidance to the faculty - both those on personnel committees and those considering or coming up for personnel actions - on the factors they should take into account in demonstrating and assessing whether the criteria have been met.”

The Senate is not suggesting that it has formulated any substantive position concerning Section III. Rather, the Senate is only suggesting that the Charter may require that the College Council review them

and eventually approve them, just as the College Council reviews and approves many other proposals that are brought before it.

5. Respect Limitations of FPC Authority to Amend the College Charter and Bylaws.

Until the new appeal process was set up last year, all FPC review committee actions were taken by the FPC, either directly or by adopting the actions of the review committees. In this way, the FPC is making the recommendations to the President, which seems to be required by the CUNY Bylaws and the JJCCJ Charter.

With the updated appeal process, the FPC created an entity or deliberative situation that is a hybrid of the FPC - minus some FPC members and plus some appeal members elected in a separate process and this not specified in the College Charter or Charter Bylaws. There are two problems.

1. A governance committee cannot reconstitute its officially elected membership by a committee action. UCASC could not decide, for example, that for Humanities proposals the Science faculties could not be present or vote. Similarly, UCASC could not vote to add new members whenever General Education topics are under consideration. But in the appeal process, the FPC added new members elected and appointed in a process not established in the College Charter or Charter Bylaws.
2. The actions by the new entity are not being adopted by the FPC as recommendations to the President by the FPC, which is required by the CUNY Bylaws and the JJCCJ Charter.

Since this issue as initially raised last year, the administration has recognized some validity to this concern, but amendments to the FPC Guidelines have not yet been drafted and circulated to address the problem.

6. Reconcile and Balance Competing Expectations for Teaching, Scholarship and Service

The 2013 Middle States Self Study (pp.71-72) explained: *“The dissatisfaction with teaching load and the anxiety over tenure and promotion point to a tension between the College’s research aspirations, its obligations as a teaching institution, and its need for faculty willing to serve the college community. It will be important in the years to come to strike a balance among these faculty activities—teaching, scholarship, and service—and to communicate clearly to faculty the expectation that ideally they will achieve a balance among these sometimes competing demands. We also need to shape the promotion and tenure process so that it recognizes that some candidates will excel in teaching, others in scholarship, and yet others in extraordinary service, and that distinction in one area will be rewarded as long as the faculty member shows sustained true commitment, energetic engagement, and high-quality achievement in the others.”*

The Faculty Senate supported this statement in 2013 and continues to support it today.