



FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Friday, September 21, 2019

Room L.61, New Building

9:30 am-1:00 pm

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

- I. Welcome**
- II. Approval of Minutes, 5/04/18 meeting**
- III. Service Committee proposal for guideline revision**
- IV. Faculty Personnel Appeals process, subcommittee report**
- V. New Business and Announcements**

Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 11:40 am* – 1:00 pm

- I. Initial appointments (Fall 2018)**
 - Slate vote on initial appointments
- II. Appointment with Tenure**
 - Ratification of electronic vote
- III. Initial Appointment with Tenure**
 - Vote on recommendation put forward by Departmental P&B

Fall 2018-Spring 2019 PFC/ FPAC Meetings:

Full FPC	Friday, December 14, 2018
Full FPC/Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, February 8, 2019
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 1, 2019
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 8, 2019
Full FPC	Friday, April 5, 2019
Full FPC	Friday, May 05, 2019

Notes:

***All times are approximate**

09/07/2018



FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

May 4, 2018

Room L.61, New Building

Open Meeting Minutes

NOT YET APPROVED – will be voted on at the 9/2018 FPC Meeting

Allison Pease (ENG), Marjorie Singer (Legal)

Open Meeting called to order at 9:46 am

I. Welcome

II. Approval of Minutes

Motion - JG, Second – JNG

23- Y; 0 -N; 2 - A

III. Service Committee Update

- a. AL reviews *Follow-up Activities on Service Report – Draft* (Handout provided at FPC meeting)
 - i. Expectations of Chairs
 - ii. Current Charter
 - iii. Same people dominate the process
 - iv. Conflict with emphasis on scholarship
 - v. Different kinds of service
 - vi. Service should occur across ranks and departments
 - vii. Inequities in service (based on race and ethnicity)
 - viii. Recognizing the scholarship of practice (applied scholarship)
 - ix. FPC needs to develop guidelines for service and how it would be defined/evaluated
- b. Faculty (anonymous) response to categories of faculty service at John Jay (document shared with FPC by Provost Lopes)
- c. Open Discussion for Comments/feedback/suggestions on how to proceed related to the feedback:
 - i. CS- It is perfect timing to review and act on this issue
 - ii. EC – Where do we emphasize ourselves – the College- scholarship or service? There needs to be a balance of the two.
 - iii. KM – It is not either/or situation. Per understanding of CUNY policies they both are included. We (JJC) need to define service and address it in the guidelines and have foundational principles we agree upon, need to find judicious balance.
 - iv. SB- Sometimes service arises as a need-based due to last minute needs that could/would interfere with judicious balancing.
 - v. JNG – We’ve made progress, but no decisions made. Next steps – we need a revised draft based on the feedback to provide an updated proposal for discussion in the fall and perhaps voting on incorporating into guidelines.
 - vi. JC – In recent years it has become difficult to advise junior faculty. Are we (the FPC) addressing the underlying problem or are we trying to fix a problem we have now?
 1. Service is different in smaller departments and affect faculty differently (underlying problem)
 2. We have not been enforcing the FPP guideline that states service gradually increases as faculty move through the Associate and Full Professor ranks

- vii. KM- We needs to address several matters, one being the Charter and the number of the list of “mandatory” committees
- viii. DU – Suggestion to weigh teaching, service and scholarship
- ix. AA – Does not believe there is a conflict with service and scholarship. The FPC should streamline the process and allow the departments to address service within the departments based on the FPC streamlining. FPC should request departments’ guidelines/criteria for service and the FPC can review to adjust FPPG accordingly or provide guidance for those departments that need it.
- x. JJ – We may not be able to codify service
- xi. DB – UGS rely on service for the unit/department to run (i.e. UCASC, policies related to curriculum and programs, and more). JJC needs to address long-term and short-term planning, work on ensuring that the same faculty are serving on the same committee, therefore shaping the curriculum and other UGS related matters.
- xii. MP – Looking at service not just to acquire tenure and promotion
- xiii. BL – Service needs to be included in the discussion at the review committee level and within the appeals committee. Heavier burden committee work should not be assigned to junior untenured faculty
- xiv. KG –Address the service of advising, also faculty needs guidance for how to appropriately communicate service on their Form C
- xv. AP – CUNY and FPPG provide guidelines for service, is the FPC acting and valuing service based on the guidelines that exist?
- xvi. JLM – College needs to look more deeply on how service and faculty contributions are being reported and recognized, particularly service related to student success (advising, student engagement, etc.)
- xvii. RB – Meetings should be more efficient (i.e. there’s a lack of committee charge, agenda, minutes, better telecommunications, etc.)
- xviii. CS – Including student mentoring, student engagement, and student success in the discussion about service. How do we list and value these interactions and service on the Form C.
- xix. JNG – Problem is that JJC needs more faculty. This needs to be included in the discussion.
- xx. JC - Service needs to be meaningful (as a follow-up to RB’s comments)
- xxi. AC – Problematic to use service to make up for the lack in another area (i.e. teaching and service)
- xxii. AL – the Form C is a vehicle for faculty to report service, but the standards need to exist and interpreted. The FPC should review its decisions such as year in review.
- xxiii. AB – The Chair’s annual evaluation is another mechanism
- xxiv. KM- Using the summer to look at how to include more rigor in the Form C for faculty to report and highlight service and other related matters. (perhaps including Allison Pease) The committee should review the Committee Service report and Anne’s draft
 - 1. The FPC meeting in September needs to include a decision about what to do about service based on the review over the summer.
Volunteers to work on this matter over the summer:
Demi (SCI); Carmen (SEEK); AP, AL

IV. Student Evaluation of Faculty– Report to College Council

- a. AL - Next steps – the instrument needs to be refined. The SEOF committee of the College Council will receive feedback and make changes; continue to make updates to the online platform
- b. JC – Concern – the range of response rates is dramatic, some of the rates can be as low as 20%; we should report response rates in Form C and chair’s annual evaluation
- c. AL – Including ways to increase student repose rates
- d. KM – working with Student Affairs/student council to encourage student participation
- e. JNG – How to encourage students to thoughtfully and meaningfully
- f. Questions about how to release grades sooner and how to work to incentivize student participation (suggestion to work with Student Council to contribute to the cost)
- g. JC – How to download reports with departmental reports or cluster reports (discussions with vendor)

V. Baumrin Proposal (Expanded Publication Categories)

- a. SB – The response to the discussion at April meeting related to journals and how to categorize them within the faculty's materials for review (i.e. Form C, CV, etc). Suggestion for the committee based on how he codes/categorizes his CV.
- b. KM – Hoping to see more consistency in how faculty thoughtfully organize their record. How do we systematize faculty organize their scholarly record? The document is a helpful move in that direction.
- c. JNG – including general categories such as Peer-Review and Non-Peer-Reviewed
- d. Send suggestions to AP for inclusion in a proposal for September.

VI. Systematic Feedback with Faculty (Personnel Process) – moved to executive session

VII. Updates

- a. First reading of bylaw change (College Council)
 - i. KM – First reading held in April, 2nd reading and voting scheduled for May 9th. Those in support of the amendment should attend to ensure their perspectives are heard. The bylaw change does not halt the continued conversation and work to address and update the appeals process. FPC members should engage colleagues and discuss their concerns about the appeals process.
- b. FPC Annual Outcomes Report – Available by September 2018 FPC meeting.
- c. FPC process Report (Demographical data) – S. Montalban is still working; data will be provided by September 2018 FPC meeting.
- d. Workshop/Training for Evaluating Sources and Faculty Files
 - i. Chair Development Day 10am -3pm in June 12th (AP and AL) – diversity, annual reviews, difficult conversation with faculty, faculty recognition, and other aspects in the role of the chair. Dept. P & B will be invited to the 10am session.

VIII. New Business and Announcements

Open Meeting adjourned at 11:30 am

Proposal to Revise the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines and Form C Regarding Service

Background: In October 2016 the “Report on Mandated Committees” revealed that faculty and staff at John Jay devoted 10,544.5 person hours participating in meetings on 197 committees for the college and university. This report noted that the 2015 COACHE survey at John Jay had revealed that faculty rated “Nature of Work: Service” amongst the lowest in CUNY and peer group institutions. The COACHE working group report (June 2016) reported that faculty were frustrated with redundancy of some committees, difficulty of balancing service commitments with research and teaching expectations, lack of clarity of the value of committee work in the personnel process, and the large burden committee work places on small departments. In response to those issues President Mason and interim Provost Lopes tasked a working group of FPC and Faculty Senate members to study ideas and make recommendations on service expectations in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process for faculty in fall 2017. That working group shared their “Report of the Joint Working Group of the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate” (November 2017) in which they outlined four key recommendations:

- Increase the number of professors so that more faculty are available to engage in the key activities.
- Revise instructional workload expectations so that faculty members have time to engage in the key activities.
- Revise the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines (FPPG) to encourage reasonable levels of engagement in the key activities by all faculty members at all stages of the personnel process.
- Revise the FPPG to encourage leadership, engagement and service at all stages of the faculty

In response to those recommendations, interim Provost Lopes held four open-session faculty focus groups to elicit faculty responses to the working group report. From these sessions interim Provost Lopes identified further considerations which she outlined in a document she shared with the Faculty Personnel Committee at their May 4, 2018 meeting. President Mason then charged the Associate to the Provost for Faculty, Allison Pease, and two academic department chairs, Shu-Yuan “Demi” Cheng (Sciences) and Carmen Solis (SEEK) to solicit further feedback on the reports and other issues with service, and then to propose how the FPC might address faculty concern with service.

Recognizing the limits of what is within the purview of the Faculty Personnel Committee to effect with regard to service expectations for faculty, we propose to change the wording of the guidelines and Form C in an attempt to make the value and expectations of faculty service more clear, and to guide those who produce and evaluate Form Cs as to what they should consider, both in individual cases and across the college.

Proposal 1: Revise the Wording of the Form C Regarding Service

Explanation: First, we propose to change the wording on the Form C, line 21, which asks candidates to describe their service. In the new wording, we ask candidates to indicate the number of faculty available to do service so that reviewers can assess the size of the person’s department and therefore their relative service burden. This is an attempt to address the fact that those in smaller departments carry a disproportionately

large service burden relative to their peers in larger departments. By indicating this on their Form C reviewers can weigh their overall portfolio in relation to the service burden they carry. Additionally, reviewers will be able to assess the relative service commitment of a candidate given the number of available colleagues to serve.

In addition, the new wording is more clear as to how to list and contextualize one's service work by asking them to list all activities since appointment to current rank, and to provide evidence of effective service by explaining the nature and time allotted for those commitments.

Current FORM C:

21. List Service Activities (Indicate whether departmental, college, and/or university service; note where student-focused)

Proposed FORM C Wording:

21. First, indicate the number of faculty in your department available to do service. Then, referring to the guidelines in section III.E "Service" in the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines, list your service commitments since appointment to your current rank. Provide evidence of effective service to students, department, college, and/or university and, if applicable, to your scholarly or professional community of practice, noting the nature and time of those commitments.

Proposal 2: Revise Language in Section III.E Service of the Faculty Personnel Process Guidelines

Explanation: The revisions to this language attempt to simplify expectations for what service is, as well as the expectation that one's service commitment increases as one moves up the ranks. The language attempts to be capacious, allowing for individual and unique contributions, but clear that the onus is on the candidate to explain how such contributions support students, departments, the college and/or university, or a scholarly or professional community of practice.

III. GUIDANCE FOR CANDIDATES AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEES

III.E. Service

III.E. 1. Department, college, and university service, as well as service to students outside of teaching and mentoring, is recognized as important in considering a candidate for reappointment, tenure, C.C.E. or promotion to either Associate or full Professor, as well as in reappointment and the granting of tenure. The expectation for service increases as one moves up the ranks. While candidates for C.C.E., tenure, and Associate Professor are expected to ~~demonstrate a commitment to~~ provide effective service that supports students, departments, the college, and/or university, candidates for ~~Associate~~ full Professor should have an established record of service of continuing and increasingly significant service and leadership and service to the college community and/or university as well as the candidate's scholarly or professional community of practice. ~~Candidates for full Professor should have established records of continuing and increasingly significant service to the college and to the outside community.~~

III.E.2. Service that supports students may include, but is not limited to, advising of student clubs, student advising or other activities outside of teaching and mentoring that support student engagement and success. Service that supports departments may include, but is not limited to, serving on department committees such as program assessment or personnel & budget committees, development of curriculum, or other activities necessary for the governance and continued development of a department. Service that supports the college may include, but is not limited to, serving as a member of the faculty senate, the UCASC, or other chartered committees, development of an academic program, or any other activity that supports the governance and

development of the college. Service that supports the university may include, but is not limited to, representing the college on a university-wide committee, or supporting other university-wide projects or any activity that supports the governance or development of the university. Service leadership may include chairing committees or departments, coordinating majors or academic programs, representing the PSC-CUNY at any level or any other activity in which one takes on responsibility for the running of a college or university entity. It is recognized throughout the college that certain activities and committees take a significant amount of time and energy and have a significant impact on the college community. These may include, but are not limited to:

- ~~• participation on the Faculty Senate and College Council (as department representative or at-large)~~
- ~~• at-large member of the FPC;~~
- ~~• participation on the College Curriculum and Academic Standards Committee (UCASC) and its subcommittees;~~
- ~~• advising of student clubs;~~
- ~~• Chairing of, and participation in, various ad hoc committees (such as Middle States)~~
- ~~• college representation on the PSC-CUNY Research Foundation;~~
- ~~• service as chair or college administrator;~~
- ~~• leadership and participation in conferences, colloquia, and symposia held at the college or the university; and~~
- ~~• participation on the University Faculty Senate~~

III.E.3. Candidates should clearly document the nature and time commitment of their service on the Form C, and include it also in the self-evaluation narrative. Any published materials resulting from such service, for which the candidate is responsible, may be included in the file.

~~III.E.4. The name of the chairperson of the committees on which the candidate has served should be noted next to the name of the committee on the Form C. The department chair will be responsible for contacting the chairs of those committees for comments on the candidate's contribution. It is appropriate that this information be shared with the personnel committees at each level of the process. Candidates are also encouraged to document their file with letters that describe their service when extraordinary, such as letters of thanks from committee chairs or program managers.~~

III.E.4. Service ~~thus consists of not merely being a formal member of a committee, but will be~~ is evaluated in terms of level of work involved, attendance, participation, and contribution.

III.E.5. A candidate may offer evidence of pertinent and significant community and public service in support of reappointment, tenure or promotion. Evidence of such service may include, but not be limited to:

- Service provided to community organizations with purposes broadly related to the mission of the college and the areas of focus of the college's academic programs;
- Service to professional organizations related to the candidate's discipline or area of professional expertise;
- Providing public information and education through the news media;
- Providing public education by appearing in public events, documentaries, and other means of public information;
- Service to the federal, state, and local government in special roles such as an advisor, expert, mediator, or compliance monitor; and
- Service as an elected or appointed public official or as a governance board member for an independent organization, provided that the service can be rendered in a manner that complies with applicable CUNY regulations.

