



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**Friday, September 15, 2017**  
Room L.61, New Building  
**9:30 am-1:00 pm**

***Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 12:00 pm***

- I. Welcome**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
- III. Revision of Distinguished Professor Nomination Process**
- IV. Service at John Jay (FPPG section III.E)**
- V. Discussion - Response to Faculty Senate Statement**
- VI. New Business and Announcements**

***Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 12:15 pm – 1:00 pm***

- I. Initial Appointments (Fall 2017)**
  - Slate vote on initial appointments
- II. Distinguished Professor Nomination**
  - Vote on recommendation put forward by Departmental P & B

**Fall 2017 & Spring 2018 FPC/FPAC Meetings**

Full FPC	Friday, December 8, 2017
Full FPC/Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, February 9, 2018
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 2, 2018
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 9, 2018
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 16, 2018
Full FPC	Friday, April 13, 2018
Full FPC	Friday, May 4, 2018

**Notes:**

---



---



---



---



---



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

September 15, 2017  
Room L.61, New Building

### Open Meeting Minutes A

**APPROVED** at the 12/8/17 FPC Meeting

Allison Pease (ENG), Ned Benton (PAD), Vanessa Gutierrez (Student Council Member)

### Open Meeting called to order at 9:45

#### I. Welcome

President's welcome  
Introductions

#### II. Approval of Minutes

Motion to Approve minutes (BL) – Seconded (SB)  
Minutes approved (Yes: 21; No: 0; Abs: 12)

#### III. Revision of Distinguished Professor Nomination Process

AL: Reviewing context for change and discussions from last year (overview). No changes for current academic year or anyone currently in the process. These are the written version of the approved changes via discussion from 5/5/17 meeting. AL reviews the bolded text (section II.J.3 and II.J.4).

GG: II.J.4 clarifying the materials and file review. Add "the file, including."

SB: Wants to remember/revisit some of the conversation not recorded in the notes. This is all advisory to the President? AL confirms, yes, all is advisory to the President. KM: Approach is that she needs discussions to inform her decision.

NB: Why doesn't it require a vote? Shares letter of how changes should be circulated. Not posted on the website. AL: Voted on the language from 5/5/17. No process for circulating items for items were already approved. KM: Clarifying this was approved via 5/5/17 meeting and read the text from the FPC May 5, 2017 meeting minutes. Confirmation from the group put in writing the discussions from last semester and included in the document. Does it reflect what was voted on? No FPC member has objections.

#### IV. Service at John Jay (FPPG section III.E)

AL: Providing context and background for service at JJC, references COACHE survey. Requests the FPC and Faculty Senate form a small committee to clarify the guidelines (FPC), non-prescriptive and within CUNY's guidelines. A joint committee is ideal/goal.

1. Raise issues we liked addressed in the guideline.
2. Identify who from the FPC would like to participate.
3. General timeline for process: work in Fall 2017, provide preliminary feedback by 12/8/17 meeting, continue in Spring 2018.

4. This will be about a 1-2 year project that will include open meeting opportunities for faculty to consult and provide feedback.

JNG: One issue related to small departments and the amount of service required, thinks the process is a good approach.

GG: Approves general process timeline. Needs to be a broader definition of service that reflects what we have but also includes a different kind of community service; not explicitly stated (but implied) broadening of professional services – what constitutes professional services (includes organizing conferences – no matter size).

HP: Parse out different types of service (department, college, community) and possibly provide weight to each.

AA: Seems similar to teaching discussion and its weight in the FPC process a few years ago. It would be important to include how its weighted.

NB: Faculty Senate is considering another statement to make proactive statements related to policy and practice. There is a draft that has been circulated. The concerns in the current draft: a need to reconcile the difference and weight on teaching, service and scholarship; FS concern about how the FPC values services (UGR Coordinators, Assessment Coordinators and more). Faculty think of service as being misunderstood or having less weight. The statement “show a commitment to service” is weak. The statement is forthcoming and he looks forward to being involved.

KM: It’s important to have the broad representation. FPPG Section III.E.2. is compensated service included and considered, there should be distinction between non-compensated vs compensated.

JP: radical recalibration of expectations. His understanding is that while an Assistant professor faculty focus on scholarship and teaching. Thinks this should be FPPG Section III.E.6 – community and professional organization – sounds to count in support of reappointment and not promotion; that should be adjusted.

KM: Reconfirming that the current policy is part of the FPC guidelines.

JLM: There is an unspoken criteria and faculty receiving guidance that scholarship is paramount. It’s not a recalibration but a ...

JG: Ask that degrees of services and expectations should be provided at the various levels of the professorial ranks (Assistant, Associate, and Full).

AM: This is more about clarifying the process and not recalibration. We must consider that, start looking towards the strength versus the weakest – the metaphor is static and need to be dynamic regarding the 3 legged stool vs 3 stranded braid. Discussion regarding the international stature is important.

GG: Expectation of service for junior faculty – the weight is more on teaching and scholarship. Through contractual agreement they have more time spent on research and scholarship. The needs and interest of junior faculty need to be clear and possibly different.

KM: understanding that service should be a graduated process and we need to figure out how.

BL: Service situations become unavoidable in smaller departments. This needs to be addressed.

KM: She and AL have been discussing the burden on smaller departments. KM read the report and wants to address the mandatory committee burden but still comply with committee requirements.

AA: Junior faculty expectations are pretty clear for teaching and scholarship. The committee should clarify the expectations, particularly a checklist.

AA: This is important, but is also a major form of service.

AL: Joint committee will receive these comments/feedback and this service will be recognized. This type of serviced is important to fixing the issue.

AL: Will support the work of the committee anyway she can, the service will be recognized. (Food and Beverages). This is a great opportunity to address this, looking for 3 each from FPC and FS. Setting up open meeting.

Committee Volunteers: Silvia Dapia, John Pittman, Jose Luis Morin, Amy Green, Jay Gates

## **V. Discussion - Response to Faculty Senate Statement**

KM: May correspondence from FS in Spring 2017, Former Provost responded on behalf of FPC on May 9 and the FS responded to that letter dated August 31. FS still have four open items – three of those are being addressed and examined by Counsel- Transparency, substantive changes (and submission to College Council), Respect Limitations (Open Item) difference of opinion of what is procedural, and Respecting balance for Services (in progress).

AL: Silvia Montalban is working on Diversity report to address one of the items in the FS statement FPC website in the works to store materials; webpage overview provided (addresses transparency).

NB: FS appreciates the continued effort, seems we are waiting on lots of legal advice and await the feedback for further discussion.

JC: The wider discussion about needing a second reading rule, is there a deadline for items to be included on the agenda?

AL: The 2<sup>nd</sup> reading rule can sometimes slow items down and it may not be bad thing as the FPC process is not in flux.

KM: If something comes at the last minute it may be urgent, but if it's not it can be moved to the next meeting. Wants to think further about this before formalizing.

NB: Previous discussion – use the Fall semester to discuss and the Spring semester to vote giving more time for distribution. Share the agenda with stakeholder committees. He received information by colleagues sharing the information. The webpages may help with providing information. There has to be a way for the committee to be more open.

KM: The webpage will solve many of the issues. We will discuss how information is shared in addition. Some people have email fatigue, open to the suggestion on how the information is to be shared – send them to Faculty Services Manager.

## **VI. New Business and Announcements**

KM: Is there any new business for discussion? – No

### Announcements

AL: all AA offices will hold open houses – for what departments have done and what they plan to do for the year. The schedule of dates will shared soon and will occur in mid-late Fall.

**Motion – KM seconded by JG  
All approved**

**Meeting adjourned at 11:38 am**



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**Friday, December 8, 2017**  
Room L.61, New Building  
**9:30 am-1:00 pm**

***Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 12:00 pm***

- I. Welcome**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
- III. Updates from AVP and Counsel Marjorie Singer**
- IV. Updates from FPC and Faculty Senate Joint Committee on Service**
- V. New Business and Announcements**
  - **The role of the FPC in Faculty Compensation Decisions**

***Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 12:15 pm – 1:00 pm***

- I. Fellowship Leaves**
  - Vote on recommendation put forward by Faculty Personnel Review Committees
- II. Professor Emerita – Special Case**
  - Vote on recommendation put forward by Departmental Review Committee

**Spring 2018 FPC/FPAC Meetings**

Full FPC/Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, February 9, 2018
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 2, 2018
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 9, 2018
Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee	Friday, March 16, 2018
Full FPC	Friday, April 13, 2018
Full FPC	Friday, May 4, 2018

**Notes:**

---



---



---



---



---



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

December 8, 2017  
Room L.61, New Building

### Open Meeting Minutes

**APPROVED** at the 3/16/2018 FPC Meeting

Allison Pease (ENG), Marjorie Singer (Legal), Ned Benton (PAD)

### Open Meeting called to order at 9:42am

#### I. Welcome

#### II. Approval of Minutes

##### Motion – AM, Second – SYC

KM - Add “yes”/affirmative answer to the question KM posed (“Does it reflect what was vote on?”). See last line of the “Revision of Distinguished Professor Nomination Process” section.

Unanimously approved

#### III. Updates – Faculty Senate Statement (August 2017)

Three remaining items from statement submitted in August 31<sup>st</sup> memo to President Mason and Provost Lopes

##### a. Faculty Personnel Process Reporting (item #2)

Status: In progress. Submitting information to Affirmative Action Office reflecting past 5 years. K. Bailey submitting information to Silvia Montalban (Director of Compliance & Diversity). Hopes to have information from Silvia Montalban by April 13<sup>th</sup> FPC meeting.

NB – Asked for consideration: a cohort report in addition to a 5 -year report. The report should reflect what happened by the 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> reappointment and 4<sup>th</sup> reappointment to tenure. i.e. for all appointed in 2010 who is still here in 2018? How many were denied tenure?

KM - asked that NB consider the specifics of request and provide to KB.

AL – We can provide a cohort analysis and indicate what happened to them by the 4-year mark and tenure mark. Second type of report (will take longer to report): what happened to faculty along the way at these 2 points.

##### b. Specialized Departmental Guidance

AL – CUNY was consulted, CUNY says only in two cases where different guidelines exist, Journalists and Librarians. Proceeded to discuss the difference of the Library faculty and why there is a difference. Anne will forward rationale to Ned, for Faculty Senate to review and discuss. Anne will follow-up with CUNY again.

NB- Could we see the rationale for CUNY’s decision.

LS – Clarifies the reason behind the different guidelines, particularly for Librarians.

KM- CUNY’s position is clear on this matter

##### c. Appeals Process

KM - President and Provost visited departments, in the meetings pockets of faculty questioned the process and fairness of the process. Reaffirmed that the members of the FPC take the work on the FPC seriously.

Revisited the appeals question posed by the Faculty Senate. Concerned about the outside members of the FPC hearing and making decisions about personnel actions. Concerned from a due process standpoint, couple this with the faculty concerns, KM wants to discuss with the FPC.

SB – recalls/explains the former appeals process and FPC members’ general thoughts about the pros and cons of each.

AM – Requested description of current process (Bailey provided in meeting)

KM- Read the chart from 2015 that outlined FPC changes from 2011-2015, which included revisions of appeals process. If we go back to former process, the persons affected by the current process were not disadvantaged because it goes to the President from final decision.

JC – Problematic issues – review committee members and the chair that made the decision participated in the review of their own decision.

KM – legal perspective, its problematic without having a governance change. There are two questions to address:

1. How do we want to process for this year?
2. Ultimately, what kind of process do we want?

AC – We should not change in the middle of the process. It is disconcerting for people currently in the process. Open to the idea of changing the governance.

EC – Wants to ensure the chair and faculty have the opportunity to advocate for themselves

AL – The decision is made based on the file. But faculty have opportunity to provide a written statement and come in to answer for questions from the appeals committee.

KM – reiterating understanding of the practice from last year

SB – consider, “what is the actual spirit of the appeals process?”

NB – One new concern (structural)– Quorum issue: when there is a committee of 26 vs committee of 32. Senate’s concern – FPC never had the authority to enact the 2014 or 2015 appeals process because the items did not go through the appropriate governance process.

KM – reframing the discussion and clarifying the main questions that need to be answered: –

1. Is there any concern with the notion that FPC should take the current process through the governance? (**No concerns raised**) We have consensus that we work through the governance process to make the change? (**Affirmative/agreement from group**). Concluded no one was disenfranchised by interim process because all were required to be reviewed by the President.
2. What are we going to do with this appellant cycle? Do we keep the process currently in place or do we go back to former process prior to 2014?  
KM will conduct an independent assessment of the record. KM will read the file de novo, the discussions of the FPAC will be a factor in the decision.

AG – Appreciates the addition of the written appeal that all assigned to appeals case gets to read. However, appellants may not know the basis of the denial. There should be some way for them to know, other than relying on the chair to communicate.

AL – CUNY does not allow a process by which the decision/discussion is provided in written form.

The University may revisit this issue because there are some concerns from other Provosts about this issue.

NB – Has anyone been prejudiced by the current process? Yes, because positive or support for personnel action may be excluded from the room based on those excluded from the process (FPAC). What is the standard by which the record is being reviewed? The standards are vague because of CUNY’s policies/bylaws. The outside members (appeals panel) do not have the notion of the “norms” because they are not part of the FPC.

KM – reminder that recommendations ultimately come back to the president for review and decision. Therefore, someone who receives a negative vote still has their file reviewed and decided upon by the president and therefore not prejudiced, not harmed by the process.

KM – Is there a motion to revert back to old process for 2018? (**No motion**)

Is there a motion to keep current process and take this process to College Council?

**Motion - Dara, seconded by Henry**

AG – the question should be separated to

1. Keep current fore 2018.
2. Should a different process be submitted to College Council? (JC agrees)

Vote on motion called: **Y- 22; N- 7; A-2**

KM – Prior to change it was discussed and voted upon, the motion carried because of this. The argument will go to the College Council and be debated; those who object will have the opportunity to do so in that forum.

JG – Suggests a smaller body discusses this issue before going before College Council.

KM – FPC needs to think about how it will go about informing the college community about this process before going before the College Council executive committee; asked Jay Gates to participate in this project/task – JG agreed to work with President on this item. Jay G. asked for a small committee to assist (committee will include: J. Gates, J. Hamilton, J. Cauthen).

Carve out time on the April agenda to discuss the process after having lived through process this spring and then taking those items to the College.

NB – Reminder that the Faculty Senate suggested there be an opportunity for the college community to provide feedback before going to College Council.

KM – Clarifying that the discussion with FPC will occur in the spring, and then there will be an opportunity to share with the college community

After further discussion, there will be a different vote

Separate earlier questions:

1. Keep intact current process from current cohort (AG, motion, RC second) – *Unanimous*
2. At the next Full FPC meeting we will discuss how FPC will proceed with appeals

#### **IV. Updates from FPC and Faculty Senate Joint Committee on Service**

- a. NB (Chair of committee) – Progress report document is ready for circulation for FPC review, also looking to have a session at Faculty Development Day for more discussion. The document will be sent to President to share with the FPC.
- b. JP (member of committee)– recommendation includes in part that service should be a component increasing significance from reappointment through promotion of full professor.
- c. KM – Thanks committee for thoughtful review of service
- d. AL – would like to create forums to discuss this more. Will call for meeting in February and will ask members of the committee to participate in the forums. Information from the forums will be included in the feedback to the FPC discussion.

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

- a. The role of the FPC in Faculty Compensation Decisions  
AL – Senate query about what is the role of the FPC in compensation decisions. Guidelines indicated the FPC may make recommendations. Clarifies the CUNY guidelines  
NB – It is important to look at JJC charter and CUNY bylaws to see what they say.  
KM – Asks “What is the real issue?”  
NB – Compensation requests such as: faculty’s individual’s request for compensation increases/changes; equity in hiring salaries; remedying salary issues. Salary compression study is in process by HR and the FPC may have something to weigh-in on and report.  
KM – Wants to figure out what the main problem(s) is/are?  
AB – Shares former history of variations in starting salaries.  
KM – KB will share memo from Ned dated September 20, 2017
- b. Faculty Personnel Calendar Action Adjustments (Spring 2018)  
KB- Appeals cases heard on 2/9, 3/2, 3/9; 3/16 agenda will include general meeting items, DP reviews and Appeals process.  
CUNY sent a memo requesting DP reviewed sent to them by April 1<sup>st</sup>. As such our process will be adjusted to accommodate. Materials are due to Provost Office March 2, 2018.

#### **Motion to adjourn**

JP - Motioned, AL – Seconded

**Meeting adjourned at 11:18am**



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**Friday, March 16, 2018**  
Room L.61, New Building  
**9:30 am-1:00 pm**

***Meeting Open to the Public 9:30 am – 11:15 am***

- I. Welcome**
- II. Approval of Minutes**
- III. Service Committee Report**
- IV. Appeals Process**
- V. New Business and Announcements**

***Executive Session – Full Faculty Personnel Committee 11:15 am – 1:00 pm***

- I. Initial Appointment with Tenure**
  - Vote on recommendation put forward by Departmental P &B Committee
- II. Distinguished Professor Reviews and Reappointment**
  - Vote on recommendation put forward by Departmental P &B Committee and Provost Independent Assessment

**Spring 2018 FPC/FPAC Meetings**

**Faculty Personnel Appeals Committee**  
**Full FPC**  
**Full FPC**  
**Full FPC**

**Friday, March 9, 2018**  
**Friday, March 16, 2018**  
**Friday, April 13, 2018**  
**Friday, May 4, 2018**

**Notes:**

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

March 16, 2018

Room L.61, New Building

### Open Meeting Minutes

**APPROVED** at the 4/13/2018 FPC Meeting

Allison Pease (ENG), Marjorie Singer (Legal), Ned Benton (PAD)

### Open Meeting called to order at 9:45 am

#### I. Welcome

#### II. Approval of Minutes

**Motion – AC, Second – JLM**

Unanimous approval

#### III. Service Committee Report (Anne Lopes)

Reflections regarding small committee meetings with faculty.

NB- Sharing reflections as a member of the joint committee. Three recommendations related to the FPPG (3 recommendations: Judicious balance in weighting tenure and promotion as it relates to service – particularly in small departments. Clearer expectations of service – align JJC FPPG to University Manual Practice (Bylaws). Table of types of services for faculty.

This will help with the continuous need for feedback about service and reviewing/revising the FPPG. In general faculty are interested in this topic. AL will provide a written report to share this more concretely.

##### Questions

KM - Will the Service committee come to the April 2018 meeting to report followed by AL's reflections?

AL Response - Yes. This is an iterative process

KM - The committee will hear the report in advance so they can address questions at the next FPC meeting?

AL Response – Yes. Guidelines will not change immediately because it will take time.

GG: Did the committee look at the previous report on College Committee Service?

Response - Yes (AL and NB)

#### IV. Appeals Process (Karol)

KM- reflecting on her statements regarding the appeals process in December 2017 and discussing the nature the memo to the FPC (dated 3/12/18, sent 3/18/18)

- Proposal: bylaw change request to the College Council to allow persons on the Appeals Panel be deemed as members of the FPC (not permanently) for the appeals. This is open discussion.
- Jay Gates, Jim Cauthen and Jay Hamilton have been looking at how other campuses address appeals committees and that work will continue.

HP- Seems reasonable

AA - What is the current process?

KM - The process is not changing; it will remain the same.

DS - Seems very reasonable as long as the bylaws do not prevent two separate groups

NB - would have liked opportunity to review and share with Faculty Senate before it was discussed today. Two questions: Is it good to exclude some members from the FPC on voting on certain matters legally and open meeting laws? Unsure if this solves the problem or if there is a problem.

KM response: Recognizing Faculty Senate raised issues and as a result conducted her own review. The memo is not a response to the Faculty Senate document, this change is only meant to address the issue of compliance with governing documents. The committee of the 3 Js: J. Gates, J. Hamilton and J. Cauthen, are researching similar processes at other schools to address how we may revise our current process.

JH – Would we have 5 groups: Chair, Deans, At-Large, Alternates and then Appeals members? By expanding the number of members does it expand the determination number we have for meet quorum.

KM Response - The composition of the committee would not change, this is for purposes of the appeals and solely appeals. There is the full FPC. Different groups are represented, but they are the FPC.

They (Appeals Panel members) are not Full FPC members so it does not impact the minimum number for quorum (MS confers)

JC - reflects on what the small committee is doing in their research of appeals processes at other colleges. Open for other FPC members to join small committee.

## **Motion to call the question RC, seconded by AM Unanimous**

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

- a. Labor Management Issues to discuss with committee
  - i. Request to advise FPC in writing NOT to use faculty productivity scores in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process, only use for OAR purposes
- b. Reminding FPC confidentially of “downloading” documents
  - i. External Evaluator letters are only in the hard file and members must read and consult the hard file. The letters are confidential. Chairs or any member of the FPC may not refer to or characterize the letters to faculty.
  - ii. Recommendations to FIDO – disable any ability to “download” works in progress and unpublished works. This is in progress with DoIT.

JC – We should not be able to “download” documents.

GG- Documents have been stored in her computer files

KM – This may be a MAC feature because it does not occur with a PC

BL- can we restrict media files as well? That should be added to the list.

KM – This is a question of trust and we have to get everyone to understand that we respect the process. Given the technological barriers

**Meeting adjourned at 10:19am**



**FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE  
AGENDA**

**Friday, April 13, 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

April 13, 2018

Room L.61, New Building

### Open Meeting Minutes

**APPROVED** at the 5/4/2018 FPC Meeting

Allison Pease (ENG), Marjorie Singer (Legal),

### Open Meeting called to order at 9:39 am

#### I. Welcome

#### II. Approval of Minutes

**Motion** – RC, **Second** – SYC

Unanimous approval

#### III. Appeals: Update on submission to the College Council

AL recapping action discussed on moving bylaw change forward

#### IV. Student Evaluation of Faculty

AL submitted report on SEOF to Faculty Senate and College Council. There is also a motion to include 8-week sessions (Fall, Spring & Summer) in the personnel process (currently not happening). Motion to include 8-week session evaluations in the faculty personnel file so chairs and program directors can have access to review.

AC – How does the college pay for the sessions? (KB – College has contract with vendor - \$16,000 annually - covers 5 – 6 evaluation periods)

GG – Is there a peer observation of teaching for online courses

AL response: there should be, this should be coordinated by the department chairs. Graduate programs have a challenge because the program directors are not chairs, but they can consult with the chair.

AB – Guidelines in progress to address online course evaluation in a more systematic way.

JC – Are Graduate program directors conducting observations?

AL response– It is the role of the chair, but they can/have delegate to directors

#### V. CUNY Policies Regarding Standards and Rigor (Predatory Journals)

AL – CUNY and Inspector General wants to ensure that tenure and promotion decisions are not being based on faculty publishing in predatory journals. In a study of 7,000 faculty it was found that a nominal number, 21 works, were published in predatory journals.

- Provosts have been charged with addressing questions (handout provided in meeting)
- Requested a discussion about the questions and responses
- Forthcoming – chair, departmental P&B and FPC training (June 2018)

GG – Has CUNY released a definition of what a predatory Journal?

AL response: Librarian Faculty have a definition/ descriptors posted via library website (Library Faculty contacts: Ellen Sexton and Kathleen Collins). Dean of Research (Designee: Dan Stageman), Allison Pease and Library Faculty are working together to create a development plan.

AP – Librarian faculty are offering a workshop on navigating open access vs predatory journals. They have amazing amount of resources on their website. Forthcoming in late(r) Spring 2018.

AL – Analyses of reviews vary amongst review committees and department chair evaluations. Would like to see more development to have some standards of evaluating and reviewing the veracity of the publications. Trainings for chairs (encouraged to invite departmental P&B members) scheduled for 2<sup>nd</sup> week in June.

AL- reviews questions and her possible responses to questions sent by CUNY.

SB – There should be a review/revision of the FPPG to include or expand categories (with a key) for faculty to use on their CVs to notate peer review publications (i.e. blind, double-blind, etc.). Current categories in FPC guidelines are located in section I.B.3 (publication categories) on page 4 and section III.D (Glossary for Reporting Status of Publication and Works in Progress on page 24).

AL – CUNY culture/standard is one by which guidance is communicated in non-written form. It is hard to develop a standard for chairs and committees when feedback to faculty is not permitted to be communicated in writing (excluding annual evaluations and 4<sup>th</sup> year reviews)

AM – Another problem with the “oral tradition” is that recommendation/feedback from committees are not communicated directly to the candidate but funneled through the chair. Information can be lost in the transmission or lacking.

## **VI. New Business and Announcements**

JC – Request to share information from appeals cases with review committee and resolution from President, how the President proceeded with recommendations for appeals committees.

AM/JH – would like to explore 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> reporter being designated to meet/discuss with the faculty about FPC decision with chair present (JC – recommends it be the review committee chair)

AL – Awaiting report from Affirmative Action office on the personnel actions (process)

**May 4<sup>th</sup> meeting agenda item: Systematic feedback in sharing information with faculty candidates**

HP – Possibility of exploring the President sharing decision-making process when there is a choice to not accept the committee’s recommendation.

**Open Meeting adjourned at 10:53 am**





## FACULTY PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

May 4, 2018

Room L.61, New Building

### Open Meeting Minutes

**APPROVED** at the 9/21/2018 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, 2<sup>nd</sup> reading and voting scheduled for May 9<sup>th</sup>. 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 12<sup>th</sup> (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**