

Minutes for FPPC

Meeting 4

Friday, October 21, 2022

Called to order 12:37

In Attendance:

Leslie Andersen, Erlyana Erlyana, Malcolm Finney, Gary Hytrek, Barbara LeMaster, Tianjiao Qiu, Robin Richesson, Jalal Torabzadeh.

1. Approval of Minutes
2. University RTP Policy 09-10, Section 6 was reviewed.
 - Gary requested the President and designee findings should be included in document (add designee, for clarity) Article 2 CBA defines “President” as President or their designee. (Sections 6.9/6.10)
 - Jalal concurred and all agreed.
 - Debate ensued about open period letters, Section 6.3. (Where to post, signature or not, etc.)
 - It was agreed that posting the open period notice outside of the Department Office would be the best practice.
 - It was determined that letters could not be anonymous, but did not require an actual signature, in the traditional sense. That was not added as a requirement.
 - Discussion of open period letters vs external letters ensued. It was pointed out that Open Period letters are actually defined currently by Faculty Affairs to be letters from the academic community in the university (faculty, students and staff), and not from the outside community. Those outside letters may be included, but not in the Open Period section. Malcolm explained this is based on the premise that letters from the academic community would be unsolicited, generated by the posting of the notices, etc. Outside letters would need to be requested by the candidate, therefore possibly carry less weight in the review process.
 - Tian raised concerns about how faculty would know they could solicit outside letters, and where they would go in the file.
 - More discussion ensued about who receives the letters and deals with them (section 6.4)
 - Robin thought many letter writers would have to put forth effort to find out who the RTP Committee chair was in a given year.
 - Gary mentioned that even if the letters were submitted to the administrative entity or the chair of the department, they could and usually do forward to the chair of the committee, once elected. He expressed this was fine to leave as is (currently letters are collected by the Dept. RTP Committee Chair)

- Barbara wanted to reopen this discussion for further debate, siting issues with varying skills sets on the RTP Committees. She felt the administrative entity would be better equipped to collect, distribute and make an index of the letters.
- It was brought up by Eryana that once the open period letters are added to the Interfolio site, the candidate has access, and therefore distribution to the candidate is no longer needed.
- Jalal expressed concern about the candidate having the allotted time to respond to the letters.
- Robin noted the candidate can respond to the letters, as needed, after the file is under review, in their allotted time for rebuttal.
- Robin noted some members would be leaving the meeting, and quoroum would be lost, and discussion was wrapped up.

Sections 6.1-6.3 were deemed to be fine as stated. Members voted unanimously to accept.

It was noted more discussion, on 6.4 may be wanted.

Meeting adjourned, 1:35 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by
Robin Richesson

Future Meetings this semester:

November 4

November 18

December 2