

FPPC Minutes
Meeting #11
March 18, 2022

Present: Al Colburn, Barbara LeMaster, Richard Marcus, Jalal Torabzadeh, Leslie Andersen, Rebecca Sittler, Frank Cardinale, Tianjao Qiu, Jo Brocato.

1. Approve minutes from meeting #10. Approved.

2. Announcements

- Al going to President's Equity Commission and the Senate Exec.
- Senate retreat. Al met with Black Affinity Group.
- Al met with Covid Task Force and waiting for more thoughts. Unofficially, they appear content with the FPPC direction.
- Discussion about direction and timing of college and department RTP. There appears to be different directives in different colleges. Al: A college RTP cannot be approved until it is voted on. Likewise the department. Richard: A department can do so at any time, but it must conform with the current college and university RTP. A department that submits this year means that they will have to do it later. Barbara: concerned in a department that it is changed on faculty mid-process. Al: by his understanding an existing faculty has the right to choose.
- Al : we may need to revise again if Clinical Professor or etc. are added.

3. Revision of University RTP Policy 09-10, section 2.3 Service

- Al: Do we ask Senate to review in pieces?
 - Richard: skeptical. There may be issues addressed in another part of the document. It is inviting the Senate into the FPPC writing process.
 - Jalal: Also worried about it. There are things that come out in one section not another that senators have not seen.
 - Jalal: Concerns have been raised with the broader RSCA categories. Concerns that we are diluting RSCA. We need a full policy to give our answer.
 - Tian: procedure is important for the policy. We need more discussion about procedure before submitting.
 - Don: I originally liked the idea, but hear the concerns about process with Senate. But, sharing with other groups can converge in timing.
 - Leslie: I am in favor of sharing, but not sure about whole senate just yet. Smaller groups for input.
 - Jo: The whole Senate it wouldn't be good. Maybe to the Exec?
 - Rebecca: Get some feedback from exec and some infinity and equity groups.
 - Frank: Asking myself: What was the Senate asking us to do? If we give them a draft but concerned about the following?

- Tian: President commission of equity and change has a subcommittee on RTP
- Jalal: It may take only one or two more meetings. We will finish before the end of the semester.
- Conclusion: Get broad feedback from different groups but not send to Senate.
- Al : April 1st is Spring Break (no meeting); April 15 and May 6th. What we have to do:
 - what needs to be submitted (consensus not to add more specificity; leave it to the colleges). This section of CBA seems to require SPOTs:
 - 15.21 Periodic evaluation procedures shall be approved by the President after consideration of recommendations from the appropriate faculty committee(s). Such procedures shall, for tenure-track faculty unit employees who teach, include, but not be limited to, student evaluations of teaching performance, peer reviews and administrative reviews. Department chairs may make separate recommendations as a part of the periodic evaluation process. If such a separate recommendation is to be made, the chair shall not participate as a member of the department peer committee.
 - How should the university RTP policy respond to alleged bias (consensus: add an equity advocate or something like that).
 - Discussion about the idea of equity advocate.
 - There is broad support from all committee members but concern about the details (All levels? All committees or at the request of the candidate? Etc)
 - Concern raised that tenure is normative but the process is frequently a problem leading to retention issues.
 - Barbara: Agree that it is all about the details. Example: a strategy in a department to deny certain people in favor of others so that those that tenure first will have control over money and other things.
 - Al: If we FPPC like the idea but are concerned about details we can take the questions to different groups for input.
 - Rebecca: Models from other universities? Are there other related initiatives on our campus?
 - Barbara: Training for search committees was horrible. They didn't convince anyone of any changes. Al: has received comments with similar concerns.
 - Consensus: Make a list of questions about advocates and seek input on those questions; then decide.
- Al: RTP Equity Advocate Questions
 - What committees should they be on? (Dept College Both?)
 - What should we call them?
 - How long should the term be? (One year? Multiple years?)
 - How many do we need?

- Who do they report to?
- What qualifications must they have?
- Who appoints them? Or elected? If elected then who elects them?
- Confidentiality - how might that be handled?
- Are they optional? If so, at whose decision?
- What is the scope of their charge?
- What is their authority? Do they only look at equity issues? Do they make sure policies are correctly followed?
- Should it be an "Equity" advocate or is that one thing in the scope of work of a "Faculty Advocate"?
- Concern for the word "Advocate": It implies that everyone else on the committee needs to be advocated against.
- Tian: A paradox. Equity comes with transparency but RTP is confidential.
- Jalal: How about EDI advocate?
- Should advocates be from the same college? Where do they come from?
- Richard: Concern that 1) this is a very difficult list of skills/background to fill the role and 2) concern that "equity" issues can be very different for different groups and issues are likely to come up with certain groups feeling the equity advocate doesn't understand their needs.
- Jo: RTP Equity Appeals committee (instead)? Barbara: There is a grievance procedure. Faculty of color have spoken out against anything for them right now. There was a suggestion along this line but couldn't figure that out. It is a topic of discussion.
- Richard: Are there discussion about centralizing to address equity concerns? Something like the Dream Success Center works (advocacy, counsel, training) Barbara: There is discussion about that. Equity and Diversity is supposed to be that, but it doesn't work.
- Section 3.1 Candidate
 - Role of department chairs in RTP?
 - Tian: Often great chairs but sometimes those with biases.
 - Barbara: Chairs working with college looking to suitable mentors. And, acknowledge role of mentors.
 - Jalal: As chairs we provide mentoring for all faculty particularly tenure track, but there should be designated mentors. Richard: Creating a mentor program and formalizing was the primary activity of the Chairs Learning Community last year. I wonder how many departments/chair followed through and created something sustainable.
 - Don: require the creation of a mentor program? That I don't know. In College of Ed designated mentors. But, harder for small departments.
 - Reassigned time?

- Jalal: if we don't finalize and it goes to the next group they will start all over. This Council needs to wrap it up even if details need to be worked out next year.
 - Consensus: not an easy answer; return to it.
- Discussion about materials needed (adding some examples)
- Richard: do we want to add more clarity to this document or just strengthen the responsibility to colleges to make sure they add that clarity? Barbara concurs.
- Don: 3.2 – Add: “The department policy must articulate specific guidelines for candidate materials, including an estimated length of the narrative, as well as any required materials beyond those articulated in this policy and the Collective Bargaining Agreement.” Frank, Jalal, Richard concur. Leslie: Line 402 - The department MUST... the departments *must* develop standards. Frank: “Use “must” not “shall” to impose requirements. “Shall” is ambiguous, and rarely occurs in everyday conversation. The legal community is moving to a strong preference for “must” as the clearest way to express a requirement or obligation.”
- Tian: Department standards may not be higher or lower than other departments in the same college. Richard: agree with the spirit, but difficult to mandate given the enormous difference between RSCA types between departments (and scholarship of practice). Al: Are we changing what RSCA means; less linear/ordinal. Rebecca: need to make sure we are not in conflict, but the standards can't be consistent. Al: “not conflict with” but not “higher vs lower”. Barbara: “Department standards must align with college standards.” (?) Concern with bad actors.
- Rebecca: I think that's why the departmental policy standards cannot be lower than the college, but they could be higher - the candidate can't be held to a higher standard as they go past the departmental review process.
- Don: concerned with consistency as a term.
- Leslie: part of what we are talking about should be taken care of by the paragraph below – responsibility of those approving the college/department policies to make sure that they align.

4. Next steps

- Share document for input? Consensus: Al is working on a ppt summary of the process we have gone through and the core changes we have made. He will share that and we can use that (not sharing the actual document)

Future meetings

[Apr 1 is spring break]

Apr 15

May 6

Meetings start at 12:30 pm, <https://tinyurl.com/ZoomWithAI>