

Faculty Personnel Policy Committee
1/19/11 Minutes

Present: Teresa Beck, Sheila Blackman, Jan Brashler, Sonia Dalmia, Kurt Ellenberger (chair), Jon Jellema (ex-officio), Cynthia Madder, Linda Masselink, Figen Mekik, Scott Richardson (ex-officio), and Janet Vigna,

- Linda Masselink motioned to approve agenda for today's meeting; Figen Mekik seconded; Agenda approved
Figen Mekik motioned to approve minutes from the 12.8.2010 meeting; Sonia Dalmia seconded
- Introduction of new members and a reminder by Kurt as to the scope and purpose of this committee

New Business

- *Revisions to "Faculty Personnel Policy FAQs" to reflect changes in the "Conflict of Interest" policy.* Revisions made to questions #7 and #10. While FPPC agreed with changes, Committee suggest that the answers to #7 and #10, start with the answer No, and then provide an explanation. Committee suggested that the language be stronger and more explicit as what is and is not allowed.
- *Effective Teaching Language in Ch. 3 and Ch. 4.* FPPC was asked by UAS to make sure the revisions to 3.01A complements Chapter 4, Section 2.9.1. Vote was unanimous to accept.
- *Associate Deans and Unit Personnel Actions.* CLAS Faculty Council submitted a Handbook revision recommendation and rationale for FPPC's consideration. Discussion was held. Teresa Beck motioned to accept the CLAS document, Linda Masselink seconded. Vote was 1 Yes and 7 No to support the CLAS Faculty Council document.

Unfinished Business

- *Promotion Level Beyond Full Professor.* Discussion on wording for criteria. Suggestion was, "Continued engagement by demonstrating (insert current language of full professor)." A person may go up for this recognition, 6 years after initially being promoted to full professor. The six years is consistent with the other promotions from assistant to associate, and associate to full. If a faculty member does not receive the recognition, he/she may resubmit after three years. The number of full professors on this recognition committee should be either five or seven.
- *CPC Reporting Procedures.* Currently, there is no mechanism for CPC to provide feedback to unit. Recommended change to language below:

4.2.10.4.B.8. College's Personnel Committee Action.

2. Committee Does Not Accept Unit Recommendation.

If the Committee does not accept the unit recommendation and the Committee recommends a personnel action in favor of the candidate, the recommendation will be made in writing to the Dean with a copy to the candidate and the Unit Head or Designate. The written recommendation must include the rationale for not accepting the unit recommendation. [The rationale must include specific reasons for not accepting the unit recommendation with reference to the relevant unit, college, and/or university criteria in the three areas of evaluation. The Unit Head or Designate will report on the Committee's recommendation to the unit.](#) If the Committee does not accept the unit recommendation and if the candidate does not have the support of the Committee, the opportunity for a personal appearance before the Committee by the candidate shall be given. Only after such an opportunity is given to the candidate, can such a negative recommendation become official. If the candidate appears before the Committee, the candidate shall address the Committee on her or his own behalf and without an outside advocate or observer. The recommendation of the Committee will be made in writing to the Dean with a copy to the candidate and the Unit Head or Designate. [As above,](#) the written recommendation must

include the rationale for not accepting the unit recommendation- and the Unit Head or Designate will report on the Committee's recommendation to the unit.

Linda Masselink motioned to approve changes, Sheila Blackman seconded. Vote was 7 Yes and 1 No to support changes to the CPC Reporting Procedures.

Respectfully Submitted
Teresa M. Beck