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**Faculty Personnel Policy Committee**

**Minutes**

Feb. 12, 2020

3001 Seidman Center

3:00-5:00 PM

Present: Marie McKendall (Chair), Tonya Parker (recorder), LeShell Palmer Jones, Sean Lancaster (recorder), Douglas Montagna, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Nancy Schoofs, Kim Ranger, Maureen Walsh, Steve Schlicker, Pei-Lan Tsou, Kurt Ellenberger, Greg Cline

Not Present: Ed Aboufadel (ex officio)

***Note: Tom Butcher was a guest this week.***

1. Approval of agenda (pg. 1) – approved by consensus

4. BOT 4.2.3.2 Charge (pg. 4)

* Tom Butcher present to discuss
* 4.2.15 – Tenure resides at GVSU, not an individual unit – This is historical from the 1980s personnel policy, which became consolidated and tenure assigned to GVSC because of the size of the institution back then.
* Members of FPPC have variance for where tenure is housed on their letters.
* Provost ultimately decides on tenure
* Reduction in force language is where tenure housing matters and this language was created many decades ago. This process is triggered for changing enrollment patterns or discontinuance of programs and that requires Provost to go through much faculty governance.
* What does reduction in force mean for faculty?
* Discussion about what it means to be in unit, college, or university and how HLC is impacted and Faculty Qualifications Assurances (FQA).
* FPPC should consider how reorganization and program closure impacts faculty who have been here longer than others, but are suddenly are in the same unit/program. Who has seniority?
* Language needs to be updated, but working on new language can create apprehension.
* What does an appointment mean with tenure when: I take another position at the U. Or, when there is reorganization? Or when mergers happen, etc.

5. BOT 4.2.5 Charge (pgs. 5-6)

* For personnel actions, the unit should decide service expectations was a conclusion of FPPC members and this was proposed to Tom Butcher.
* Tom notes the language could have negative impacts as written.
* Use “unit standards” instead of unit.

2. Approval of minutes of 1-15-20 (pgs. 2-3) – minor edits made. Then approved by consensus.

3. Chair’s report

* Reassigned time for governance chairs – passed UAS last Friday.
* Feedback from UAS
  + Workload emerged as a theme from the comments.
  + Mentoring program also emerged as a concern. Units have developed mentoring programs and these formative reviews seem duplicative and overlapping. Can mentor do formative review in year 1?
  + Discussion about using Digital Measures for personnel actions university-wide.
  + Team teaching presents additional considerations.
  + CLAS Feedback:
  + 1. CFC requests that Formative and Summative should be defined in the document. – Fine.
  + 2. Question: Is it Observation? Review? Evaluation? – FPPC discussed what this means. Evaluate is fine.
  + 3. Question: Should not evaluations always be formative? – No. Even when summative, there is formative information that emerges.
  + 4. CFC is concerned about managing workload. --
  + 5. CFC is hesitant about three reviewers meeting to discuss their peer observations. Would this not be a “micro” personnel committee?  If so, is it redundant for Units with Personnel Committees?  Is not there the strong likelihood of consensus building among the reviewers?  Which in turn may defeat the point of three reviewers? – Personnel committees might also be used for teaching reviews, but does that create conflict of interest to provide formative feedback when they are also the judge for tenure/promotion.
  + 6. Question: Are we in danger of imposing pedagogical straight jacket? – We do not understand this question.
  + 7. Question: How are reviewers determined? Besides tenure? Are the reviewers expert/excellent teachers? By what standard? – unit determines.
  + 8.  Question: Does the specific FTLC training referenced already exist? – Partially, but FTLC is committed to developing this.
  + 9. There was concern that rubrics included do not offer flexibility. – Sample rubrics are not required.
  + 10. The was hesitancy regarding the number/frequency of reviews. – workload.
  + 11. There was concern about the use of the language “ We… feel…  and failure” – hmmm.
  + 12.  The was a concern that assessment methods are divergent by nature. – acknowledged.
  + Christine Rener’s feedback
    - 1. What is appropriate verbiage?
    - 2. Units can reduce rating scale to more detailed items.
    - 3. Materials provide context to ensure more productive observation of teaching. Summary report can be a single report from the 3 peers. A unit can combine instruments.
    - 4. FTLC will train reviewers, so perhaps this training could address this concern.
  + Discussion about mentoring processes and overlap with the formative review of teaching.
  + Discussion about pilot proposal and whether that can be approved independently or whether the whole program must be approved with a pilot year built in.
* Prospective dates for teaching proposal – No UAS in March, so April is it. Feb. 26 is next FPPC and Marie proposes completing teaching proposal and have it ready 2 weeks later (3/11/20). March 20 to ECS, April 3 to UAS.

6. LIFT score charge (pg. 10)

* Paul Sicilian did not appear. He will be invited in the future.