

Minutes
10/20/2021

Teams Meeting

PPC Members: Adams, Gregory; Toce, Jacqueline; Lopez-Velasquez, Angela; Marx, Helen; Tomczak, Stephen; Shea, Michael; Martinez, Kelly (absent); Metaxas, Virginia; Starling, Natalie (chair)

12:10pm

Approval of minutes of 10/6 meeting

CONTINUING BUSINESS:

Team discussed the three tasks and prioritized work for the year:

1. P&T Guidebook

- a. We will take this on, and include consult with other bodies
- b. We will divide task to determine misalignments and bring back to PPC

2. P&T/renewal Procedures documents

- a. Adding rebuttals to personnel/HR files: should candidates send to HR as well?
 - i. Resolved: Team made a draft of changes the procedures documents: *The candidate is encouraged to send an identical copy of their signed written response to the Office of Human Resources for inclusion in the candidate's personnel file.*
- b. Observation/Interview by DECs: what is the intention of the procedures? Who initiates this?
 - i. Resolved: Team made a draft of additions to the procedures documents: *The DEC/CFEC shall notify the candidate of the opportunity to appear personally before representatives of the DEC/CFEC by the date specified in the Appointment Calendar.*
 - ii. *Peer review through observation of load credit activity should normally be a part of evaluations, especially in pre-tenure evaluations (See Article 4.11.7 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement).*
- c. Possible expanding of review period for evaluators, i.e., allowing Deans access to file at time DECs have access.
 - i. Team is philosophically in support of allowing all evaluators as much time as possible to conduct their reviews, however, no changes to current procedures are recommended.
 - ii. L. Cunningham indicated in discussion with PPC Chair (prior to today's meeting) that there is no way to further expand the periods of review on the calendar and also abide by the contract, maintain fairness, and honor the peer review process. She further indicated:
 1. each reviewer is allotted the most amount of time possible given: the contract, holidays, weekends, and the 4 days to append comments
 2. review of the file without appended comments would not be fair to candidates and would not honor the peer review process
 - iii. Team engaged in discussion:
 1. If Deans (admin) were to be granted access to the file at the same time as DECs and Chairs (faculty), the review conducted by the department faculty has

the potential be overlooked and/or rendered moot because admin could review the file and make decisions without having read/seen the review conducted by DEC/Chairs. Even if there were to be efforts to ensure DEC/Chair reviews are completed before Dean review, the PPC is concerned that a change to allow simultaneous access would make these efforts optional and could also allow for arrangements and communications about expectations that deviate from the contract and intent of the contract, e.g., varying unofficial deadlines that differ from file to file, from School/College and from department to department. For example, the PPC can conceive of scenarios where the DEC/Chair could feel compelled to complete reviews sooner than what they would complete under the current procedures to provide Deans/admin more time.

This issue is one of unintended consequences, optics and intent. The PPC's interpretation is that the intention of the contract is a "peer review process" which could be eliminated by providing all reviewers access at the same time. Deans (admin) could essentially never see the DEC/Chair (faculty) review. The PPC is concerned that such a structural change would set the stage for erosion of the peer review process, even if the erosion is unintended. The current procedures for access to the file protect both the operations and optics of a peer review process. DEC/Chair (faculty) verify candidate information and work, and provide perspective of the discipline and value of candidate work, along with emphasis in addition to what the candidate presents in the file (of which the Dean (admin) may not have). **In conclusion, sacrificing the peer review process to gain more time for reviewers is not worth the erosion and potential loss of the peer review process.**

- iv. What are some ways to give reviewers additional time? PPC began discussion and will continue discussion in future meetings.
 - d. Substantial comparability (moved to next meeting agenda)
 - e. Election of P & T committee members (moved to next meeting agenda)
 - f. Record keeping by DEC members (moved to next meeting agenda)
3. **Academic advising** re P&T (moved to next meeting agenda)