

FCPT Meeting

10/27/04

Present: Hanks, Kalton, Landenburger, Stein, Thompson

### **Agenda for this meeting and beyond**

- Decide on process, rules and dates for this year
- Review past minutes and other documents from last year ("sense making")
- Prepare material for meetings with external constituents (SH: wasn't clear to me who we were meeting with. Academic programs? Junior faculty?)

Minutes for future meetings. Decided that we would rotate the minute-taking task. Hanks volunteered to go first. SH immediately made mental note to himself to put this item in the minutes above and beyond all else, so there is an official record that he already did his Duty :-)

Question about how many cases we will be seeing this year. Consensus seems to be roughly 6 from IAS and 2 from elsewhere. Several of these will not be available for the first round (which starts mid-November). We should expect 5 to 6 cases beginning the first round.

=====

### **Procedures**

Main questions were:

- what does our vote mean that makes it different from the promotion committee vote? (answer: we are supposed to be monitoring and commenting on the consistency of cases from all the academic programs, to make sure there is parity)
- should Jack Nelson be present at all or part of our discussion, and in particular when we vote?
- conflict of interest: what is considered a conflict of interest, and what should happen in those cases?
  - conflict defined to be either somebody in the candidate's program, or a member of the candidate's committee
  - consensus that conflict of interest means no vote
  - Mike suggested that the person be invited for the first part of the discussion but excused for a subsequent "closed session"

Somewhat of a side note: there was a discussion about whether a junior faculty member should be invited to all or part of the discussion consensus was yes for part of the discussion, but not to the discussion with Jack [[ no action item in terms of choosing a junior faculty member ]]

### **Decisions made:**

- Committee will meet on its own first, beginning with all parties, then excusing those with conflicts of interest
- There will be a subsequent meeting with Jack, again first with the whole committee, then excusing those with conflict of interest [[SH: and excluding junior faculty too]]
- The vote will be taken during the part of the meeting shared with Jack [[SH: but without the junior faculty]]

- There was a lot of discussion on this point. The upside of having Jack present for the vote was that he could potentially add information to the discussion that would be helpful in deciding how to vote.
- The potential downside was the possibility that he would try to influence the vote.

**Dates and Scheduling:**

We believe that these are the externally mandated dates:

11/19 -- Folders available

12/6 -- Votes taken

**Our meeting dates (to be confirmed):**

Nov 2 2:00

Nov 23 2:00 <= Goal is to review two files at this meeting; held in GWP?

Nov 30 2:00 - 4:30 <= Internal discussion complete by end; held in GWP?

Dec 2nd 2:00 - 4:00 <= Meet with Jack

For next week: bring program-level material on criteria and procedures for promotion process.

Respectfully submitted,  
Steve Hanks  
Interim Secretary