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CLA Faculty Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2017

In Attendance

Call to Order

CLA President Ashley Kistler called meeting to order at 12:36pm.
Approval of Minutes from May 3, 2017 CLA Faculty Meeting

Queen: Motion
Walton: Second
Approved by Voice Vote

Announcements

Habgood: Soliciting announcements for Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award Nominations. Nominations due to Laurel Habgood by Oct. 5. Nominees will know by Nov. 6 about process for consideration.

Old Business

Discussion of FEC Workload and Recommendations

Motion Delayed to November 16 faculty meeting to allow this academic year’s CEC’s to operate under current guidelines.

Vander Poppen – Motion: I move that the body enter into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of discussing the recommendations for addressing FEC workload.

Second: Gournelos
Approved by Voice Vote

Houston – FEC facing crisis. 15-16 candidates per year is manageable. Forecast suggests that increase to 25-30 is on horizon. Want to be proactive and address the issue ahead of time. Staffing and scheduling issue, but these things are baked into bylaws. Examining proposal from FEC task force: Lines, J. Davison, and Norsworthy. Want input from faculty on how to address situation.

Proposed Change to CLA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 5, d.

Article VIII. Faculty Appointments and Evaluations

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS
Section 5. Promotion to Professor

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate’s file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by November 15 October 15. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean of the
Faculty, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

**Houston**: Allows FEC to have more time to expand calendar. Current date is Nov. 1st. Move allows candidates for promotion to Full Professor to be evaluated in Fall.

**Kistler**: EC suggested compromise for October 15 instead of committee’s recommendation for October 1, to allow more flexibility for departments and allow for meaningful class visits in Fall before CEC meeting.

**Harper**: Departments have a heavy workload already. October 1st is not viable for departments who have many candidates.

**Houston**: End of Spring observations can help with this process and alleviate crowding.

**Murdaugh**: Can we tie these to the semester, rather than absolute dates.

**Kistler**: Option, but isn’t very elegant. Dean could do that if people wanted.

**Do you support moving the deadline for CEC’s to deliver letters for candidates for promotion to Professor to October 15?**

**Straw Poll: Support for change = 100, No = 5, Abstain = 9**
Discussion of Other Potential Changes

Change in Composition of FEC Committees

For mid-course evaluations: We recommend changing the composition of the FEC evaluation committee from five (5) to three (3) four (4) members (friendly amendment offered and accepted at EC).

Houston: Midcourse is critical. Task force suggested breaking FEC into teams for mid-course to allow for scheduling flexibility. Is three enough given importance of the mid-course review? FEC thought three plus liaison might be better solution.

Vitray: Three is too small, four would work.

Houston: Not a dramatic change. Currently 5 members, only removes one member. Still will make a significant difference in terms of scheduling for the committee.

O'Sullivan: Won’t work with three people due to nature of discussions. What do we do in the case with split votes? Need guidelines.

Houston: Not a formal vote at the midcourse. Split decision indicates a problem and that is conveyed to candidate.

O'Sullivan: FEC has evolved, this isn’t the way it used to be done. Does this mean in a tie administrators make the decision? For midcourse only?

Houston: Only for midcourse. Not a formal vote, ties are an expression of concern.

Cavenaugh: Is this temporary or permanent?

Houston: This is a temporary rather than permanent problem. FEC works well in its current incarnation and could go back to its original structure later.

Kistler: But we have to adopt a change within the bylaws and then later change bylaws back. Could promise to revisit in 5 years. However, a change to the bylaws is a permanent change.

McLaren: In earlier cases, there were also spikes. Not a new problem, but this has happened before. We should build this in long-term.

Jones: I’m uncomfortable with this. Evaluation is one of the most important things we do. Midcourse and promotion are the most important things we do as a faculty. Need a diversity of voices in the room and also ensure someone for your division is likely there.

Anderson: Can we say, at least four? Then there is flexibility in years with scarcity of candidates.
**McLaren:** In the past, we proposed a different solution: Add more people to the FEC body as a whole, this allows more people to rotate off the committee for each case.

**Kistler:** Just wait a minute. That is coming in the next recommendation.

**Vitray:** I’m of a mind to either increase size of FEC or change mid-course composition. Not both.

**Do you support changing the composition of Mid-Course FEC committees from 5 to 4 members?**

**Straw Poll Results:** Support = 59, Oppose = 44, Abstain = 13
Full FEC composition: We recommend adding one additional member to FEC (for a total of 7 members).

Houston: The task force recommended adding an additional FEC member (from 6 to 7) to allow more frequent recusals and have more staffing resources. This splits the workload a bit further. It also helps when certain departments grow quickly. When a single department has many candidates, an FEC member in their department has to recuse themselves from all those cases.

Norsworthy: In light of previous recommendation, I encourage faculty to vote to increase overall numbers. We rarely get an opportunity to be kind to ourselves. Let’s take it.

Harris: What’s magic about number 7? Why 7 instead of 8?

Norsworthy: The task force diagramed the situation and looked at numbers and the rotation of mid-course membership. Allows alleviation of time crunch. Now that 4 at the midcourse is the recommendation, the workload will be high for 7 person FEC.

Vitray: Should be a contingency not permanent numbers, but another problem is having enough people to staff FEC. Not sure about making it permanent.

D. Davison: I want to make an observation about flexibility: we want continuity for tenure and promotion. The committee needs to have continuity of the evaluation process. Making a change temporary could lead to inconsistency and unevenness of faculty evaluations. We can always change the bylaws again if we need to, but we need to focus on what enhances the integrity of the faculty evaluation process while facilitating the workload.

Do you support adding one additional member to FEC (7 members total)
Straw Poll Results: Support = 96; Oppose = 10; Abstain = 13

Almond: Motion to move out of committee of whole
Harris: Second
Approved by voice vote
Salary and Compensation Taskforce Update

**Fuse:** Salary Task force has met a couple times since retreat. I’m meeting with Cornwell and Singer to receive input and share information. Need feedback on a couple of issues from faculty. The Compensation Task Force will be holding two colloquia in Bush Auditorium on Thursday, October 5, 12:30 - 1:45pm and Friday, October 13, 2:00 - 3:30pm.

We will have philosophy in place to show the faculty by the next faculty meeting, if at all possible.

Queen: Are the colloquia different?

Fuse: No. They are the same.

Salary Resolution (Tabled at 4/20 Faculty Meeting)

**Background:** At the 4/20 CLA faculty meeting a group of faculty presented a pair of resolutions from the floor in order to ensure that salary inequities would be addressed in the AY 17-18 pay cycle. The faculty approved a resolution instructing the Provost to distribute the AY 17-18 salary pool in a manner that would not exacerbate current inequities. Consideration of the second resolution was postponed until the first faculty meeting of AY 17-18.

Resolved, in anticipation of salary cycles beginning in 2018-19, we support a salary distribution model informed by the benchmarks and developed and enacted by the provost in consultation with faculty representatives. Due to time constraints, we entrust the provost to develop such a model for the 2017-18 salary cycle.

Norsworthy and Tillmann Reintroduce resolution:

**Tillmann:** Longstanding discussion surrounding salary equity. Had task force in place, but due to end of year approaching needed to have motion to floor in have a faculty discussion. Attempt to give guidance to provost about how to allocate 2% and 100,00 of salary for addressing inequities.

Key phrases here: “informed by benchmarks” “in consultation with faculty representatives.”

**D’Amato:** I believe we should wait until we have the task force come forward with a proposal to consider the question.

**D’Amato:** I move to table the resolution until the Compensation Task force completes its work.
Smaw: Second

Tillmann: Table until when?

Almond: I believe that Mario indicated a time: until the committee completes its work.

D’Amato: Yes.

Tillmann and Norsworthy: Is the motion debatable?

Vander Poppen and Lewin: No.

Are you in favor of the motion to table until the task force completes its work?

Results: Support = 69; Oppose = 39; Abstain = 12
New Business

All Faculty Appeals Committee

Norsworthy - Motion: I move that the body approve Alicia Homrich to serve as alternate to the All Faculty Appeals Committee for a 1 year term.

Vote Results: Approve = 103; Oppose = 3; Abstain = 4
Motion to Amend CLA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 4, d.

Almond – Motion: I move to abrogate Article VIII, Section 4D, to remove the date for the delivery of CEC letters for candidates for tenure to allow the Dean to extend the deadline by a week to allow for rescheduling of CEC’s made necessary by Hurricane Irma.

Charles: Second

Article VIII. Faculty Appointments and Evaluations
E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Section 4: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee Having reviewed the candidate’s file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

Kistler: We need to do this due to exigencies of the hurricane. We will repropose the original language next faculty meeting.

Vote: Support = 100; Oppose = 2; Abstain = 5
Committee Reports

Faculty Affairs Committee (c/o Chris Fuse)

Fuse: FAC has met only twice. Begun to look at policies and procedures for contingent faculty. How do we fit relative to benchmark institutions? Looking at hiring and professional development. Also evaluating grants. Critchfield, Ashforth, IDG, FYRST grant submissions need to be submitted by Oct, 5.

Norsworthy: At retreat, in discussions on market driven salary, questions were structured so that discussion was fuller on advantages rather than disadvantages. Can we have more time to discuss? What is the validity of the notes produced? Not really a full assessment? Can there be a full conversation at the symposium?

Fuse: Absolutely. Also, come see me if you have questions about the work of the task force. We certainly will have the conversation broadly at the colloquium in addition to the focused issues the Task Force has identified.

Tillmann: I want to advocate for more conversation in light of new colleagues and those coming back from sabbatical. We need a robust conversation about merit pay and market disparities. I’m disappointed that the resolution was tabled, because we could have had that conversation today.

Fuse: We see this as a recursive process. We will continue to have conversations throughout the process.

D’Amato: We can also have conversations on discussion threads on the Strategic Planning Task Force on Compensation Blackboard page. There currently aren’t any posts. We can post ideas and concerns on the Blackboard forum.

Curriculum Committee (c/o Josh Almond)

We’ve met three times this semester. We approved and forwarded SEB and Social Innovation proposals to EC and they should come to the full faculty in due time. We approved minor changes to Physics course numbers. Going forward, we will look at requests for sabbatical requests from BUS and EDU. Several curriculum revisions are on the docket. We will also continue to support the rFLA revision process. The new course subcommittee is working on proposals. There is a new coversheet that needs to be completed when all changes in curriculum are suggested that verify nothing proposed endangers our accreditation. I am happy to step people through the process.
Executive Committee (c/o Ashley Kistler)

We’ve met twice this semester. We discussed at length damage to CSS with Ken Miller. Miller is doing air quality testing every three weeks in CSS. The results are public and I will be happy to share with all interested parties. EC also worked on the plan for making up classes and adopting optional Saturday / Blended coursework. We need to develop a forward-looking plan for future academic years. We also began discussing changes to SEB major. This was tabled by EC to its next meeting, and it will likely be on agenda for the next CLA Faculty meeting.

President’s Report (c/o Grant Cornwell)

What is up with these hurricanes?

Thank you to all of you and my appreciation. Thank you to safety, security, facilities, Sodexo… Thank you for turning up for clean-up day. Students wrote to say they wanted to say thank you to all who helped them get through the hurricane and this desire led them to volunteer on SPARC cleanup day.

One concern is recapturing momentum and academic integrity of semester. Thank you for getting back to work so quickly.

Provost’s Report (c/o Susan Singer)

Thank you to all who put together workshops for faculty. Thank you to all faculty who attended and for sharing the excellent ideas for teaching in new ways. This has further accelerated our mission of delivering curriculum to students.

Thank you for being inclusive of new faculty. I’ve heard their perspective mentioned several times today.

I also want to express support for work of Compensation Task force. They are working toward a recursive model where a healthy conversation happens every Spring. Are we making progress? What else do we need to do to make progress?

Kistler: I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Almond: Motion to Adjourn

Patron: Second

Approved by Voice Vote

Meeting Adjourned at 1:40.
Agenda: Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
8/21/17

1. Approve Minutes from May 3, 2017 CLA Faculty Meeting

2. Announcements
   a. Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award nominations

3. Old Business
   a. Discussion of FEC workload and recommendations (see attached)
     i. Proposed Change to CLA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 5, d. (see attached)
     1. See also: http://webmail.cornell.edu/news/
   b. Salary and Compensation Taskforce Update
   c. Salary Resolution (Tabbed at 9/20 Faculty Meeting) (see attached)

4. New Business
   a. Approval of Alicia Hinrichz to serve as alternate to the ALI Faculty Appeals Committee
   b. Motion to Alleviate CLA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 4, d. (see attached)
     i. See also: http://webmail.cornell.edu/news/

5. Committee Reports
   a. Faculty Affairs Committee (n/a Chris Fuss)
   b. Curriculum Committee (n/a Yarko Almodovar)
   c. Executive Committee (n/a Ashley Kahler)
   d. President’s Report (n/a Grant Cornelison)
   e. Provost’s Report (n/a Susan Singer)

MEMORANDUM

Date: February 22, 2017
To: Dean Brown
From: Ad Hoc Committee on FCG Workload

Re: FCG Workload Issues

As requested, our committee met on February 29th (2:30 – 5:00) to evaluate FCG scheduling and workload issues. We considered a wide range of issues and potential solutions (as directed by the Executive Committee) and after considerable discussion, we reached strong consensus on the following recommendations:

**FCG Calendar Revision**

1. For presentation to Professor: We recommend changing the date by which the OCG submits their evaluation letter to the Dean, FCG chair, and the candidate to December 1.
   - Rationale: This change provides additional time and flexibility to the Dean of CLA in preparing letters for candidates.

2. Change in composition of FCG Committee
   - For mid-course evaluations: We recommend changing the composition of the FCG evaluation committee from five (5) to three (3) members.
     - Rationale: This change provides additional flexibility for FCG in the scheduling of candidates for review. This change also reduces the workload for individual FCG members and further supports the Dean of CLA in the timing of candidate evaluation letters.

3. Full FCG composition: We recommend adding additional members to FCG for one (1) member.
   - Rationale: This change will increase FCG membership in adhering to the deadlines, making the overall FCG workload more manageable. This change will also provide additional flexibility for FCG in scheduling meetings with FCG liaison.

We are very happy to discuss the thinking behind these recommendations in greater detail with you and the Executive Committee, as well as the larger faculty.

Fiscal Salary Resolution 420 CLA Faculty Meeting

Resolved, in anticipation of salary cycles beginning in 2018-19, we support a salary distribution model informed by the benchmarks and developed and executed by the provost in consultation with faculty representatives. Due to time constraints, we entrust the provost to develop such a model for the 2017-18 salary cycle.