

## MEMORANDUM

TO: CFA

FROM: Steering Committee

RE: Timeline for Promotion Appeals and Start Date of Departmental Promotion and Reappointment Committees

DATE: November 7, 2018

### **Background:**

On March 7, 2018, CFA received the following charge:

Steering asks CFA to review the memo from the Faculty Senate Executive Board and to determine whether clarification of the beginning date for terms on department PRC's is needed. If CFA determines that clarification is needed, it should gather preliminary testimony electronically from academic department chairs. Following this, CFA should prepare a preliminary recommendation and gather testimony from the faculty following Tier II guidelines.

Steering accepted CFA's recommendation not to make changes to the timeline.

On October 18, 2018, Steering received a memo from the Faculty Senate Executive Board. The memo raises two issues. The second issue again raises the question about the start date for PRCs.

1. The date by which the candidate is notified of the CPTC recommendation and therefore the date when appeals can be held. The Faculty Senate Executive Board notes that the dates in the Reappointment and Promotions Document (RPD) may have been influenced by the old TCNJ academic calendar, one that had a shorter winter break and one that did not account for the fact that we offer on-campus and global winter courses. Affected faculty may be teaching at the time of an appeal.
2. The RPD is ambiguous in regarding to Departmental Promotion and Reappointment Committees (PRCs). The date for departmental elections and the date by which these results are to be communicated to Academic Affairs are clearly indicated, the date that the term begins is not. Given that departmental personnel decisions are made throughout the year (spring reappointment and tenure decisions, fall promotion decisions, alterations

in the timeline due to qualifying life events, and 5-year reviews) the term start date should be explicit.

**Charge:**

In keeping with the timeline outlined below, Steering charges CFA with review of the RPD in regard to two specific areas:

1. Throughout the timeline which outlines responsibilities and deadlines and specifically with respect to appeals, CFA should consider either stating deadlines **or** specified time periods. The RPD currently uses both specific dates and time periods. For example, see VI. SUMMARY CHART OF RESPONSIBILITIES AND DEADLINES (pp. 44-45 of the 2017 RPD). CFA should consider seeking input from the department chairs, CPTC, the Provost, and other stakeholders deemed appropriate by CFA.
2. In light of the Faculty Senate's memo, CFA consider specifying a date on which departmental PRCs begin their term. See B. Selection of Committee Members (p. 47 of the 2017 RPD). CFA should consider seeking input from department chairs, David Blake, and other stakeholders deemed appropriate by CFA.

**Testimony Tier:** Tier II from Faculty

The issue requires moderate testimony from the campus community. The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation. The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups, and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail).

**Timeline:** CFA should begin work immediately on the charge, with the goal of completing a preliminary recommendation by February 2019. CFA should aim to submit a Final Recommendation to Steering by the end of the Spring 2019 semester.

## **TCNJ Governance Processes**

*Step 1–Steering issues a charge*

*Step 2-Governance prepares a Preliminary Recommendation*

Once the appropriate standing committee or council has received the charge, it should start by collecting data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. It should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community.

*Step 3–The Relevant Stakeholders provide Testimony*

Once a preliminary recommendation has been completed, the standing committee or council should seek testimony from the campus community. The testimony should be gathered in accordance with the Testimony Tier (see below) assigned to the issue by Steering.

For issues that require public testimony from the campus community, the chair of the standing committee or council should approach the president of the appropriate representative bodies to schedule the next available time slot at a meeting of that body.

Testimony should be gathered in a way that allows stakeholders to weigh in fully on the issue. Members of the standing committee or council that wrote the preliminary recommendation should be present to hear and record the testimony.

*Step 4–Governance prepares a Final Recommendation*

Once the standing committee or council has received appropriate testimony, it should revise the preliminary recommendation into a final recommendation. Once the final recommendation is complete, the standing committee or council should use sound judgment to determine whether or not more public testimony is required. If, in its feedback to the original preliminary recommendation, a stakeholder representative body requests to review an issue again, the committee or council is bound to bring it back to that body. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must re-submit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When the committee or council has completed the final recommendation, it should forward it to the Steering Committee. The final recommendation should be accompanied by a cover memo that summarizes the initial charge, how testimony was gathered and the nature of that testimony, and how the committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

*Step 5–Steering considers the Final Recommendation*

*Step 6–The Provost and/or President and Board consider the Final Recommendation*

*Step 7–Steering notifies the Campus Community Testimony*

*For a complete description of all steps and of the testimony tiers, see Governance Structures and Processes, 2017 Revision, pages 21–24.*