

GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPATION IN CPC REVIEWS

Draft 11/6/03, prepared by CPC chair on the basis of by-laws, past practice, and consultations
Discussion of the Guidelines is on the agenda for the CPC when it next meets. If approved they will be forwarded to the Senate for the record and for codification where needed in by-law changes.

1. *Representation.* CPC is elected by faculty according to the bylaws of the College senate to represent the faculty. Vacancies are filled by the Senate chair following by-law 6.13.
2. *Participation in reviews.* Discussion and voting on CPC reviews are undertaken by all CPC members not ruled out by other guidelines. The work of drafting CPC reviews is distributed as evenly among CPC members as possible, taking into account CPC members' participation in Ad hoc (Departmental) level reviews. Voting members sign off on the final wording of the review.
3. *Independence.* Although each level of review for a candidate is informed by the reviews at lower levels, the CPC review is conducted by CPC members who have not participated in a lower level review for the candidate according to the College criteria. Issues about participation in and conduct of the reviews (e.g. election of CPC chair) are determined by the CPC once it has been elected as a standing committee of the Senate to represent the faculty.
4. *No conflict of interest.* The Provost prefers that candidates for promotion not serve on the CPC during the year of their review.¹
5. *Rank.* The Provost is working towards an ideal in which only full professors review candidates for promotion to full professor, but it is acceptable for associate professors to participate and vote provided there are at least as many full professors as associate professors on the review (emails from Assoc. Provost Langley to CPC chair, 2/24/03 and 10/7/03).² The Provost asks the CPC to consult with the Provost's office about associate professor participation each time the issue arises.
6. *Institutional memory.* Participation in Discussion and Voting on CPC reviews provides experience (especially about standards) that feeds into subsequent contributions to personnel reviews.
7. *Size of review panels.* The Provost's preference is for at least five people voting on each review so that "No single member's vote can give the appearance of a substantial division of opinion" (University guidelines, affirmed by Assoc. Provost Langley 10/7/03).

¹ The rationale is that working together with colleagues on a committee makes it harder for the colleagues to act in judgement of them. When this advice was received from the Assoc. Provost, the two 2003-4 candidates on the CPC stepped aside. They had already asked to recuse themselves from the reviews of the candidates for promotion to full professor and were not eligible to serve in the remaining CPC review (because they were serving at the Ad hoc level.)

² In making this ruling, Assoc. Provost Langley explicitly placed it above two other alternatives:

1. CPC review panels (subcommittees) consisting of associate professors and full professors, with only the full professors voting.
 2. CPC review panels consisting only of full professors, but smaller than the recommended size of five.
- The CPC has not yet met to discuss whether to accept the Provost's advice or request that he accepts that the GCOE CPC operates one of the two alternatives. The participation of associate professors is not without precedent at UMass or in the GCOE.