

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, October 8, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Brown, DeKrey, English, Kang, Landry, Lee, Levin, Morse, Newman, Senbet,
Sileo, Wieben

Zoom: Alcantar

Absent: Lunaris

Call to Order 3:36pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of September 24th, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements – We are close to completing evaluations policy. President Feinstein would like the committee to work on the distinguished professor policy. Mit McGlaughlin is open to having a discussion with the committee at a future meeting.

- Review of the Provost Office's comments on 1-1-307 and 2-3-801.
- Board Policy Manual 2-3-801:
 - PAGE 8
 - (I) Regarding the revised paragraph of part (I)
 - It was suggested inserting replacing “dean, unit /program area evaluation committee, the unit leader and the evaluate” with “appropriate parties.”
 - Who are the appropriate parties?
 - Sileo suggests language similar to “the parties involved in the evaluative process”
 - Levin asked if there is language about communication at every stage.
 - Sileo shared that there is communication through the workflow.
 - Brown suggests using similar language used in the dean section.
 - The committee agrees and Brown will make the notification process for the provost parallel with the deans.
 - 2-3-801(III)
 - (C)
 - In response to the provost's comment, the following was inserted to the end of the sentence for clarification,
 - “, and if necessary to resolve score discrepancies between the Unit Leader and unit/program-level evaluation committee.”
 - (D)
 - The committee agrees that there seems to be redundancy in having the provost and dean doing the same thing

- It was shared that some members would prefer the CAO since it is their responsibility to make sure the dean's reasoning and arguments are correct.
 - DeKrey stated that the provost's role includes resolving disagreements, which requires a clear understanding of both the basis for those disagreements and the criteria involved.
 - This section covers the reason why both are required.
 - It was shared that when there are challenges redundancy is needed and that at any level of disagreement, the CAO and dean should be working to resolve it.
 - The last sentence is rewritten as,
 - "In particular, when there is a disagreement between the unit/program-level evaluation committee, unit leader, and/or the dean, it is the responsibility of the CAO to resolve the disagreement."
 - Morse shared that "assure" should be replaced with "ensure" in parts (C) and (D).
- 2-3-801(3) Subperiod Review
 - (a)(I)
 - Newman and Brown inserted,
 - "All subperiod review criteria must be approved by the unit leader, Dean and CAO (see _____)"
 - Brown thinks subperiod criteria should be different from the comprehensive review, the committee agrees with him.
 - Levin asked if the committee would require a certain metric of difference.
 - If the evaluations are different, how will they be different?
 - Units should be careful with how they do their subperiod
 - Make sure they follow criteria
 - (IV)
 - A member asked what decision is made regarding "final decision."
 - Replace "make a final decision" with "decide the final outcome of the review."
 - Levin noted in the document that the changes are consistent with the corresponding part of comprehensive review.
 - (V)
 - This section will be deleted since evaluations and employment decisions are separate things.
 - Brown will clean up the language and bring it back for a final review before moving to Codification.
- University Regulations 1-1-207:
- 1-1-307(1)
 - Brown added the following to the end of the first sentence

- "...and reviewed by the Unit Leader/Chair, Dean, and CAO or designee [See ADD]"
 - "faculty member's" is used for the singular but is not consistently used.
- 1-1-307(2)
 - (a)
 - Replace "teaching, research, scholarship and creative works" with "instruction, professional activity"
 - Language will need to be consistent throughout the document and BPM.
 - Remove "(a) These expectations are to be defined by the evaluatee's program area with unit college, and University consideration of the mission and goals."
 - (b)
 - Replace "be based on" with "follow"
 - Insert "and be based upon the criteria" after "the process"
 - The reference to 2-3-801(2)(b) will need to be checked to make sure it applies to both the criteria and process.
- 1-1-307(3)
 - Replace "teaching, research, scholarship and creative works" with "instruction, professional activity"
 - Insert "based on their assigned workload" after "service"
- Future work on distinguished professor or some other new rank above "Full Professor."
- DeKrey shared the following issues
 - 2-3-801(2)(II)(B)
 - Regarding the material and information of the dossier, the dean and provost can add relevant material. He asked if the evaluation committee can add relevant material as well.
 - There are different levels or material that can add information to the evaluations and the faculty should be able to introduce them if it was not included.
 - Mores stated that in certain situations, for example Title IX, he hopes that the committee and unit leader are already aware of it
 - Brown and DeKrey will work on language to consider.
 - Wieben emphasized the importance of ensuring this does not become a collegiality issue.
 - Levin noted that he can see the matter going in either direction and that the language will need to be explicit.
 - Non-criteria information can be introduced at any level; however, it must bear on the three required criteria areas of a faculty member.
 - DeKrey had some concerns regarding the evaluation process during the transitional retirement process.
 - Sileo suggested including language about that during the subperiod review discussion.

Special Orders

1. None

New Business

1. OSRP meeting?
2. New Business from last year:
 - Regulatory compliance issues.
 - Faculty workload policy – revision by Jeri Lyons (status?)
 - Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
 - Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
 - Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center!?!
 - Codify Research Fellow designation as (e.g., part of Emeritus)?

Unfinished Business (from last year)

1. Revisions to 2-3-801 and 1-1-307
2. 3-3-902 Faculty salary bonus for award of Distinguished Professor title
3. 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures

Completed Business (as of last academic year)

- ~~1. Revision of 2-3-801 on 4/14/2025 – sent to Codification Committee 4/26/2025.~~
- ~~2. Revision of 1-1-307 on 10/9/2024 – sent to Codification Committee 4/26/2025.~~
3. Revision of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.
4. Revision of 2-3-305 Academic Titles on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.

Transferred Business (as of last academic year)

1. Step-back policy – transferred to Salary Equity Committee
2. Amorous Relationship policy – now being considered by General Counsel

Call for the Good of the Order

Great job!

The shared governance reception tonight!

Thank you, Jeff and Harmony, for working on this during the summer to quickly move through this!

Adjournment 4:45pm