

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, November 5th | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Brown, DeKrey, Kang, Levin, Newman, Senbet, Sileo, Wieben

Zoom: Alcantar, Landry, Lunaris

Absent: English, Lee, Tian

Call to Order 3:34pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of October 22nd 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements – Brown will reach out to Mit McGlaughlin to attend a meeting next semester. The distinguished professor policy will also be an item for a future meeting.

- We will finish 1-1-307 and 2-3-801 today (hopefully!) after reading through the documents before sending to Codification.
 - Newman shared an email regarding joint appointments in two program areas. She proposed language that can be included in the policy for clarification,
 - “Unless otherwise specified in a faculty member's memorandum of understanding or contract, faculty members who hold a joint appointment in two program areas shall be evaluated using the criteria of only one program area, determined by the program area wherein they were assigned the largest cumulative fraction of FTE in their performance areas across the period under review. In the case of equal cumulative workload in two program areas, the evaluating program area shall be the one designated for evaluation purposes in their most recent contract or at the start of the review period.”
 - Scholarship and service were two that were difficult to place.
 - It was clarified that there are faculty members that have joint appointments in multiple units.
 - Members think that the language should be clear and practical.
 - Levin expressed support for the proposed language and emphasized that, unless otherwise specified, faculty in joint appointments should consistently be evaluated under a single set of criteria.
 - It was asked if each performance area criteria should be applied to its own performance area.
 - It was clarified that most joint appointments are within closely related fields.
 - Landry shared that it may be difficult for music because MOU's do not exist and the fields are closely related.

- Senbet asked who the evaluators will be if performance areas are evaluated individually.
- DeKrey mentions that there may be parts of this policy that will need to address this.
- MOTION: Levin moves to adopt Newman’s suggested language; Landry seconded.
- DISCUSSION:
 - Newman’s proposed language will be inserted into section (b) Comprehensive Review Procedures.
 - Landry agrees and emphasizes the need for additional conversations since the school of music is structured differently.
 - Faculty should be evaluated using their school’s criteria.
 - DeKrey asked whether program-area criteria match school criteria.
 - It was clarified that programs use adapted school criteria.
 - DeKrey recommends changes to sections 1-1-301 (faculty contract) and 2-3-201.
 - Dana noted a gap in the second area pooling won’t serve the faculty member well.
- VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.
- (II) Process:
 - (D)
 - Sileo commends everyone for the language in part (D)
 - Insert “members” after “faculty” in the last sentence.
 - (E)
 - Insert “may include additional” after “evaluation committee” at the end of the paragraph
 - DeKrey wonders how that additional information will be included
 - It was noted that it can be attached in Faculty Success and negative information may be discussed by the committee itself.
 - The committee is in favor of the highlighted new addition.
 - Replace “explain, in writing, its reasons,” with “must provide a written explanation of its scores”
 - Senbet asked if each member have to explain their score.
 - It was clarified that the overall score from the committee is what matters most
 - Sileo stated that a rational of the score is included based on her experience. If rational is not given individually, rational cannot be given collectively.
 - (F)
 - (i) Tenure Application
 - Insert “, and the comprehensive review process stops” after “tenure will be denied”
 - There was some confusion regarding the following sentence, “The sole basis for such an appeal is that the

unit/program-level evaluation committee's evaluation was not consistent with the program area's approved criteria and procedures, which resulted in a negative recommendation for tenure."

- It was clarified that faculty may appeal if there is a failure to follow criteria or procedure.
 - Insert "Tenure Appeals" before "committee" in the last sentence of the paragraph.
 - Insert "and the review process stops." At the end of the paragraph.
 - The TAC does not overturn any decisions.
 - No one other than the faculty should be able to overturn the committee's decision.
 - If the evaluation committee recommends "no tenure" and there is no appeal to the TAC, the tenure review stops, but the dossier review continues.
 - If the committee recommends against tenure, the faculty members cannot receive tenure from administration.
 - A faculty member cannot receive tenure without faculty support.
 - Current language suggests the process continues, FWC would need to determine whether it does.
 - The committee will continue from section (F) at the next meeting.
- We will take up the outside work policy.
 - We will also look at the AI task force's policy.

Special Orders

1. None

New Business

1. OSRP meeting?
2. New Business from last year:
 - Regulatory compliance issues.
 - Faculty workload policy
 - 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

\$640 was raised at the CSC bake sale!

Adjournment 4:55pm