

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, December 3rd | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Brown, DeKrey, English, Landry, Levin, Newman, Senbet, Sileo

Zoom: Lee, Morse, Tian

Absent: Kang, Lunaris, Wieben

Call to Order 3:35pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of November 19th, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements

- We will work on 1-1-307
- Comments from Kirsty
 - 2-3-801(1)(c) and (d)
 - Fleming made grammatical corrections to these two definitions
 - 2-3-801(1)(e)
 - Comment: Does it say somewhere that the evaluator is responsible for documenting their case?
 - Response is in section III-(A)
 - 2-3-801(1)(p)
 - Comment: Not sure the CAO should be assigning scores.
 - This is just the definition of a score. It doesn't require all parties to provide scores.
 - For clarification insert "(if appropriate; see procedures below)" after "unit leader, Dean, or CAO"
 - 2-3-801(1)(s)
 - Comment: Average as in mean.
 - For clarification insert "(arithmetic mean)" after "The average"
 - 2-3-801(2)
 - Comment: What decision is made at pre-tenure review and post-tenure review? Maybe this will come later.
 - It was clarified that the pre-tenure review is primarily formative where most feedback is positive and developmental.
 - Levin shared that there is a decision that would impact the university regulations (3-801(2)(f)(III))
 - Comment: This can only be true if material outside the dossier can be used. I think this is specified later.

- The committee agrees to remove “pre-tenure review” and “and post-tenure review” from the sentence.
- 2-3-801(2)(b) Comprehensive Review Procedure
 - Comment: How does this align with the comment earlier about the make-up of the committee?
 - In response Levin noted that the committee can include faculty from more than one program area in this case, but the *criteria* must be from just the one area described here.
- 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(E) Process
 - Comment: Shouldn't there be something explicit about using the criteria?
 - In response “, based on the approved program area criteria,” Is added after “assigns a score”
 - Apply the same edits to 2-3-801(2)(b)(G).
- 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(F)(i)
 - Comment: Consistency in terminology. Provost or CAO?
- 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(I)
 - Comment: I really don't think this should be about scores at this point. I am not sure the CAO should be deciding for example between 4 and 5 given that both result in a positive. This should really be about whether the CAO agrees with the recommendation from the other levels.
 - In response it was noted that first the CAO determines whether the evaluations are consistent with criteria and procedures. If so, move on. Otherwise, they then must decide if the scores are “agreeable”
 - It was agreed that the main focus is the outcome (satisfactory or unsatisfactory), which is based on the score.
 - The CAO can make a decision based on the outcome but not the score. In the case of disagreement, the CAO can give a score.
 - Following the first sentence insert “If the CAO finds that the evaluations are consistent with the approved criteria and procedures, or that the resulting scores would not affect the outcome of the comprehensive evaluation, no further scores need be assigned.”
 - Begin the second sentence with “If the CAO determines that evaluations are not consistent with the approves criteria and procedures and”
 - Comment: I thought other comprehensives unless negative were not going to the CAO. Plus, what is an outcome for something that is not tenure or promotion?
 - It was clarified that this only happens in the case the CAO or Dean request the CAO get the review.
- 2-3-801(2)(b)(III)(A)
 - Comment: Emphasize quantity and impact not just a summary of the CV.

- In response, the concern is corrected by referring to the definition.
 - Insert “(see 2-3-801(1)(e))” after “prepare a dossier”
- Get together to celebrate Greg’s retirement after last meeting for this semester.
 - The committee will get together sometime next semester.
- Landry expressed concern about EAP cuts and emphasized its value.
 - It was agreed that EAP should be improved, not eliminated, if underused.
 - Brown recommended doing a comparative analysis with other institutions and can invite Robert to a future meeting to discuss this.
 - It was suggested to contact Keith Humphrey to see whether EAP services are being offered in another form.
 - Faculty should be informed about the Colorado State Employee Assistance Program.
 - Members will gather additional information, seek faculty feedback, and continue the discussion in the spring.

Special Orders

1. None

New Business

1. Outside work policy
2. AI task force policy
3. OSRP meeting?
4. 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 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. ~~Revisions of 2-3-801 sent to Codification Committee 12/1/25~~
2. ~~Revision of 2-3-801 on 4/14/2025 – sent to Codification Committee 4/26/2025.~~
3. ~~Revision of 1-1-307 on 10/9/2024 – sent to Codification Committee 4/26/2025.~~
4. Revision of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.

5. 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

Adjournment 4:56pm