

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

February 11th, 2026 | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Brown, DeKrey, Kang, Landry, Lee, Levin, Newman, Reyes, Senbet, Sileo,

Zoom: Alcantar, Morse, Wieben

Absent:

Call to Order 3:34pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of January 11th, 2026 meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements

- We will continue working on UR-3-3-801
 - For consistency Sileo and English recommend reviewing revisions once more to make sure both match up.
 - Newman proposed the removal of numerical ratings in favor of qualitative categories like "does not meet," "meets," and "exceeds" for evaluations.
 - Brown raised concerns about how this change could affect the most vulnerable faculty members, particularly those facing non-renewal, as well as potential implications for full professors.
 - It was stated that committees could rely on clearly identified criteria within rubrics rather than numerical scores. However, removing numerical ratings could create tension between faculty and chairs or committees, as well as within units.
 - Levin is working on removing decimals in their unit.
 - Members shared that the decimal itself causes several issues during evaluations.
 - Levin emphasized that regardless of the evaluation system selected, clear criteria will be necessary and must account for multiple factors.
 - Expectations for promotion need to be clearly defined and that a three-category system could accomplish this.
 - Lee shared that the distinctions between "4" and "5" can introduce bias, as individuals may interpret categories like "exceeds" or "excellent" differently.
 - Landry shared that in music competitions, a five-point scale is used but judges are instructed not to score below a "2" due to the psychological impact of low ratings.
 - Senbet stated that "meets expectations" should be sufficient, as meeting expectations indicates satisfactory performance.

- It was noted that developing clear evaluative criteria may be easier in some areas than in others.
- It was noted that an associate professor seeking promotion to full may feel greater pressure to demonstrate “exceeds” compared to a full professor already at rank.
- Sileo suggested that next year the committee could offer workshops to assist units in developing clearer criteria.
 - Brown agreed, noting that some units do not clearly distinguish between comprehensive review and subperiod reviews.
- DeKrey shared that one reason this proposal was dropped because the distinguished professors was a topic that would do something like this; however, those details need to be determined.
- (a) replace “Promotion Review [See Section 2-3-801(2)(b) Pre-Tenure Review.
- ” with “Pre-tenure review”
 - It was noted that an empty (a) for promotion review may be needed.
- 3-3-801(1)(c)(V)
 - Brown raised concerns about the post-tenure review process, questioning how the performance plan influences the next evaluation and noting that the process feels too vague.
 - There were concerns that there is not enough guidance for a faculty who have an unsatisfactory review and clarity is needed.
 - Sileo shared that the provost’s office would appreciate a clearer process.
 - There is a lack of clarity about which evaluation requirements must be satisfied and whether new criteria will be developed or the current criteria will be used.
 - The program area faculty can determine if the criteria met the approved performance plan.
 - Since this section is about unsatisfactory for a comprehensive review DeKrey shared that the evaluation criteria can be different if it is not clarified that a comprehensive evaluation will need to be done.
 - He is in favor of requiring a comprehensive evaluation to be done subsequently.
 - Remove “or their designee” and replace “that is approved by the unit leader and dean” with “based on the approved program area criteria.”
 - Insert the following sentence “The plan shall be approved by the program area faculty, unit leader and the dean.”
 - Senbet suggested restarting the entire evaluation process and extending the period from five years to seven years.
 - For the performance areas Senbet does not have concerns about service or instructions but can see problems with professional activity in the case of publishing work.
 - Sileo shared that improvement plans typically focus on the area of weakness, which is usually teaching.
 - This will protect students from faculty who are beginning to decline in their work

- Levin asked what clock is being used. Calendar year?
 - Clarification is needed about whether they have two years from the start date of the evaluations to get satisfactory.
 - DeKrey stated that faculty with a performance plan should continue to meet in all three categories regardless of an unsatisfactory in one of those areas.
 - It was clarified that material from the last comprehensive should be included. Which brought the question of whether they are required to submit five years' worth of work within two years?
 - It was clarified that it would essentially be a prorated comprehensive review.
 - Those requirements could be included in the plan.
 - It is very important to ensure faculty resume teaching without being deficient in other areas.
 - A definition of a performance plan was suggested.
 - Rewrite, "Faculty have two years to achieve a satisfactory evaluation." As
 - "The faculty member has two years from the unsatisfactory evaluation period to achieve a satisfactory comprehensive evaluation."
- 3-3-801(2) – change title to "Subperiod review"
- Continue from 3-3-801(2) at next meeting
- Distinguished Professor discussion
 - Under discussion
- Nancy Henke (OER and evaluations)
 - Henke will attend a future meeting to discuss making OER more prevalent at the university and its potential use in faculty evaluations.
 - Faculty should not be penalized if OER resources are unavailable in their discipline.
 - Making language too strong can affect the academic freedom of faculty, however they should be informed of this opportunity
 - Concerns regarding OER:
 - Quality can vary and is not always comparable to required textbooks faculty use.
 - In some courses, particularly advanced or specialized areas, it can be difficult to find suitable materials, requiring flexibility.
 - Any expectations around OER should be balanced and discipline sensitive.
 - Faculty work very hard on creating their own text and publishing an OER text can have significant scholarly and institutional impact.
- Discussion of reduction of faculty benefits (EAP)
 - Feedback – Robert VP HR; John Hammel
- New web design and faculty concerns

Special Orders

1. None

New Business

1. Amorous relationships and nepotism policy
2. EAP
3. Outside work policy
4. AI task force policy
5. OSRP meeting?
6. New Business from last year:
 - o Regulatory compliance issues.
 - o Faculty workload policy
 - o Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
 - o Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
 - o Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center!?!
 - o Codify Research Fellow designation as (e.g., part of Emeritus)?

Unfinished Business (from last year)

- ~~1. Revisions to 1-1-307 sent to Codification on 1/15/26~~
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 5:00pm