

# FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, August, 27<sup>th</sup> 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM

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

Absent: Lunaris

Zoom: Alcantar, Kang, Morse

**Approval of Agenda approved without objection**

**Approval of April 30, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection**

## Chair's Report/Announcements

- Welcome back!
- Introductions
- Revisions to 1-1-307 and 2-3-801 have been sent to Codification and to the provost for comments
  - Brown met with Newman about the comments made by the provost
    - He suggests pausing the work Codification is doing and bringing back to Faculty Welfare for revision.
  - Since 2-3-901 is referred to in other policies, Brown would like to make sure they are correct.

## Special Orders

1. None

## New Business

1. Setting this semester's agenda and priority rankings
  - 2-3-901
2. OSRP – New Leadership
  - It was suggested that the committee invite Mit to a future meeting to discuss priorities and answer questions.
    - Members agreed to invite him however he just recently started this role and may not have had the time to determine those priorities.
  - Sileo suggested that the committee suggest priorities and raise the policy work that Jeri was working on to his attention.
  - Brown proposed reaching out to him to see what he thinks and clarify what the committee would like to accomplish.
  - It was stated that Mit does have a directional vision and how it can be helpful if it can be aligned with Faculty Senate priorities.
    - It was suggested that the committee send him “bigger picture” questions to understand his vision.

- Internal discussions may be more efficient than addressing issues at the federal level which would require more time.
- Landry mentioned that it would be helpful to hear what is going on at the federal level.
  - English shared that things are changing everyday at the federal level. She suggests those questions should be specific and detailed to ensure a valuable conversation.
- What would the committee like to gain from this meeting with him?
  - A discussion about regulatory compliance and clarification on what was told to FWC by Jeri and current realities.
  - Brown will revise the two sections, review the questions for Jeri, then share with FWC before inviting Mit.
    - Sileo will follow up with Mit.
- 3. New Business from last year:
  - Regulatory compliance issues.
    - OSRP
  - Faculty workload policy – revision by Jeri Lyons (status?)
  - Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
    - DeKrey noted that this came from the provost’s office to increase the impact of service, which was framed with an equity argument.
    - Senbet explained that the typical workload distribution is 60-20-20, but during evaluations service and research are not weighed equally.
      - He emphasized the need to elevate the 20-20 portion without reducing the teaching component.
  - Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
    - Student evaluations are used differently across the university
      - For example, in the history department student evaluations are used when addressing inequities
    - Faculty should know evaluations can be used as evidence among many.
      - However, there are concerns about using these during evaluations due to low response rates, overly negative or positive comments, and bias due to voluntary participation.
    - An issue that was highlighted was how the evaluations are open for such a long period of time.
      - It was suggested that professors can designate a time during class to fill them out.
    - Although the student evaluations are deeply flawed, they should not be used at the university-wide level and only at the unit level.
      - It was believed that if the evaluations hold good evidence it can set up some trajectory for the faculty member, it shouldn’t be the only piece of evidence during faculty evaluations.
    - This is an item the committee can revisit in the future.
  - Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center!?!
    - This can be seen as a minimal investment that can help boost faculty morale and encourage faculty to be healthy.

- We can look into what other universities are doing and do some research.
  - Codify Research Fellow designation as (e.g., part of Emeritus)?
    - Coming from an article highlighting a trend that allows senior faculty with active research to reduce teaching loads in order to continue their research.
      - This approach can be beneficial but likely won't be widely utilized.
      - In many cases, grant funding covers their salary
    - The idea is that they will release their tenure and maintain lab or research space.
    - There were concerns that this approach may not be ideal, though it could be an advantage for research fellows.
    - Sileo did mention that there are grants-funded employees and involve no teaching.
      - If faculty are essentially grant-funded and want to continue tenure, it may not work.
  - DeKrey was approached by former tenured faculty member who has returned to teach. HR informed them they would be paid less as a retired faculty member compared to a non-retired hire.
    - General Counsel English believes this may be a legal matter and requests more information.

### **Unfinished Business (from last year)**

1. 3-3-902 Faculty salary bonus for award of Distinguished Professor title
2. 3-3-801 Implementation of Faculty Evaluation Procedures
  - Part (f) should be revised to determine what needs to be changed.
  - It was suggested to adjust contract renewables.
    - Since some contract renewable faculty have been here a long time why are they subjected to annual/biennial evaluations instead of extending?
      - Securing senior lectures was suggested as well.
      - Changes must be made to avoid excluding certain groups.
    - It was mentioned that if promoted to contract renewable, they won't have to be evaluated until year 3.
      - If a comprehensive review is being done there won't be an annual and criteria will be different.
    - It was stated that current language was ambiguous
  - Revisions will be made before the next meeting.

### **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 APC

### **Call for the Good of the Order**

- Thank you all for being here!
- There should be an equal amount of money for doughnuts if faculty get free access to recreation center!

**Adjournment 5:06pm**