

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, September 24th, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Brown, DeKrey, Kang, Landry, Lee, Levin, Lunar, Morse, Senbet, Sileo

Zoom: Alcantar, English, Wieben

Absent: Newman

Call to Order 3:31pm

Approval of Agenda approved with the abstention of kang

Approval of September 10th, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements – No report

- Review of the Provost Office's comments on 1-1-307 and 2-3-801, Starting on page 5
- b) Comprehensive review procedures
 - Brown shared that faculty within program areas should set the evaluation criteria. However, there is a limited scope of evaluation at the provost and dean levels.
 - Faculty evaluators are considered the most appropriate evaluators.
 - Faculty are responsible for developing the criteria, while deans and the provost may use that criteria when conducting evaluations if needed.
 - Levin strongly believes that the guiding principles should emphasize faculty as the most suitable evaluators.
 - It was clarified that the intent of the comment was to state that program areas are not the only evaluators.
 - Sileo suggested language along the lines of “the chair/director, dean, and provost may also fulfill the role of evaluator” as part of the evaluation process.
 - DeKrey stated it is important to clarify that these roles are at different levels, not at the faculty level.
 - The word “primary” was suggested to clarify the hierarchy of evaluation roles.
 - Insert “primary” before “evaluator” in both instances
 - “Most appropriate primary evaluators” and “May fulfill the role of a primary evaluator when necessary.”
 - Does “primary” imply they are the best suited?
 - Although faculty are best qualified, there may be administrative pushbacks regarding the use of “qualified”.
 - It was noted that the section on developing criteria might not belong in this procedures section and the development of criteria could instead be placed under preliminaries.
 - Replace “shall” with “must.”

- (I) Preliminaries.
 - PROVOST COMMENT: Why? Consider CR.
 - Insert “tenure track” before “Assistant Professor”
 - The comment is addressed by referencing tenure track
- (II) Process.
 - To keep the communication system open-ended, Brown suggested inserting the following to the end of the first sentence,
 - “official university communication systems of the recommendation made”
 - Removing “, which may include, email or Digital measures, campus mail and university email...decision”
 - (B)
 - It is important to remember that faculty are allowed to supplement information in response to the committee, chair, or dean.
 - DeKrey mentioned that there are some instances where the dean may have information that is not included in the dossier, in that case should they include them?
 - It was suggested to reference those instances.
 - Sileo shared that the dean or provost may review material that the committee doesn’t view.
 - However, unless advised otherwise by General Counsel, most materials may be accessible for review.
 - To clarify, Levin asked whether the committee is permitted to consider materials not included in the dossier.
 - It was agreed that the committee should be able to consider additional materials, both positive and negative.
 - It was noted that some faculty may be bashful about their accomplishments.
 - It was emphasized that material should be “fact checked” and that everything is constrained by the criteria.
 - (E)
 - Brown, Newman, and Sileo added the sentence:
 - “In addition, the committee must explain, in writing, its reasons, in terms of the approved program area criteria, for its scores.” In the paragraph
 - The committee suggested moving this sentence to the end of the paragraph and agreed that explaining how the committee arrived at the score is important.
 - Levin proposed removing the word “mode” from the possible methods for calculating a score.
 - Kang shared that her unit uses mode for evaluations.
 - Lee shared that her unit also uses mode, considering it in terms of plurality.
 - Discussion followed on whether consensus scoring could be an alternative.

- Wieben shared that her unit reaches a single score through discussion until consensus is achieved.
 - Scenarios were shared based on different situations of scoring.
 - It was shared that some units even submit decimal-based scores, which can complicate comparisons across programs.
 - The committee acknowledged that there are currently too many different scoring approaches, and further discussion may be needed to promote consistency.
- Continuing to page 8
 - (H)
 - Inserting this sentence, “If the Dean finds the evaluation is consistent with the approved program area criteria of process, they will communicate those findings to the unit/program area evaluation committee, the unit leader and the evaluate” clarifies the communication of the dean.
 - (I)
 - Any action item will go to the CAO, in hindsight, Sileo shared that during her time as interim provost this process involved others reviewing materials when there was no official CAO in place.
 - The committee suggest leaving “their designee”
 - In response to the provost’s comment, “Interestingly if the only items forward to the CAO are action items or challenging cases then the “or designee” may not be needed.” It was noted that any action should be tied to scores based on criteria.
 - Senbet raised considerations regarding tenure decisions.
 - A recommendation refers to a positive outcome that moves forward to the President and Board of Trustees (BOT). A decision refers to a negative outcome.
 - For clarity actions items do include denials
 - The inclusion of “pre-tenure” implies that such cases go to the BOT, when they actually do not.
 - “pre-tenure” should be removed and addressed in a separate section.
 - Members asked the following question.
 - Is there a requirement that the CAO must communicate with other than the BOT?
 - Brown suggests adding language regarding that communication
 - The following paragraph will require revisions,
 - For comprehensive reviews involving tenure and promotion, the CAO, consistent with the program area’s criteria, decides whether the evaluation should result in a positive recommendation to the President and Board of Trustees. In all other comprehensive review cases, the CAO, consistent with the program area’s criteria, decides the final outcome of the review and communicates this appropriately.

- Brown suggests referencing the section that provides details on unsatisfactory ratings for post-tenure reviews.
 - As for pre-tenure reviews, language will need to be developed.
- As a reminder, Senbet shared that actionable items are the only things that move to the CAO, otherwise it stays at dean level.
- Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

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 APC

Call for the Good of the Order

Thank you everyone for your collaboration on this! Thank you, Oscar, for working on the edits!

Adjournment 4:58pm