

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, December 4th, 2024 | 3:40-5:00PM

Present: Barkley, DeKrey, English, Iannacchione, Kang, Kyle, Landry, Senbet

Zoom: Garrett, Lee, Lunaris, Trask

Absent: Wieben

Call to Order 3:40pm

Approval of Agenda approved with the addition to chairs report

Approval of November 20, 2024, meeting minutes approved without objections

Chair's Report/Announcements

1. The Faculty Titles policy and the Affiliate Faculty policy Faculty Titles policy and the Affiliate Faculty policy were both approved at the last senate meeting, 2024-11-24.
 - The provost, general counsel, and president's office have fully approved the policies, and it will be included on the Board of Trustees agenda.
2. Among the documents provided with this agenda are the responses received from faculty members in units with three or fewer T/TT faculty members.
 - Units either use the existing policy and it works for them, or they combine with other units and conduct evaluation.
3. Regulatory compliance –
 - Item will be added to the January agenda
 - At the Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting concerns about regulatory compliance are addressed, IRB and IACUC process is taking too long
 - David Greene brought up the issue and wants it addressed quickly, ensuring the President is informed.
 - Kim Murza will draft a letter to be shared at Monday's FS meeting.
 - The letter might result in an item for FWC to handle.
 - FWC has the authority to invite individuals to discuss and address issues or questions which might be beneficial in order to conduct a more organized inquiry.
 - Should FWC pursue this in an organized fashion or wait after Monday's Faculty Senate (FS) meeting?
 - Iannacchione suggests waiting until after Monday's FS meeting to see how things go.
 - There was an IRB update that most members did not receive
 - Barkley will forward that update.

Subcommittee Reports

1. None

Special Orders

1. None

Unfinished Business

1. 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluation.
 - 2-3-801(2) Comprehensive Review.
 - See notes on hard copy
 - In keeping with this policy, tenured professors must undergo a comprehensive review at least once every five years. Associate professors must undergo comprehensive review at least once in every six years if at least one subperiod review is conducted in a year between comprehensive reviews.
 - 2-3-801(2)(a) Comprehensive Review Types
 - Promotion review
 - Remove “, when requested by the evaluate,”
 - Reorder the review types as
 - Pre-tenure Review
 - Tenure Review
 - Promotion Review
 - Post-tenure Review
 - Pre-tenure review
 - Delete “will include scores and reasons based on the program area’s approved criteria”.
 - 2-3-801(2)(b) Comprehensive Review Procedures
 - (I)
 - “for a faculty member holding rank of Assistant Professor”
 - Will it cause problems if hired without tenure?
 - We may want to look at this again. How does promotion for associate professors who want to go up for tenure factor in?
 - Some can request comprehensive review and not a tenure review until the very last year.
 - Barkley - Is there language about hiring a professor or associate professor without being on tenure track?
 - (II)
 - (B)
 - “chair/director/coordinator” should be “unit leader”
 - What does “review dossier and other relevant material” mean?
 - For example, Dean knows something that is not known to the faculty that is material to the decision. Policy requires that if there is no legal reason to be withheld there should be no reason to include
 - Remove “whatever”; remove “can reasonable be gathered” and replace with “or information”
 - Where does the information come from? Who provides it?
 - (C)
 - Insert “members” after “Contract-renewable faculty”

- (D)
 - (I)
 - Double what is short.
 - If the committee is short one, two faculty names are submitted. Short two, four are submitted.
 - (II) Should “at least” be removed or not?
 - Senbet shared that if short, Economics will bring in someone to meet the minimum of three evaluators instead of exceeding the threshold of having too many evaluators outside the program.
 - The committee should not consist of a majority of members from outside the unit.
 - Some programs allow as many evaluators as they wish.
 - If criteria are established by the program, this should not be a problem.
 - Landry stated that having large committees where the majority are from outside the program’s area of expertise can be problematic.
 - If the Dean appoints members from outside the unit, it can diminish the influence of unit members.
 - Some program areas are already violating the policy by exceeding the evaluation committee size.
 - There are concerns on how committees are established for these reviews.
 - Can cross campus/joint appointment units combine their committee?
 - This is something that will need to be reviewed
 - Lee stated that in (II) there are faculty advisory boards which is an already established entity as for (I) that involves a new set of people.
 - (I) seems to have no “guardrail” and is open to the whole university.
 - Does (III) address the original concern?
 - There was a hope for colleges to establish specific, college-level committees.
 - The current structure does not seem to resolve ASL-specific challenges.
 - Adding a fourth option may be problematic
 - Garrett explained that comparing ASL criteria with criteria from other disciplines has previously caused problems and having a cross-college set of criteria could be beneficial for consistency.
 - Faculty welfare will continue the discussion at the next meeting.

- Starting at 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(D)

New Business

1. Distinguished Professor designation
2. Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
3. Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
4. Step-back policy
5. Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center
6. Amorous relationship policy – consider addition of references to other BPM sections such as 1-1-508(3) Sexual Harassment Policy, 1-1-502 Conflict of Interest, 2-3-410 Conflict of Interest, 3-6-125 Discrimination Complaint Procedures.

Completed Business

1. Revision of 1-1-307 on 10/9/2024 – on hold for submission to Codification Committee until completion of 2-3-801 and 3-3-801.
2. Revision of 2-3-3-5 Academic Titles on 11/6/2024 – on hold for submission to Codification Committee until completion of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty.

Call to the Good of the Order

Adjournment 5:01pm