

## **FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

**Campus Commons 2200**

**Wednesday, February 12th, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM**

**Present:** Barkley, Brown, DeKrey, English, Kang, Kyle, Landry, Senbet

**Zoom:** Garrett, Iannacchione, Lunaris

**Absent:** Lee, Trask

### **Call to Order 3:34**

**Approval of Agenda approved without objections**

**Approval of January 29, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objection**

### **Chair's Report/Announcements**

1. Regulatory compliance/ORSP follow-up:
  - Documents were shared from NHS RSCW outlining concerns and recommended actions.
  - Did Britney Kyle meet with the administrators in the past couple of weeks?
    - There is a possibility of inviting Jeri-Anne Lyons to a Faculty Senate meeting to discuss RSCW concerns.
      - It was suggested that she is invited to Faculty Welfare instead of Faculty Senate
      - It is best to acknowledge what has been done and get something on her calendar now.
    - It was proposed to invite her to the 4/2 Faculty Welfare meeting, followed by inviting her to the 4/21 Faculty Senate meeting
    - DeKrey will prepare a set of targeted questions in advance to help guide the discussion.
    - Office hours were initially stated as being only on Tuesdays and Thursdays. However, it has been clarified that office hours are available Monday through Friday.

### **Subcommittee Reports**

1. None

### **Special Orders**

1. None

### **Unfinished Business**

1. 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluation
  - Revision of Unit-Level Evaluation Committee
    - There are faculty with joint appointments and clarifying which unit will conduct the evaluations would be helpful

- If evaluation criteria shift based on circumstances, it could be problematic.
- Using two sets of evaluation criteria creates confusion, making it unclear what faculty should follow for tenure.
  - It was also stated that a split appointment would not dilute an evaluation but instead add to it.
- It was suggested to allow each unit determines or adjusts the maximum number of members
  - There are concerns about how often changes will occur and the rationale behind them.
    - Frequent changes could lead to lawsuits or grievances.
    - Stability is needed and there can be implications if the policy is misused.
  - There should be some criteria since some units do not have this criterion in their evaluation criteria.
- It was proposed to set the maximum to the number of people in the unit and for joint appointments it should not exceed the two units combined.
  - Garrett can see this language as problematic and hard to understand, especially for her unit.
- DeKrey will draft language to address concerns.
- Continue at (2)(b)(II)(D).
  - Changes were made to clarify who is responsible for determining the scores.
- (2)(b)(II)(E)
  - Question raised: “Would using “by a vote” be acceptable since tenure evaluations do not involve a vote but instead a score?
    - Committee decided to remove “by a vote”
    - Discussion on why scores were given, and any subsequent adjustments is considered helpful.
  - Insert “must” before “explain” in the second to last sentence.
- (2)(b)(II)(F)
  - (i)
    - If unit evaluations do not grant tenure, what is the next step in the process?
      - Committee agree there is a process, but language says different.
      - Current language implies the process stops and can move to the Tenure Appeals Committee.
    - Remove “shared with” in the second paragraph.
    - The rationale should be framed as a discipline-based decision.
    - It is not true that there is “no further action is needed”
      - The evaluation committee will need to submit the letter
      - Reject the insertion of “no further action is needed” and keep original language.
- What happened in the case of a tied vote on a score?
  - The mean, median, or mode would have to be used but it would have to go back to the evaluation criteria.

- Units using a mode would have to come up with a process that results in a single score.
- (2)(b)(II)(G)
  - Current practices are going against the policy
    - The unit leader's evaluation is supposed to be shared with the unit faculty and with the evaluatee.
  - This section is still working in progress and needs more clarification.
- (2)(b)(II)(H)
  - Dean would share unless deemed inappropriate and should be able to provide rationale for the scores.
  - Would the faculty of the program and the unit leader have the opportunity to respond?
    - Who is referred to as "faculty", does this mean the evaluation committee?
      - The evaluation committee, unit leader, and evaluatee.
- The committee will continue discussion at the next meeting

### **New Business**

1. Faculty workload policy – revision by Jeri Lyons
2. Regulatory compliance issues.
3. Distinguished Professor designation
4. Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
5. Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration
6. Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center

### **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 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.
3. Revision of 2-3-305 Academic Titles on 11/6/2024 – approved by BOT on 12/13/2024.

### **Transferred Business**

1. Step-back policy – transferred to Salary Equity Committee
2. Amorous Relationship policy – awaiting draft from general counsel

### **Call to the Good of the Order**

### **Adjournment 4:59pm**