

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, February 26th, 2025 | 3:30-5:00PM

Present: Barkley, Brown, DeKrey, English, Iannacchione, Kang, Kyle, Lee, Senbet

Zoom: Lunaris, Trask

Absent: Garrett, Landry, Wieben

Call to Order 3:36pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objections

Approval of February 12, 2025, meeting minutes approved without objections

Chair's Report/Announcements

1. Proposed questions for Jeri Lyons distributed along with supporting documents
2. Jeri Lyons scheduled to visit FWC April 2

Subcommittee Reports

1. None

Special Orders

1. None

Unfinished Business

1. Review of proposed questions for Jeri Lyons
 - Rewrite the first sentence as
 - Keeping track of tasks that have high stakes, such as regulatory compliance and grants management are critical to the effectiveness of ORSP/IRB/IACUC.
 - Add the following question(s) to the list
 - What are your procedures for these things, and where could we find them? Is it possible to make these procedures publicly available?
 - There seems to be a lot of turn-over in ORSP. Are there plans for managing work through staffing transitions so that balls aren't dropped?
 - Are there plans to update your website to provide more clarity about how ORSP can help faculty?
 - Point 2
 - Insert "are" between "procedures" and "used"
 - Replace "aren't missed" with "are met" at the end of the question.
 - Point 3
 - Replace "frustration" with "concern" should be "frustrations"
 - Replace "received" with "expected"
 - Point 4

- Insert “The Dean of Students Office uses Maxient to track cases.” After the first sentence.
 - Replace “Is this type of system possible with” with “Do you think that this type of tracking system is possible or something you think could work for”
 - Point 7
 - Insert “and turnaround has improved In IRB and IACUC?” at the end of the second question.
 - Point 10
 - Replace “There has been” with “What’s the process for documenting annual reports. We’ve heard reports of”
 - Add “How do you ensure that we’re in compliance?” after the first question
 - Point 11
 - Replace “bring” with “ensure that”
 - Add “Is the plan written and/or available? How do you update your processes to respond to changing regulatory requirements?” after the first question
 - DeKrey will rearrange the questions and bring to the next FWC meeting before sharing with Jeri-Anne Lyons.
- 2. 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluation
 - Revision of Unit-Level Evaluation Committee, 2-3-801(1)(d)
 - Revision of 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(B)
 - Revision of 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(D)
 - Addressing faculty that have joint appointments their unit-level evaluation committee will be “the maximum will be total number of faculty in both programs.”
 - Other units allow participation from both units.
 - Last sentence
 - Brings the concern of whether it negates from the fact we have new language
 - Remove “solely” in the last sentence
 - Continue at (2)(b)(II)(H) – should the ULEC and unit leader have the ability to respond to a dean’s comments?
 - It was stated that the provost actionable items should go to her office aswell.
 - Barkley will provide any more actionable items if any come up
 - For clarification this section deals with comprehensive evaluations
 - Tenure track evaluations would be related to Annual/Biennial/Triennial evaluations
 - Insert “, and evaluatee’ after “unit leader” in the last sentence of the second paragraph.
 - New language of the third paragraph.
 - For comprehensive reviews involving tenure, promotion, and/or unsatisfactory comprehensive evaluation, the dean forwards their findings, along with those of the unit-level evaluation committee and unit leader, together with all responses, to the Chief Academic Officer. In addition, the dean will include the Tenure Appeals Committee findings only if the Tenure Appeals Committee has decided that the unit-level evaluation committee’s evaluation was not in accord with the program area’s evaluation criteria or process. For comprehensive reviews not involving

tenure, promotion, and/or unsatisfactory comprehensive evaluation, the evaluation process ends with the dean unless the dean decides to send the dossier for further review by the Chief Academic Officer or the CAO requests participation.

- Questions to consider:
 - Do we have "Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory" designations for pre-tenure?
 - What is the two-year process? What happens if the outcome is unsatisfactory?
 - What would the workload be like if pre-tenure evaluations were sent to the provost?
 - There may be concerns if the provost does not receive these evaluations.
 - It would make sense for evaluations to go to provost if it was a negative outcome.
- If a pre-tenure evaluation needs improvement but is not unsatisfactory, clearer language is needed.
 - Senbet has concerns about the additional workload this may create in the provost's office.
- (2)(b)(II)(G)
 - Does the evaluatee have the opportunity to respond?
 - It does not clearly state that they are required to respond.
 - Insert "and evaluatee" after "The unit-level evaluation committee" in the third sentence.
 - Depending on workload, Senbet recommends moving pre-tenure evaluations up the chain.
 - Could the review process remain with the dean if additional review is needed?
 - The dean could consult with the unit leader or program area coordinator.

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 4:58pm