

# FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

## UC Aspen A & B Wednesday, February 8, 2023 - 3:30-5:00PM Minutes

**Present:** C. Brown, J. Brown, T. Endres, B. Iannacchione, D. Senbet

**Present via Zoom:** S. Weigand, B. Garrett

**Absent:** J. Lee, N. Sileo, D. Landry, N. Matchett, N. Pullen

**Guests:** J. Rich Fredericks

### Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 3:34pm.

### Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved by unanimous voice vote.

### Approval of January 25 meeting minutes

The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

### Chair's Report/Announcements

### Special Orders

### Unfinished Business

- **Sanctions short of dismissal workshop session**
  - Committee to define the purpose for such a policy and develop potential language.

### DISCUSSION:

- Goal is to involve faculty at the unit level and make the document less punitive.
  - It was mentioned that currently the Dean holds most of the power.
- How would this be different than Faculty Grievance Committee issues?
  - Faculty Grievance Committee handles violations, mis-applications of board policy, rules/procedures, there is a hearing) Grievance is not Title 9.
  - Should we broaden the Faculty Grievance Committee's scope or create a new committee, i.e., Faculty Appeals/Sanctions Committee?
- Weigand commented about how Indiana University allows for many opportunities for faculty to correct their behaviors, etc.
  - Consider a probationary period with re-review, anger management classes, etc.
- Punishment for "failure to perform responsibilities" is too vague. We are looking for consistency in language. Current document is too one-sided and contains punitive language. Design a more "faculty-centered" document.

- Currently when the Faculty Grievance Committee makes their recommendation, then the issue is out of the committee's hands; the President makes the final decision.
- If we create a Faculty Appeals/Sanctions Committee that uses specific criteria, then we can give this committee more power. Decide what sanctions Faculty Appeals/Sanctions Committee handles, faculty can act as "fact finders."
- Develop a clear written record of the process, ensure procedural fairness, and maintain a workable relationship with faculty moving forward.
- Get faculty involved at a certain threshold (i.e., ineligibility for prospective benefits message would need to be delivered from a Dean or the Provost, not a faculty member). It was mentioned that "benefits" does not mean health benefits or retirement; this relates to eligibility for tenure.
- Since this may include anything from ineligibility for prospective benefits, to warnings to dismissal, then we need to develop a "threshold."
- Consider empowering the unit leader(s) to start a conversation with the faculty member, before escalating to the Dean.
- Committee would like to ensure that every faculty member understands the policy. Be specific regarding what actions are "punishable."
- Jeff Brown to voluntarily edit and revise the current UNC draft document. What happens if Dean, Chair and Faculty Appeals/Sanctions Committee disagree? Maybe easier to navigate if Faculty Appeals/Sanctions Committee only handles lower threshold violations.
- Committee reviewed page 12 of UNC board policy. We need a metric for measuring the "severity" of "violations." Talked through (7)(a) through (7)(g) of UNC draft document.
- Committee reviewed AAUP's statement of professional ethics, which could be used as a springboard for ideas.
- Committee reviewed Indiana University's Code of Ethics; Rights and Relationships; inside instructional context, specific responsibilities, regulate class time, responsibilities as university citizens, personal misconduct, circulating false reports/warnings, duplicating systems, endangering others, failure to comply, fireworks, faculty or private citizens' protection of rights and enforcement procedures.
- Committee will begin with developing a Code of Ethics, types of violations and then sanctions if those are violated.
  - What UNC already says about ethics
  - What Indian University says
  - What AAUP says
- Chair Endres to send a link to Indiana University policy, AAUP policy, any existing UNC sources.
- **Dismissal proceedings of tenured faculty** (back from Codification):
  - Under "*Reasons may include the following:*" omit "institutional needs" bullet point.
  - In section: 2-3-901 "*Rationale for Purpose:*" Reviewed language modifications.

- Added <https://www.aaup.org/report/1940-statement-principles-academic-freedom-and-tenure> hyperlink after “*American Association of University Professors (AAUP)*.”
- Chair Endres to work with Nina on generating clean copy version for Faculty Senate.

**New Business**

**Call to the Good of the Order**

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:53pm.