

## **FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

Remote Meeting - Zoom

February 10, 2021 – 3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

### **MINUTES**

**Present:** Anderson, Applegate, Black, Blatt, Brown, DeKrey, Doerner, Endres, Leek, Luger, Peterson, Schaberl, Stoody, Wiegand, Zimmerman

**Absent:**

**Guests:** Levin, Senbet

#### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:32pm.

#### **Approval of the Agenda**

Approved without objection.

#### **Approval of the January 27, 2021 meeting minutes**

Approved with objection.

#### **Chair's Report/Announcements (Luger)**

- The RSCW Misconduct policy recently passed at Senate was returned by the administration; Codification has made some recommendations. We'll look at it at a later meeting.

#### **Special Orders**

#### **Unfinished Business**

- **Contract-Renewable Faculty 3-3-201(1)**
  - The committee approved without objection the definition of Unit Leader added to (b)(iii).
    - References to chair/director changed to unit leader throughout the policy
  - The committee approved without objection Applegate's recommendation to strike "or hire into a tenure-track position" from the opening sentence in 3-3-201(1) to make it consistent with the wording throughout the policy.
  - The committee approved without objection Anderson's request to add "with approval of the CAO" to first sentence in (d)(iv).

**MOTION:** DeKrey – It is moved to approve the policy as amended and forward it to Faculty Senate.

**VOTE:** Approved by voice vote.

- **Student-Faculty Dispute Complaints Report**
  - Luger reported on two incidents where multiple students filed complaints regarding a single faculty member.

- Of the two faculty members subject to complaints from multiple students, one was terminated from the University.
- Satriana told Luger that in future reports tabulations will be included as to the number of unique or repeat cases.

#### DISCUSSION:

- The committee discussed whether faculty type or rank should be included in the report data.
- In comparing previous reports (from 2019 and 2018), the committee noted that more detailed information was reported in 2018 and that the current year report was presented in a more confusing format.

#### New Business

- **Annual/biennial review for tenured faculty**

- The committee discussed implications of triennial review for tenured faculty.
  - Triennial review for tenured faculty would lighten the evaluation load in academic units.
  - Consider under what circumstances departments could require more frequent reviews, such as earning Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory in performance areas.
  - Triennial review as an option for *any* tenured faculty or only for tenured full professors?
    - Associate professors may need more frequent feedback as they work toward promotion.
- The committee agreed to pursue a triennial review option for tenured full professors.
- Luger will investigate what portions of the BPM and UR will need to be amended and bring revised language next time.

- **Promotion/Academic Ranks**

- The time guidelines for promotion are set forth in 2-3-901(1).
  - The sections pertaining to assistant professors, associate professors, and lecturers all have the stipulation of ‘four years of successful academic performance in rank’
  - Unlike the other sections, the section pertaining to instructors has no mention of rank.
- Brown asked that the issue be clarified, as the policy as it is written has been interpreted in different ways.
- Doerner proposed amending 2-3-901(1)(a) to say, “four years of full-time academic performance regardless of rank”

- ‘Regardless of rank’ accounts for differences in title nomenclature, while adding the stipulation of ‘full-time’ ensures the appropriate type of service is counted.
- Luger will bring the revised language to the next meeting.

### **Other New Business**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05pm.

Stan Luger  
Chair

Betsy Kienitz  
Recording Secretary