

## **FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

Remote Meeting - Zoom

April 14, 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, Satriana, Senbet

### **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 3:30pm.

### **Approval of the Agenda**

Approved without objection.

### **Approval of the March 31, 2021 meeting minutes**

Approved without objection.

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

- Satriana is joining us today to aid in discussion of the RSCW Misconduct policy.
- We will be looking at the Promotion policy again; there may be an issue with the amendment as approved at Senate.

### **Special Orders**

- **Officer Nominations**
  - Luger nominated Senbet as Chair for 21-22, and Senbet accepted the nomination.
  - No members were nominated for Vice-Chair.
  - We will vote next time.

### **Unfinished Business**

### **New Business**

- **RSCW Misconduct Policy**
  - Satriana explained the difficulties of using mental state language in University policy. His recommendation is to delete the mental state language because it is not crucial to determining whether misconduct happened.

### **DISCUSSION:**

- Culpable mental state may be relevant to determine the level of sanction imposed as a result of misconduct.
- Although 'negligent' versus 'intentional' behavior is relatively easy to define, it may be difficult to judge. 'Reckless'/'knowing' are even more problematic.

- Inadvertent missteps may result in misconduct if the scope is too narrowly defined (e.g., editing mistakes resulting in plagiarism, or changing standards of conflict of interest resulting in unintentional failure to disclose conflicts).

#### *Key Items to Consider*

- Intentionality and whether to remove mental states from the policy language – How does inadvertency/negligence factor into investigation or punishment? (see discussion above)
- Clarify the Confidentiality section 3-8-102(3) – What information can be shared and with whom?
- How to address informal resolutions – Although informal resolutions are not possible in all situations, the current policy is silent on whether they can happen at all.
  - If a mutual resolution is available, can the process stop?
  - How to approach situations where the Complainant or Respondent are not part of the University?
- Clarify the Inquiry subsection 3-8-102(5)(g) – The Complainant should also have access to the inquiry report. Jeri Lyons may have additional input.
- Clarify the Discipline section 3-8-102(7) – The section is vague, and the last sentence is problematic: “Disciplinary proceedings shall be governed by established University procedures.”
  - Dismissal has an established University procedure, but what about lesser disciplinary actions?

We will postpone further discussion until the committee takes up the item next year.

#### • **Promotion Policy – follow up question**

- The committee discussed the best way to re-write the Eligibility subsection (b), which underwent additional changes at Senate after it was reviewed at the last Welfare meeting.
- Lecturers and instructors are both promotable, so years of credit would apply to promotion but not tenure.
  - If lecturers/instructors are converted to tenure-track, the term conversion policy would be applicable.

MOTION: Doerner – It is moved to strike “and tenure” from the end of the last sentence in 2-3-901(4)(b).

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

- We will bring the amended revision to Senate on 4/19.

#### **Other New Business**

#### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:22pm.

Stan Luger  
Chair

Betsy Kienitz  
Recording Secretary