

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Remote Meeting - Zoom

October 7, 2020 – 3:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

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

Absent: Blatt

Call to Order

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

Approval of the Agenda

Approved with addition of discussion of annual/biennial review as the first item of new business.

Approval of the September 23, 2020 meeting minutes

Approved without objection.

Chair's Report/Announcements (Luger)

Special Orders

Unfinished Business

- **Administrative Position Searches 3-3-1201** – *returned for review*
 - Add “the Faculty Senator(s) from the college” to the appropriate sub-sections in both the College Dean and the Asst/Assoc. Dean sections.

MOTION: Doerner – It is moved to approve the policy as amended.

VOTE: Approved by voice vote.

- Luger will send a version to Andy that shows all the changes from last year's version to now.
 - The committee will review the policy again next time.

- **Contract-Renewable Faculty 3-3-201(1)** – *returned for review*

New Business

- **Annual/Biennial Review Discussion**
 - Murry forwarded a request for the suspension, if not elimination, of annual/biennial review for tenured full professors.
 - Ceasing annual/biennial review would relieve the burden on academic units, which no longer have department administrative assistants.
 - The original reason for instituting annual review was for merit pay increases; salary increases have not been common in recent years.

- Consider the implications of suspending versus eliminating/amending the annual/biennial review cycle.
 - If we pursue suspending annual/biennial review, under what conditions would the review cycle resume?
 - Amending the cycle might be cleaner than simply suspending it.
- Consider what populations of faculty to include:
 - Tenured full professors, tenured associate professors, tenure-track professors, etc.
- Faculty can always choose to have a review; a suspension/abolition of annual/biennial review wouldn't prohibit them from asking for a review.
- Since Faculty Evaluation is handled in the BPM and in UR, both policies need to be examined.
 - The President has final approval for UR changes.
 - The BOT has final approval for BPM changes.
- The issue is time-sensitive in that the changes would need to be in place before the next review cycles begin.
- Endres suggested changing to a three-year review, which would provide a mid-way point check-in between comprehensive reviews (every 6 years).
 - The committee weighed impacts/options about how a three-year review would affect full, associate, and/or tenure-track professors.
 - The review cycle would remain unchanged for contract-renewable faculty.
 - Keep in mind, like annual/biennial review, triennial review would not directly factor into comprehensive review.
- Changing the review cycle would not impact the RIF policy, in which evaluations have no direct effect, but rather rank and time in rank impact RIF proceedings.
- Luger will examine the Faculty Evaluation sections of the BPM & UR and bring forward draft revisions based on the spirit of today's conversation.

- **RSCW Misconduct Policy Revisions – re: Senate Action 1153**

Other New Business

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24pm.

Stan Luger
Chair

Betsy Kienitz
Recording Secretary