

FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

Campus Commons 2200

Wednesday, September 25th, 2024 | 3:40-5:00PM

Present: Barkley, DeKrey, English, Garrett, Kang, Kyle, Lee, Luanris, Senbet

Zoom: Trask, Wieben

Absent: Iannacchione

Call to Order 3:41pm

Approval of Agenda approved with the addition of to the Chair's report

Approval of September 11, 2024, meeting minutes approved without objection

Chair's Report/Announcements

- Kyle and DeKrey met with Kirsty about identifying issues and ways to solving them as a committee
 - Kirsty requested a roadmap to accompany any committee action outlining how the action fits into a larger vision for policy change.
- Speaking of the Tenure Track policy, there are several concerns that were addressed. Her main concern was what she perceived as a requirement for a performance evaluation of a tenure-track faculty member even in a situation of non-renewal for cause, which Garrett agreed was a valid interpretation.
- It was stated that contract renewable faculty members were considered “at-will” employees according to the previous general counsel;
 - But it is not really stated in policy
- As for Faculty Evaluations Kirsty is looking for ways to reduce the volume of work and dossiers that she receives.
 - Actionable items like tenure, promotions, terminations, along with negative outcomes should go to the provost.

Special Order

- Appointment of members to the FWC subcommittee on COM policies – nominees are: Greg DeKrey, Nick Pullen or Mit McGlaughlin, Britney Kyle, and Todd Allen – possibly others?
 - Discussion:
 - DeKrey is still waiting for responses from a few more people.
 - It was stated to consider rank when deciding on who to appoint.
 - Provost's office has no concern about having too many representatives from one college
 - Nick and Mit can both be on the committee

- VOTE: The appointment of members of the FWC subcommittee are approved by acclamation.
 - Barkley is willing to serve as ex-officio on subcommittee.
- Sanjeev Choudhary, Associate Dean of the College of Osteopathic Medicine will be the source for policies for the ad hoc committee. He will be in touch but there are currently no policies for FWC to review.
- Barkley brought forth a policy for the subcommittee to consider.

Unfinished Business

1. Faculty Evaluation – examine frequency and timeline of comprehensive and other evaluations with a goal of reducing the burden on faculty and administrators of unnecessary and/or inefficient evaluation practices (including ABT review, performance levels, AY versus calendar year timing, and program area evaluation practices).
 - Review and discuss proposed changes to 1-1-307
 - 1-1-307(1) Purposes and Intent of Evaluation.
 - Remove “:” from “The purposes and intent of the faculty evaluations are:”
 - Insert “;” at the end of each part (a)-(d)
 - Remove part (e) “to provide a basis for merit salary increases”
 - Part (f) becomes the new (e)
 - Start new part (e) with “and” and end the sentence with “a satisfactory level.”
 - 1-1-307(2) General Principles.
 - Capitalize the start of each part of that section
 - 1-1-307(2)(b)
 - The 2-3-801(3)(b) reference may need to be changed in the future after final changes are made for accuracy.
 - 1-1-307(2)(d)
 - Remove the “.” At the end of the reference in brackets
 - Check 2-3-1201 for accuracy
 - 1-1307(3) Post-Tenure Review.
 - Replace “All faculty at the University ... meet the guidelines developed by the” with “University review procedures meet the guidelines of the”
 - We may want to link the CCHE.
 - Insert “the” between “within” and “discipline”
 - Remove extra space between “director/program”
 - Review and discuss proposed changes to 2-3-801
 - 2-3-801 “Comprehensive Review” changed to “Faculty Review”
 - The goal for reorganizing this section is to make 2-3-801 more logical in its approach by first identifying the two types of faculty review (comprehensive and subperiod), and then providing the details about each of those reviews with definitions pertinent to all faculty review in 2-3-801(1), comprehensive review in 2-3-801(2), and subperiod review in 2-3-801(3)

- The first two paragraphs have been moved to 2-3-801(2) Comprehensive Review and will be replaced with:

“Faculty reviews serve as mechanisms to provide for performance evaluation, support for professional development, assessment of progress toward promotion and/or tenure, recognition of achievement, and feedback for improvement if needed [see 1-1-307(1) Purposes and Intent of Evaluation].

There are two categories of faculty review:

1. Comprehensive review which is used for purposes of pre-tenure review, tenure review, promotion review, and post-tenure review.
 2. Subperiod review which provides a mechanism for faculty members holding academic rank to receive evaluation and feedback prior to comprehensive review.”
- 2-3-801(1) Definitions.
 - These definitions include those for both comprehensive and subperiod reviews --
 - Changes to definition “(I) Comprehensive Period”:
 - Review Period: The relevant years for the purposes of annual/biennial/triennial review, pre-tenure review, tenure review, promotion review, and post-tenure review, or if not for any of these purposes, from the previous comprehensive review [See also 2-3-901(1) Time Guidelines; See also 2-3-801(2)]which will consist of one or more academic years notwithstanding that the faculty member may not have worked the entirety of an academic year.
 - Changes to definition “(II) Dossier:”
 - Dossier: Portfolio of information relative to performance during the review period. Dossiers shall include (1) a narrative of accomplishments during the review period; (2) an updated vita in approved university format; (3) appropriate documentation; (4) all student evaluations, from each year, covering all teaching assignments; and (5) other materials as the evaluatee deems appropriate. Comprehensive review dossiers shall also contain subperiod review outcomes from the review period, including subperiod letter from unit-level evaluation committee, the chair/director/program area coordinator, and the dean for the period under review.
 - FWC will continue its discussion at the next meeting.

New Business

1. Distinguished Professor designation
2. Consideration of service and professional activity weighting within faculty evaluation
3. Ethical use of student evaluations of teaching within faculty evaluation, DEI consideration

4. Step-back policy
5. Advocate for faculty free access to recreation center

Call to the Good of the Order

Adjournment 5:06pm