### FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

# Campus Commons 2200 Wednesday, August 28th, 2024 | 3:40-5:00PM

Present: Barkley, DeKrey, English, Garrett, Iannacchione, Kang, Kyle, Landry, Lunaris,

Senbet, Wieben

Zoom:

**Absent:** Trask

Call to Order 3:40pm

Approval of Agenda approved without objection

Approval of April 24, 2024, meeting minutes approved without objection

# Chair's Report/Announcements

- Welcome back!
- Introductions

# **Special Orders**

• None

#### **Unfinished Business**

None

#### **New Business**

- The setting of the semester's agenda and priority rankings (see handout on possible topics)
  - o Tenure Track Policy
    - MOTION: To propose deferring the Tenure Track policy until it has been reviewed by DeKrey and Kyle, motioned by Iannacchione and seconded by Garrett
    - DISCUSSION:
      - Reason on holding off on Tenure Track policy
        - o Concerns were raised about how the policy aligns with the mission.
        - The provost's office still has unresolved concerns about the policy.
        - It was mentioned that an incident occurred that prompted the draft of the policy

- The Board of Trustees tasked FWC to address concerns they had about the policy
- Overall, faculty want to make sure they are protected from non-renewal in the case of a positive Tenure decision
- **VOTE:** Motion passed DeKrey and Kyle will review Tenure Track policy before bringing forth to committee.

## Financial Conflict of Interest Policy

- DeKrey proposed that each member of the committee review the policy and bring back any issues they may have found.
- Barkley suggested that the Faculty Research & Publication Board (FRPB) review the policy before FWC.
  - Does this policy fall under welfare or FRPB?
- Kyle will reach out to the chair of FRPB

## Request HR report to Welfare Committee on benefits

- DeKrey will reach out to HR to have rep come in and discuss benefits
  - Kylee Legino is the current Benefits Specialist

## Faculty Evaluation – Performance levels reduced to three

- Performance can be tiered at
  - Meets expectations
  - Exceeding expectations
  - Does not meet expectations

# Faculty Evaluation – Frequency of comprehensive evaluations, and the use of annual/biennial/triennial

- The biggest concern is that the redundancy of the comprehensive review creates a larger workload for chairs.
  - Focus on reducing workloads
- The provost prefers evaluations are received in bulk.

#### Faculty Evaluation – Service and professional activity given equal weight

- There will be potential push back on service and professional activity given equal weight
- Not all schools use a 60-20-20 weighing model, which leads to concern.
  - Can weights be determined through contracts?
  - Criteria will differ among units
- Provost office may not be married to having expectations
  - Might be okay with exceeding on one area (up to unit)
- Having flexibility would be good
  - Exceed in one area and make up the load in other areas.
- The evaluation of Service is seen to be subjective, and some departments lack in service at times.

# Faculty evaluation – AY versus Calendar year

- If the Tenure Track policy is passed, it may raise issues related to the timing of evaluations.
- Evaluations will need to be done during both fall and spring semesters
- There was frustration expressed about the time spent on the Tenure Track policy at the expense of addressing issues that impact the daily lives of faculty.

- The external comprehensive evaluation committee member election process brings challenges for new instructors. It was suggested that each school/unit should have a smaller committee for this process.
- Can agenda items be grouped together based on similarities and level of completion?
  - It was suggested that item 7 (Faculty Evaluation Performance levels reduced to three) and 9 (Faculty Evaluation – Not all dossiers need to go to the provost level) may be easiest to complete first.
  - o Taking on each item together would be the best approach.

#### • Elections document

- o The Bears Vote Coalition Brought forth from Nancy Matchett brought forth
  - Seeking endorsement from Faculty Senate.
  - Questions raised about the document:
    - Why do we need this?
    - What is the need for this now?
    - Are there no other policies?
  - Wieben suggested that the purpose of the document is covered all in the first bullet point.
  - Current events, such as the Israel/Gaza situation, and the importance of maintaining a safe learning environment should be addressed.
  - Codification recommendations:
    - BPM references
    - What are they trying to solve? Their jurisdiction?
  - As a committee it was agreed that the tone of the document came off as condescending and recommend, they revise the tone before any further review made by FWC.
    - A general statement could be sent as a reminder and how to handle situations if the arose.
  - MOTION: Landry motions to have the Bears Vote Coalition address the tone of the document and send it back to FWC for further review. seconded by Iannacchione
  - **VOTE:** Approved unanimously
- Next meeting:
  - Faculty Evaluation Frequency of comprehensive evaluations

Call to the Good of the Order Great first meeting!

Adjournment 5:00pm