

## **FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

**Campus Commons 2200**

**Wednesday, November 20th, 2024 | 3:40-5:00PM**

**Present:** Barkley, DeKrey, Iannacchione, Kang, Kyle, Landry, Lee, Lunaris, Senbet

**Zoom:** Garrett, Trask, Wieben

**Absent:** English

### **Call to Order 4:43pm**

**Approval of Agenda approved without objection**

**Approval of November 6, 2024, meeting minutes approved without objection**

### **Chair's Report/Announcements**

1. The Provost's office (Jordan) was asked to supply data in support of discussion regarding 2-3-801(2)(b)(II)(d): list of program areas and numbers of T/TT/CR faculty members. The data was received and was distributed with the agenda. The following questions were asked.
  - If a T/TT faculty member in your unit has undergone comprehensive review recently, was the above process used?
  - If so, was the process easy and seamless?
  - If the above codified process was not used, or if a modified version was used, what was the process?
  - If the codified process was not used, what were the reasons for using a different or modified process?
  - DeKrey is receiving feedback and will bring back to FWC

### **Subcommittee Reports**

1. None

### **Special Orders**

1. None

### **Unfinished Business**

2. Review of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty.
  - Codification reviewed and provided feedback
  - Landry moves to approve changes, seconded by Senbet
    - Approved unanimously
3. 2-3-801 Faculty Evaluation.
  - New terms and definitions have been added.
  - (c) Unit-level evaluation committee:
    - Senbet stated that (b) is for comprehensive review and does not apply to non-comprehensive review
      - He would like to specify that (b) is for comprehensive review.

- DeKrey is worried that it would read that all comprehensive reviews will require that extra members
  - In the first sentence it should be “not fewer than three” instead of “not less than three”
  - Remove the hyphen (-) between “makeup” in the last sentence.
  - Do members of program area faculty include comprehensive reviews?
    - They are included for their annual and the committee will revisit this part when we reach non-comprehensive reviews.
- (n) Performance Areas:
  - Scores by committee and scores by individuals are done differently across units and cause some confusion.
    - Definition (q) Evaluation Score Range is in reference to the score made by the committee
    - Leaving out “average” allows for flexibility
  - “teaching” should be “instruction”
  - Should scores be whole numbers? Or keep the nearest 10<sup>th</sup> for committees?
    - Luanris advocates for retaining scores to the nearest tenth, emphasizing that it reflects and validates the work they have done.
      - Landry disagrees, arguing that keeping tenths could prompt questions, such as why a 4.8 wasn’t rounded up to 5 or what was the reason for a 4.8 instead of a 5?
    - Kyle noted that having ranges can be misleading, but switching to whole numbers would require units to adjust their criteria.
      - Different units currently use different criteria, with some using whole numbers and others using tenths.
      - If a change to whole numbers is implemented, units would need to revise their criteria, which would then require review by deans and the Barkley’s office.
      - To avoid additional workload, it may be best to keep the current system.
    - Is (q) a weighted average for the overall score or for the individual parts?
      - This table can be used for each category or the overall score.
    - Iannacchione highlighted the value of using tenths, particularly in pre-tenure reviews, which helps set them up for success.
- (p) Evaluation Level:
  - Will the use of rank be confusing since it is used in another way in BPM?
    - The term “rank” and “(and corresponding rank)” will be removed
- (q) Evaluation Score Range:
  - New formatting of Evaluation Score Ranges
    - Changes include the removal of the first column and the addition of (I)-(V) next to the corresponding evaluation level.

<u>Evaluation Score Range</u>	<u>Evaluation Level</u>
<u>4.6 – 5.0</u>	<u>Excellent (V)</u>
<u>3.6 – 4.5</u>	<u>Exceeds Expectations (IV)</u>

<u>2.6 – 3.5</u>	<u>Meets Expectations (III)</u>
<u>1.6 – 2.5</u>	<u>Needs Improvement (II)</u>
<u>1.0 – 1.5</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory (I)</u>

- (r) Overall Evaluation:
  - Remove the second sentence
- 2-3-801(2) Comprehensive Review.
  - First paragraph:
    - The removal of triennial review for full professors has been consider.
    - Should reviews be done every six years? Or change to five?
      - Senbet has seen other institutions do their comprehensive reviews between 5-7 years.
      - According to an executive order from the Governor provided by Barkley, “Post-tenure performance reviews shall be designed both to evaluate a faculty member's level of performance and to assist the faculty member in improving his or her performance. Under the post-tenure review policy, each tenured faculty member shall receive a performance review at least once every five years.”
        - Which means if we don't do a comprehensive review for Tenure by year three, we won't be in compliance with the law of CO if changing to every five years.
      - Barkley agrees to five years since a review will need to be done for a distinguished professor designation.
      - We can keep the 6 but in order to do the comprehensive review in the 6<sup>th</sup> year a review must be done at least once in the first 5 years.
    - This was brought up addressing what should be done if people are taking advantage of the system.
    - Technically you are being evaluated during the entire duration
    - Is it required to do a 3-year comprehensive review for pre-tenure?
      - Yes, this process makes sure they present evidence of their progress, the specific requirements vary depending on their rank and the expectations of the committee.
    - Garrett – Couldn't this become an issue if someone felt targeted by their department?
      - She is not in favor of this if they can be targeted for having an evaluation.
    - Insert the following sentence after the University Regulations reference, “A tenured associate professor will undergo a comprehensive review at least once every six years, and a subperiod (triennial) review prior to comprehensive review.”
    - In the last sentence replace “faculty member” with “professor” and “six academic” with “five”

## **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
6. Amorous relationship policy – consider addition of references to other BPM sections such as 1-1-508(3) Sexual Harassment Policy, 1-1-502 Conflict of Interest, 2-3-410 Conflict of Interest, 3-6-125 Discrimination Complaint Procedures.

## **Completed Business**

1. Revision of 1-1-307 on 10/9/2024 – on hold for submission to Codification Committee until completion of 2-3-801 and 3-3-801.
2. Revision of 2-3-305 Academic Titles on 11/6/2024 – on hold for submission to Codification Committee until completion of 2-3-304 Affiliate Faculty.
  - MOTION: Landry moves to approve changes, seconded by Senbet
    - VOTE: Approved unanimously

## **Call to the Good of the Order**

**Adjournment 5:02pm**