

Faculty Welfare Committee Meeting
March 19, 2014

In attendance: Bethany Bell, Tommy Hodges, Mike Seaman, Allison Anders, Joe Flora, Eva Monsma, Jeremy Searson, Diane Monrad, and Jan Yow

Minutes submitted by: Carolyn Delton

Minutes amended by: Bethany A. Bell

1. The minutes from the February 19, 2014 meeting will be approved via email.
2. The Steering committee supported the revisions to 2014 Bylaws recommended that the word 'volunteer' be worked into the document. The document will be updated to add the wording voluntary for non-tenure and clinical faculty and reviewed by the Steering committee on 26 March 2014. The revisions will be voted on at the full faculty meeting to be held on 7 May 2014.
3. The Dean supported a new award be created for adjunct faculty and recommended that an award be created to recognize graduate students. There will be two graduate student awards for \$250 each; will follow-up with the Dean for composition of awards.

Faculty award nominations will be reviewed at the next Faculty Welfare committee meeting; nominations are due by 28 March 2014.

4. The proposal submitted under the new guidelines for Program B-External Grants has been funded. Two proposals submitted under the new guidelines for Program A-Publication were returned for revisions.
5. The Executive Associate Dean for Administration and Research stated all COE By-laws were reviewed and the changes requested only affect the Faculty Welfare committee. Changes to the Faculty Welfare committee By-Laws will be drafted by the Executive Associate Dean and sent for review.
6. Initial discussion of the document entitled 'Essential Questions for Unit Annual Performance Reviews' took place. This document was created from a review of policies at University of Arizona, Ohio State, and University of Minnesota. FWC member drafted the document by taking relevant policies at these universities and posing them as questions. Lively discussion was had – some key issues that came up pertained to the APR as a measure towards T&P vs. APR as a measure of merit in terms of raises. This aspect of the discussion then became specific to COE and its process for merit based raises this year (2013) – because there is so much variability at the department level in the nature of the APR process, discussion focused on perhaps the Dean's office requiring departments to use the same approach for merit ratings across departments. Given that any merit based monies are College monies and not department monies, it seems that for situations such as merit ratings, the dean's office can require a centralized method for assessing faculty. Discussions on the document and possible revisions, additions, etc. continue at upcoming meetings.